

UNITED WISDOM

The Family’s Emotional Vocabulary and the Words Available to Us

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-06-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Family’s Emotional Vocabulary and the Words Available to Us

Epigraph

“swift to hear, slow to speak”

James 1:19, a short excerpt from the KJV. Verified edition. The Russian article gives the authors’ translation of this fragment.

What this article is about

Sometimes naming a feeling is difficult because the right word is not readily available. Someone may describe circumstances well, remember other people’s remarks, and understand what they want, yet turn to a general “fine” or “bad” when discussing experience. The family is one place where we encounter emotional words, observe their use, and learn which statements receive a response. This matters, but someone’s present vocabulary cannot reconstruct their entire history. This article considers family speech as a possible source of habits that can be clarified and changed. We will distinguish feeling labels, judgments of behavior, and conversational rules; examine what a research review actually discusses; and compare it with specific philosophical and religious texts. The practical task is smaller than explaining an entire biography: make one conversation clearer while preserving the person’s right to choose words, withhold details, and leave some experience unnamed for now.

I. Inherited Words Do Not Pass Sentence on Us

Imagine someone who usually answers a question about their experience with “Everything’s fine.” In their family, this phrase might have meant calmness, the end of a discussion, an attempt to spare the listener, or simply a convenient everyday abbreviation. We do not yet know which applies to them. Matching expressions alone do not establish a cause: people also encounter speech at school, among friends, at work, in books, and in new relationships of their own. A recognizable family phrase may be one thread of a history rather than its complete design.

It is more useful to ask what the person means by the expression now. If “fine” means “I find this unpleasant, but I don’t want to discuss it yet,” that is already a meaningful message. If it means “I’m not noticing any particular feeling,” conversation need not uncover concealed suffering. If it means “I haven’t worked it out yet,” that uncertainty can remain. None of these answers requires first blaming the family in order to earn the right to a new word or a pause.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Examining our habits begins with an observable distinction: what I say, what I mean, and how others understand it. For example, a hypothetical listener might hear “fine” as agreement to continue a conversation, while the speaker wanted to finish it. A specific task of agreeing on meaning then appears. It does not require deciding who once taught the person to speak incorrectly. Present meaning and a present agreement can already be checked in this conversation.

This approach makes room for history without forcing someone to present that history as evidence. We may remember that feelings were rarely discussed at home and still not know how much this contributed to today’s difficulty. We may value our family’s care and seek more suitable expressions. New speech does not oblige us to declare our earlier life a mistake. It supplies another way to describe the present and understand what response is actually needed now.

II. A Feeling Label Differs from a Judgment of the Person

A family word sometimes describes experience and sometimes judges the person expressing it. “You’re upset” and “You’re being difficult” might occur in the same scene, but they do different work. The first proposes a label that the person can clarify. The second connects behavior with disapproval. We cannot automatically treat every evaluative word as an emotional diagnosis; neither should we ignore its effect on conversational conditions. First establish what was actually said instead of jumping to a conclusion about an entire family system.

Imagine an adult recalling “Don’t be ungrateful,” said after they objected. This memory does not mean that every present irritation is caused by that episode. Nevertheless, today’s speech can separate two topics: the help received and the way it was given. “I’m grateful for the help and unhappy that the decision was made without me” expresses the difference more clearly. Gratitude need not justify obligatory silence, while dissatisfaction does not prove a lack of gratitude.

Changing words does not guarantee agreement. A listener might hear the new formulation and still consider the conduct acceptable. The task then moves from emotional vocabulary to discussing an action, an agreement, and its consequences. Words help identify the disagreement’s subject; they do not decide it for the participants. Even an apt feeling label does not automatically tell us whose assessment of the circumstances is correct or what response another person must provide.

It is also useful to notice our own evaluative shortcuts. Instead of “I’m weak,” we might try “I’m finding it difficult to continue this conversation now.” This is not a positive label replacing a negative one; it describes a limited episode. It leaves room to act, rest, clarify, or return later. If

the proposed replacement does not fit, the person may reject it. Accuracy requires correspondence with their experience, rather than an attractive vocabulary an observer has chosen for them.

III. Having Permission to Say a Word Matters

A word's availability involves more than knowing its definition; it includes the conditions under which we can say it. We may know "hurt" yet avoid using it with a particular relative because the discussion usually becomes a dispute about gratitude. We may speak freely about anxiety with a friend and answer briefly around the family table. This difference between situations proves neither an inability to understand feelings nor a hidden family cause. It shows that speech choices also relate to the listener and the conversation we expect.

In a hypothetical scene, an adult says, "At home, it's easier to say I'm tired than to say I'm angry." The next question might concern the present: "What happens after each message?" Perhaps tiredness prompts an offer of rest, whereas anger starts a search for blame. Perhaps the person simply prefers short explanations. Answers help describe a particular pattern of interaction. They do not yet establish relatives' inner intentions or let us attribute the same experience to every participant.

Discussing availability need not become a demand to name everything immediately in front of family. Someone may first find an expression in a private note, try it with another listener, or decide that stating a boundary is sufficient now. "I'm not ready to continue" can be a complete message while details of experience remain private. Being able to speak includes choosing how much to disclose. Detailed openness is not the sole evidence of trust or maturity.

If new words enter a conversation, their purpose can be identified beforehand. "I want to explain how this sounds to me; I'm not asking to analyze my childhood now" sets a limit. That limit does not erase a connection with the past if the person later chooses to explore it. It keeps the conversation within an agreed scope. Family closeness does not automatically authorize demands for an explanation of every feeling. Care may involve respecting a partial message that is still unfinished.

IV. What the Research Review Actually Allows Us to Say

Eisenberg, Cumberland, and Spinrad's review, "Parental Socialization of Emotion," considers parents' reactions to children's emotions, discussion of emotions, and parents' emotional expression. It reviews research rather than reporting one experiment with a single combined sample. It discusses context and limits on causal conclusions, including reciprocal influences between parents and children. It cannot become a claim that an adult's present word proves a particular parental influence.

This distinction is valuable when considering family vocabulary: speech does not exist separately from responses and examples. The same label may be followed by attention, a change of subject, or an argument. Someone observes not only definitions but also what happens after expression. For an individual family, however, we need its actual circumstances. Naming a research field cannot replace participants' accounts, observing the sequence of events, or admitting that some history remains unknown.

Particular care is needed when moving from research on children to an adult's self-description. Years of other relationships, learning, and personal choices lie between them. Even when a habit can be traced through memories, its current function may have changed. A brief answer may save time, protect privacy, or simply suit the conversational style. We cannot select one explanation just because it fits a familiar theory. Influence is a research question, not a ready verdict based on someone's vocabulary.

The practical implication is limited and useful: we can examine several aspects of communication. Which expressions does someone hear? What responses do they receive? What ways of speaking do they see in action? These questions organize observation, but they are not a parenting test and do not sort people into categories. They may reveal room for a small change: clarifying "bad," for example, before arguing with it. That change is assessed through a particular conversation rather than a promise to transform the family's emotional life permanently.

V. Rectifying Names Does Not Create a Universal Feeling Vocabulary

Analects XIII.3, in James Legge's translation, discusses rectifying names in relation to government, speech's correspondence with reality, and the order of action. This is political and moral reasoning. It contains no modern classification of emotions. Its resemblance to our subject is limited to the question of how words connect with understanding and action. Transferring the passage's entire meaning to family self-description would be too large a step.

Nevertheless, checking particular words is useful. If one person uses "hurt" to mean "that remark was painful to me," while another hears "you must admit guilt," conversation may drift before the event is discussed. "I'm describing my experience now; I suggest discussing responsibility separately" changes the course available to the conversation. It does not make the original word wrong for everyone. It identifies a meaning these particular people needed to clarify together.

Clarification does not require finding the single correct name for experience. Different words may highlight different aspects: frustration at a disrupted plan, sadness over losing a meeting, irritation at how the news was delivered. A person may use several words or remain with a

simple description. A family vocabulary can expand without competition over the number of emotional terms. Its adequacy depends on the conversation's purpose and participants' understanding, rather than conformity to a predetermined list of ideal expressions.

We should also distinguish revising our formulation from correcting the person. "Perhaps disappointment is more accurate" leaves authorship with the speaker. "What you actually feel is fear" removes that authorship when offered as a final verdict. An observer may propose an option but must preserve the possibility of refusal. Language helps explore experience when words remain proposals that can be checked. It becomes another form of pressure when a new term is declared an obligatory truth about the listener.

VI. Family Learning Extends Beyond Conversations About Feelings

In Analects XVI.13, Legge's translation, Confucius's son reports advice to study the Odes and propriety. The episode shows the importance of cultural education and speech within a particular tradition. It is not an observational study of emotional development. Comparison with family vocabulary lets us ask which texts and forms of conversation become available to someone, but it does not establish a scientific model of emotions passing from parent to child.

Words are encountered outside the direct question "What do you feel?" They appear in stories, songs, jokes, letters, and descriptions of other people's actions. A text's content differs from how it is discussed. One reader notices sadness in a story, another loyalty, another injustice. Family reading may open several languages of description or occur without any discussion of experience. Having a book at home cannot establish the quality of emotional communication.

For an adult, expanding vocabulary may involve encountering a new expression and trying it against a personal episode. "The word 'frustration' feels close, but it doesn't cover everything here" is already independent work. We need not adopt a text's entire worldview to notice a helpful distinction; neither should we present that borrowing as complete agreement between traditions. A reader can identify what they take and what remains part of the original work's own context.

This makes it possible to approach family inheritance without an obligatory choice between preserving it and rejecting it. We may keep a habit of speaking briefly, add one clarification, and continue valuing restraint. We may use a new word in a private note without immediately introducing it into every relationship. Available expressions change gradually and need not produce a single way of speaking for every situation. Being able to communicate what matters and understand a message's limits is more useful than displaying constant emotional detail before others.

VII. Listening Does Not Require Guessing a Hidden Feeling

In James 1:19–20, KJV, the instruction about hearing, speech, and anger concerns righteousness before God. This is a religious norm of communication, rather than a finding from research on family upbringing. A narrow practical question corresponds to it here: does the speaker get to clarify meaning before the listener answers for them? The similarity concerns conversational order; the theological foundation retains its own meaning and does not become psychological evidence.

Imagine “This feels unpleasant,” immediately answered with “You’re simply jealous.” Even if jealousy is theoretically possible, that reply does not establish its presence. It replaces an unclarified message with a ready explanation. A more open response would be: “Is it unpleasant because of the decision, how it was communicated, or something else?” The question offers several directions and leaves room for another answer. Even this should be asked only if the person wants to continue; otherwise, caring clarification can become persistent questioning.

A listener need not fully understand experience in order to respect a practical request. “I can’t continue now” does not require a detailed vocabulary before a pause can be acknowledged. If the request affects both people’s interests, its conditions can be discussed: when to return, what to do meanwhile, which question remains open. The conversation retains reciprocity. One person need not explain everything immediately; the other need not promise any requested action merely because a feeling has been named.

Sometimes the best result is shared acknowledgment of imprecision. “I heard that this is difficult for you; we haven’t clarified the cause yet” preserves both the message and the limit of knowledge. Such a reply does not conceal disagreement, if there is any, and promises no elimination of distress. It lets the speaker return to the subject in their own words. Family vocabulary expands through new labels, but also through experiences in which an incomplete phrase is not used to take away someone’s right to explain themselves.

VIII. New Words Do Not Oblige Us to Reinterpret the Entire Family

Discovering a new expression may prompt a desire to explain the entire past with it. Present clarity, however, does not make every memory unambiguous. Someone may notice that they once said “tired” when they were also disappointed and still not know why they chose that word. There may have been several causes, some no longer verifiable. Clarifying the present does not require turning a hypothesis about the past into a confirmed fact or presenting relatives with a new general account of their intentions.

If someone wants to discuss a family episode, defining its boundaries is useful. “I remember this conversation and would like to understand how you remember it” leaves room for different memories. “You always forbade me to feel” goes considerably beyond one occasion and requires a different scope of support. This does not mean avoiding serious accusations when actual actions and consequences exist. It distinguishes the scale of statements: a particular remark, a repeated conversational pattern, and a conclusion about an entire history are not equivalent.

A new vocabulary can also be used without such a discussion. In today’s scene, someone might say, “I used to call this tiredness; now I want to add that I’m disappointed about the cancellation.” This does not require obtaining acknowledgment of a past mistake. It gives a clearer message that the listener can work with now. If they reject the proposed word, that does not remove the speaker’s right to their own description. A shared decision concerns conduct and agreement, rather than unanimous certification of internal experience.

Of course, words alone do not eliminate harmful conduct or replace necessary changes in circumstances. If discussion again brings pressure, the question may concern ending it or choosing another format. This article does not decide that step for the reader. It proposes keeping a distinction: learning expressions is one task, examining family history another, deciding how to interact next a third. They can be connected, but need not all be completed together to make one present conversation clearer.

IX. Vocabulary Does Not Remove Responsibility for Action

An accurate feeling label does not make every act permissible. “I’m angry” may describe a state honestly without justifying a humiliating remark. “I’m anxious” does not establish a right to control another person’s decisions. Discussing family expressions should not replace an old demand for silence with a new demand to accept anything spoken in the name of experience. Respecting experience remains compatible with examining actions, agreements, and consequences for other participants clearly.

In a hypothetical scene, someone tells a relative, “I felt hurt, so I said harsh things.” The first part may describe their experience, the second an action, and the connection between them an explanation. To restore conversation, it helps to identify the particular harsh remark and acknowledge its consequences. “That’s how I was brought up” may become a separate subject for exploration, but it does not perform today’s step for the speaker. Environmental influence can be discussed while choosing a more responsible action within present possibilities.

Listeners also retain responsibility for their response. They can acknowledge a message about feelings without agreeing with the proposed account of events. “I heard that you’re upset; I

understand our agreement differently" holds both sides in view. Then facts need to be revisited: what was promised, what occurred, where meanings differed. If discussion instead reduces to the correctness of an emotional word, the disagreement's subject disappears. An extensive vocabulary can sometimes conceal the absence of discussion about an actual action.

Useful vocabulary therefore remains specific. It helps identify what a feeling concerns, what is still unknown, and what action the person proposes. Not every message needs all three, especially in a brief everyday scene. As the stakes rise, however, the distinction becomes more valuable. It prevents treating one named experience as automatic proof of someone else's guilt, a determination of the required response, or a cancellation of other people's right to describe the same episode differently.

X. One New Distinction Can Be Enough

Emotional speech can expand through one distinction that helps the current task. For example, "I disagree with the decision" differs from "The way it was communicated is difficult for me." Both messages may be present, but they address different questions. The first invites discussion of the decision, the second of interaction. A family habit of combining them under "Don't start" or "Dissatisfied again" does not make separation impossible. Its usefulness should nevertheless be checked in a particular conversation, without promising instant mutual understanding.

To check it, compare two versions of your own message. What did the listener understand from the usual short phrase? What changed after clarification? If the meaning became clearer, that is a practical result. If conversation grew longer while its subject stayed the same, the new word may not have helped here. There is no duty to keep adding complexity. A simple "I need time" sometimes serves the task more accurately than a long list of feelings about which the speaker remains uncertain.

It matters to preserve the possibility of an inaccurate proposal. "Could this be disappointment?" allows "No, more like irritation" or "I don't know." Correcting that proposal is not a conversational failure. It shows that authorship of the description remained with the person. Even after finding a word, we might discover that it applies to only part of the episode. The note can then expand or become simpler without a demand to assemble a final picture of inner life immediately.

Family vocabulary becomes living speech when meaning can be clarified, limits stated, and room left for what is not yet named. The research review helps reveal possible aspects of interaction; classical texts open their own questions of education, speech, and moral responsibility. None supplies a ready biography of the reader. The next step remains their

choice: add a word, describe a circumstance, agree on a pause, or simply notice that today a familiar short phrase means more than others have yet heard.

What this means in practice

Choose one recent conversation you are willing to consider. Write the familiar phrase exactly: “Nothing special,” for example. Beside it, identify what you wanted to communicate in that episode. Perhaps there was no strong experience; perhaps you did not want discussion; perhaps you had not yet found a description. Do not choose the second or third option simply because they seem deeper. The task is to clarify your meaning, rather than discover an obligatory hidden problem behind a short answer.

If another formulation is needed, try adding one detail. “Nothing special; I’m just disappointed that the meeting fell through.” Or: “I’m having trouble finding a word; I want some time alone.” Check whether the expression fits you and serves the conversation’s purpose. A feeling need not be named when stating an action or boundary matters more. The word can remain approximate. Clarification can wait, and the original phrase can return if the new one feels alien or too complicated.

When speaking with someone close, first agree on scope. “I want to explain one scene from today without examining our whole history.” Then ask how they understood your message and correct a specific mismatch. Do not require acknowledgment of one definitive past account to permit a new word in the present. If actual actions are discussed, keep them as a separate subject: what happened, how participants were affected, and which next step each is willing to consider.

If listening, offer one clarification and preserve the right to decline. “Would you like to explain what ‘bad’ means, or is it enough that I heard you for now?” Do not list causes and labels as established truths about the person. “I don’t know yet” closes that question for the moment; it does not prove insufficient self-work. The practice is finished when an important message becomes clearer or an appropriate conversational limit is agreed. Expanding vocabulary need not become a separate family obligation.

Key quotation

“If names be not correct…”

Confucius, Analects XIII.3, James Legge’s translation. The continuation concerns speech, government, and the order of action; this fragment does not classify feelings. The Russian article uses the authors’ short translation.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Actual similarity in the question considered	Limit of the similarity
Analects XIII.3 and clarifying a family remark	A word's meaning relates to understanding and action	Rectifying names concerns government and moral order, rather than an emotional test
Analects XVI.13 and family learning of speech	Education and available texts matter for conversation	The normative account of Confucius and his son does not prove a causal model of emotional socialization
James 1:19–20 and attentive listening	Hearing a message can precede replying	The text's foundation is righteousness before God, rather than an experimental parenting rule
Eisenberg's review and observing family communication	Reactions, discussion, and emotional expression are considered	The review cannot establish an individual adult's history from one word
Cultural texts and the authors' clarification practice	Speech is considered alongside relationships and action	Distinct foundations remain; no common scientifically proven teaching is inferred

Primary sources and research

• Confucius, Analects, James Legge's translation, Project Gutenberg 3330: XIII.3, rectifying names; XVI.13, teaching the son the Odes and propriety. Specific passages and edition information were checked.

• James 1:19–20, King James Version: hearing, speech, anger, and the instruction's religious foundation. Short Russian quotations in the companion article are the authors' translations of the English text read.

• Nancy Eisenberg, Amanda Cumberland, Tracy L. Spinrad, "Parental Socialization of Emotion" (1998): introduction and sections on reactions, discussion, emotional expression, and research limitations were read. Used as a review, without an invented combined sample or individual causal conclusions.

Tags

emotions, feelings, emotional vocabulary, family, speech, listening, clarification, self-description, word meaning, upbringing, emotion socialization, family communication, cultural education, Confucius, Analects, James Legge, James, Eisenberg, Cumberland, Spinrad, research review, context, uncertainty, personal boundaries, responsibility, action, agreeing on meaning, memories, United Wisdom, autonomy

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.