

UNITED WISDOM

After Disappointment in a Teacher

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-08-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

After Disappointment in a Teacher

Epigraph

And when I find an interpreter, what remains is to make use of his instructions.

— Epictetus, Enchiridion §49, Thomas W. Higginson translation. Exact complete fifteen-word sentence; its context distinguishes interpretation from philosophical application.

What this article is about

Disappointment in a teacher can call more than one piece of advice into question: years of study, trusted explanations, personal decisions, and belonging. Someone may defend everything or declare it all a mistake. Between these conclusions lies the work of making distinctions. What happened? Which grounds for trust changed? What was learned, and what remained a promise or another person’s authority? This essay concerns personal spiritual history after disappointment, rather than group organization or a universal test for dangerous mentors. Epictetus, Buddhist MN95, and Matthew raise different questions about speech, conduct, and belief. Their answers retain distinct foundations. In our hypothetical story, an adult leaves a teacher whose treatment of people contradicts his teaching. She considers how to continue without excusing what she found or rejecting everything that once mattered. Disappointment may revise trust without settling the meaning of every earlier effort.

I. Naming What Disappointed You

Imagine a woman who attended spiritual reading sessions for several years. She learned to work more carefully with a text and stopped treating every difficult question as evidence of her own inadequacy. Later, the teacher used another participant’s account for a mocking public discussion, despite promising to keep it private. She stops attending. This story is invented for examination, rather than presented as a documented case. It contains a particular action, an earlier promise, and a decision. Calling it an immediate loss of faith in everything would erase those distinctions. She can first describe what she encountered in ordinary language: one thing was promised, another happened, and the previous form of participation is now unacceptable. That is neither a complete account of the person nor a final assessment of the entire teaching.

Other disappointments have different subjects: an unfulfilled promise, a mistaken explanation, an undisclosed condition of participation, or disagreement with a belief that once felt close. Each requires different questions. A correctable inaccuracy is not identical to a breach of trust; a limit to knowledge is not the same as claiming authority to decide for a learner. Making

distinctions need not reduce an action’s seriousness. It keeps the factual subject distinct from judging someone’s feelings. Here, the handling of a private account can be considered separately from the quality of a book explanation. Neither answers for the other. The teacher may genuinely have helped with reading and also have acted unacceptably. The latter is not cancelled by the former, and the former need not be reinvented to excuse the latter.

Precision also matters when information is incomplete. Knowing a personal experience does not establish the circumstances behind another person’s report. Keep that distinction visible: I witnessed a particular action; I heard about something else; I do not know the motives. What remains unknown does not require continued participation until a teacher’s entire biography is available. A personal decision can sometimes rest on what concerns one’s own consent and the relationship’s conditions. Public allegations, legal questions, and changes to personal participation have different requirements; this essay does not replace competent consideration of the first two. She can explain why she will not return without promising to establish every circumstance of the teacher’s life. A restrained formulation need not make the decision weak. It keeps speech proportionate to knowledge.

II. The Person, the Teaching, and Your Own Work

After disappointment, the whole history can easily gather around one name. The teacher appears to have authored every change: he gave understanding, then took it away. Yet even a relationship in which one person explained a great deal involved the other person’s work. The learner read, asked questions, tried to formulate a thought, and compared it with her circumstances. Acknowledging this does not permit claiming someone else’s explanation as one’s own or erasing a genuine contribution. It clarifies what was received. Here, attentive reading developed through explanations, exercises, and the learner’s participation. The teacher’s reputation alone does not decide its future. Consider what now supports the ability and whether it can be used without continuing that relationship.

A teaching is not reducible to one teacher either, but that does not mean every element can be separated easily. Some sessions used his particular approach; some ideas came from a published book; some activities required his presence or a shared ritual. Establish provenance where it is known, and avoid claiming separability before considering the conditions. Keep a book while setting aside an exercise attached to an unacceptable requirement. Acknowledge that a particular idea is still difficult to distinguish from the teacher’s voice. There is no need to settle the whole matter immediately through a single gesture of preservation or destruction. This examination belongs to a personal history. It does not become an instruction for reorganizing the entire group.

Personal effort does not establish the truth of every earlier belief. Working hard does not make each accepted explanation correct. Time and effort matter as parts of a life, but they do not

supply the grounds for a particular assertion. She can say: I genuinely worked and learned some things; certain conclusions now need checking. These words require neither ridicule of her earlier self nor defence of every mistake. They give the past definite content instead of a sweeping verdict. Revision concerns what she considers justified today, rather than a duty to prove that every year was an impeccable investment. An honest acknowledgment of incompleteness can sometimes leave a question open while ending a relationship she has already decided not to continue.

III. The Sources Distinguish Speech and Its Grounds

In Enchiridion §49, Epictetus distinguishes interpreting Chrysippus from applying instruction. Matthew 23:1–12 separates speech and conduct within religious polemic. MN 95 distinguishes conviction from conclusive knowledge. These foundations are not interchangeable. The following consideration of our contemporary learner is a bounded editorial extension, rather than their shared doctrine.

In the imagined story, the relationship between explanation and action matters. The teacher spoke about care for another person’s account, but did not keep his own promise. Respect for a useful idea does not require the learner to call that consistent conduct. At the same time, the breach does not turn attentive reading into a meaningless activity. She can examine the substance of a rule about private accounts, name the action separately, and decide separately about continued participation. Combining these questions would force her either to excuse the teacher or to reject even the grounds on which she assessed his action. That pressure comes from the framing. It does not become necessary simply because the disappointment currently touches many parts of life.

Comparison has a limit. An ancient text cannot be turned into a demand to endure a contemporary breach for the sake of a higher truth. Nor should each text be credited with present understandings of consent, privacy, or accountability. Here, historical passages help formulate questions; the decision about participation belongs to particular circumstances. Our learner may reject a source’s religious foundations while understanding the distinction being compared. She may also decline that comparison if it obstructs naming her experience. Reading is not an examination of spiritual maturity here. It is not a prerequisite for finding a particular treatment unacceptable and ending participation. No philosophical example makes another person’s consent dispensable.

IV. Revising without Condemning the Entire Past

Our learner opens an old notebook. Some entries are precise: she learned to distinguish a question about a text from a conjecture about its meaning. Others repeat confident statements whose grounds she did not check at the time. There are also lines about a personal hope that the sessions would make life clearer. These contents have different standing. A skill can be tried with new material; an assertion needs a source or an argument; a hope should be named as a hope. The notebook need be neither a sacred testimony nor evidence of foolishness. It shows how someone thought under particular conditions. Rereading may reveal distinctions once concealed by general trust. This is possible work, rather than a required ritual for everyone disappointed in a teacher.

Revision sometimes includes acknowledging a personal mistake. Someone may see that another person’s confidence was accepted as sufficient grounds, an uncomfortable question was postponed, or a useful session was attached to a promise no one could guarantee. Acknowledging a particular mistake does not imply that the person deserved unacceptable treatment. Responsibility for one’s judgment and another person’s responsibility for an action do not automatically pass between people. Our learner might previously have asked more about rules for private accounts; the teacher still remains responsible for his broken promise. Finding a more precise question now does not mean earlier uncertainty permitted the breach. That inference should not be hidden inside an attractive demand to learn a lesson from every experience.

Some earlier decisions may also remain justified. A book really was worth reading; encountering a tradition widened the questions; independently completed work mattered. Retaining those assessments does not excuse the teacher. Name them precisely, rather than turning them into proof that the relationship must continue. A useful completed session can remain useful precisely as something completed. It grants no indefinite entitlement to another person’s presence. She can use the distinction between question and conjecture, continue reading a book, and stay away from the former sessions. There is no hidden obligation to preserve everything. There is an opportunity to retain what has independent grounds, without treating that opportunity as betrayal of a decision to leave.

V. Gratitude Does Not Decide Participation

The learner may feel gratitude for an explanation and indignation about the same person’s action. Responses to different subjects need not immediately become one consistent emotion. A precise contribution can be acknowledged: this explanation helped me understand a particular text. That sentence does not mean accepting every later condition or being obliged to maintain contact. Gratitude has content and a place in time; it is not a signature beneath all future actions. Sometimes a person is not ready to discuss gratitude at all. The essay does not call that a moral deficiency. Unacceptable conduct can be named and participation decided without a compulsory list of a teacher’s positive qualities. Precision does not require balancing each serious action with a pleasant memory, as if only an equal score allowed a personal decision.

Preserving attribution differs from restoring closeness. If the learner uses a particular published idea, an accurate reference matters for its provenance. Attribution does not invite renewed relations. She can acknowledge where she encountered an explanation without responding to the teacher’s personal approach. Here, this avoids rewriting the notebook’s origins to fit a changed relationship with its source. Not every material is suitable for continued use: other people’s private accounts do not become freely available resources because sessions have ended. Their conditions and interests still matter. This essay concerns the learner’s own work, rather than a right to distribute someone else’s records, explanations, or information without adequate grounds and permission.

Others sometimes demand a demonstration of consistency: if you are grateful, return; if you left, admit you received nothing. That formula erases the subject of each decision. She can answer briefly: I acknowledge particular help and do not agree to further participation. She need not tell every interlocutor the full story. A boundary needs no general agreement. Yet this essay does not promise that a precise sentence will remove tension or change another person’s response. Distinguishing subjects primarily helps clarify one’s decision and what is said about it. It is not a technique for controlling someone else. If a conversation becomes unacceptable, continuing it for the sake of a flawless explanation is unnecessary; practical circumstances of ending contact need separate consideration.

VI. Doubt Does Not Require Immediate New Certainty

Losing trust can create a wish to find someone who will immediately explain everything that happened. A new teacher, book, or interlocutor promises clarity and an infallible assessment of the former teacher. Changing the name does not by itself change how assertions are accepted. She can hear a useful explanation and still ask what information supports it. Someone who helped name one difficulty need not become the final judge of her entire biography. Limited assistance can be accepted while other questions remain uncertain. This is not a demand to manage alone. It preserves the difference between support, particular knowledge, and general authority to explain a life. None follows automatically from another merely because an earlier relationship was disappointing.

Uncertainty can be stated specifically. I do not yet know whether I accept this belief. I have not decided whether the practice suits me without the former teacher. I know why I stopped attending, but not how to assess the entire period. Such sentences are not indifference and do not require remaining on hold forever. They identify the current state of separate questions. One may need reading, another an independent conversation, another time without commitment. Choices depend on circumstances and available help. This essay offers no sequence everyone must complete to recover faith. It also leaves room for concluding that a previous form of spiritual life no longer fits.

The learner does not enrol in another long course on the day she leaves. She first reads one chapter herself and notices which questions remain intelligible without the former teacher’s voice. This small action does not establish that independent reading is better than all instruction. It offers a limited observation: this book can currently be approached in this way. Seeking assistance later would not reverse the decision to leave the former relationship. A new choice is considered on its own conditions. Practical matters may come before philosophical reading. The order depends on circumstances, rather than a duty to give a spiritual history an elegant ending. Decision speed and pauses do not measure personal worth.

VII. Retaining Experience without Turning It into an Excuse

A meaningful experience associated with former sessions may remain: clarity while reading, closeness to a tradition, or hearing one’s own question articulated for the first time. It need not disappear when the relationship ends. Its significance, however, does not authorize unacceptable treatment. Our learner remembers an evening when she could calmly formulate a difficult thought. That event belongs to her experience. It does not prove the teacher had a right to dispose of someone else’s private account. Distinguish what happened to her then, the explanation offered for it, and the authority later attached to that explanation. Detailed examination of interpretations of experience belongs to the neighbouring topic. Here the concern is how a memory relates to revised trust in a particular person.

When a memory carries mixed meanings, neither needs to be immediately removed. Someone can remember what was useful while seeing conditions now found unacceptable. This does not mean every difficult experience should be worked through alone using philosophy. Appropriate support or professional help may be needed; this essay neither replaces it nor assigns a diagnosis. A notebook exercise can be stopped if it does not suit the present situation. Revisiting material is not required to prove independence. Independence includes choosing which questions to consider today and which actions to avoid. Our learner sets one entry aside with a brief note: this matters, but I do not want to work on it now. That note establishes no final meaning for the memory.

Retaining experience does not require restoring the former arrangement of sessions. Similar words, a book, or a place can come with different conditions in new circumstances. Try another way of reading, or decline what is currently associated with the former teacher. Neither option should be declared uniquely mature. A familiar experience should not silently decide a question of fresh consent. If our learner reads at home, that is her present action, rather than a hidden continuation of former belonging. If she does not read, the fact of her earlier work is not erased. Both decisions remain particular and potentially revisable where circumstances permit. The essay does not promise that changing the form will restore a previous feeling or produce a deeper spiritual life.

VIII. Ending a Relationship with Questions Still Open

The decision not to return may become clear before a full account of the past does. Our learner knows she no longer agrees to the previous conditions, but not yet what years of sessions mean. These timelines need not coincide. Ending participation requires no complete philosophy of disappointment. A brief message can address only future sessions and necessary practical matters. Every doubt need not be included to make the decision real. Ending a relationship may nevertheless involve practical conditions: belongings, records, arrangements, or payments. These require accurate information and competent assistance where needed. The essay provides no legal advice and does not assert that every obligation disappears when trust changes.

An explanation or apology from the teacher becomes new material to consider, rather than automatic restoration of the old relationship. Someone may listen, decline a conversation, or request a written clarification when appropriate and safe. An apology does not require immediate belief in a promise, forgiveness, or a return. Staying away also need not imply that the person is forever incapable of changing behaviour. She can acknowledge an explanation while retaining her decision. This essay imposes no duty to assess sincerity with infallible accuracy. Its concern is the conditions of her further participation. Where there is a threat or unacceptable contact, a philosophical wish to understand motives should not replace necessary practical measures and appropriate assistance.

A question may remain open after leaving. I still find it difficult to understand how useful instruction coexisted with that action. I have not decided how to describe this period to people close to me. I do not know whether I will ever return to this book. These statements do not cancel the decision to stop attending. Our learner need not choose between closing the question completely and waiting forever for the teacher to answer it. Life can continue with an incomplete explanation, revisited only when that makes sense. Incompleteness guarantees no eventual clarity, but it also provides no sufficient grounds for handing someone else authority over the whole account. Partial knowledge calls for precision, rather than obligatory submission.

IX. Telling the Past without Another Test of Loyalty

When disappointment becomes part of a personal account, another compulsory version can emerge. Someone must prove they were never naïve, or prove their earlier faith was profound enough for everything to retain meaning. Both demands can obstruct naming actual changes. She can say: I trusted particular explanations then; some were useful, others now seem unjustified; the relationship ended after a specific action. Such an account does not make every decision ideal. It allows differences over time without pretending to have always known the present conclusion. Earlier uncertainty should not become a reason to abandon personal judgment forever. Precision today need not appear as infallibility throughout the whole preceding life.

Not every listener is entitled to a detailed account. One explanation may be offered to someone close, another to an acquaintance, and nothing at all publicly. Openness depends on circumstances, other people's private information, and personal consent. Here, the notebook includes other participants' personal questions; describing one's own departure does not make those available. A broken promise can be discussed without repeating someone else's account. This is not a duty to protect the teacher's reputation at any cost. It is separate attention to people whose information became part of the story. Preserving their boundaries does not require weakening one's own decision. Where an official examination is needed, its rules and appropriate assistance differ from a conversation with an acquaintance; these situations should not be reduced to one form of disclosure.

An account can change over time. New information may refine the facts; independent work may reveal what still matters; another life question may make this topic less central. Future revision does not make a present boundary ineffective. Continued participation cannot be demanded because someone might eventually understand the past differently. Our learner leaves room to refine her description without giving the teacher an indefinite invitation. This preserves both modesty about knowledge and clarity about action. She need not promise never to reconsider any book or idea. Revisability grants no right to bypass present disagreement. An open question belongs to the person considering it, rather than to someone seeking a preferred answer.

X. Continuing Need Not Repeat the Former Form

What does continuing after disappointment mean? Sometimes reading without the former teacher. Sometimes turning to another tradition, returning to ordinary tasks, or setting the spiritual subject aside for a while. None can be declared the required outcome. Our learner retains one ability, postpones several explanations, and ends the sessions. That is sufficient for a next step even though the larger account remains incomplete. Continuing need not look like a new course, stronger faith, or a conclusive exposure. It may consist of declining promises whose conditions do not fit and doing a particular thing within present circumstances. This is an editorial possibility to consider, rather than an established sequence of recovery or a norm for judging another person’s pace of life.

A bounded question helps here: what am I choosing now, and on what grounds? If our learner wants to read a book, she can name the subject and the conditions. If she does not want to return to the material, a pause needs no elevated justification. If she needs an interlocutor, she can clarify the assistance expected and what is not being handed over for that person to decide. A limited question is not necessarily a trivial one. It prevents a choice from silently expanding into an obligation to redefine an entire life. One action need not prove complete understanding of the past. Reading one chapter remains reading one chapter; declining another subscription remains declining a particular offer. Both can be considered honestly without becoming symbols of overall spiritual victory or defeat.

Disappointment changes the grounds for trust, but it does not acquire sole authority to define a biography. Retain what is useful, reconsider what lacks grounds, acknowledge what is unacceptable, and leave the unknown unknown. These actions need not occur together, and they guarantee no ease. Their purpose is to preserve distinctions otherwise dissolved by a demand to defend everything or reject everything. Our learner need not excuse the teacher for the sake of a book or destroy her own work in order to leave a relationship. She also need not express gratitude, forgive, or restore contact. Her next step concerns present consent and a definite subject. Even with an incomplete account of the past, its whole meaning need not be surrendered to someone else’s voice. Continuing can begin with a real decision small enough for its conditions to be understood.

What this means in practice

If this examination suits the present situation, choose one small episode that can be described without disclosing someone else’s private information. This is a reflective exercise, rather than an established method of recovery. There is no need to revisit material that currently feels too difficult or contact the former teacher to complete the task. Stop at any stage and choose appropriate assistance if needed.

Write four subjects separately: what happened; what you know directly about it; which earlier belief changed; and which decision about further participation has already been made. Do not add unknown motives as established facts. In our story, the action concerns a broken promise and the decision concerns ending sessions. An overall assessment of the book remains another question.

Then name one element of the former work that can be considered separately: an ability, a published idea, a personal question, or a promise. Identify its provenance where known. Ask whether independent grounds support retaining it, whether something needs checking, or whether examination should be postponed. What is postponed need not be bad; what is retained does not excuse unacceptable conduct.

Finally, formulate only the next choice and its conditions. For example: I will read one chapter at home; I am not currently discussing this story publicly; I will clarify a practical matter with an appropriate specialist. Do not turn the action into a promise to recover faith, forgive someone, or reach a final assessment of the past. Afterwards, ask whether the subjects became more distinct. The answer concerns the clarity of this record, rather than proof of spiritual maturity or a guaranteed change in how someone feels.

Key quotation

> *for they say, and do not.*

— Matthew 23:3, concluding clause, King James Version. A passage of religious polemic, rather than a general judgment about a religious group.

Connections between traditions

1. **Explanation and enactment: Epictetus §49; Matthew 23:3.** The first distinguishes interpretation from application; the second distinguishes saying from doing. The shared comparative mechanism is to avoid transferring an explanation’s persuasiveness to an assessment of conduct. Our learner can acknowledge a useful book discussion separately from a broken promise. The boundary matters: Stoic engagement with nature is not the Gospel’s foundation of authority. Matthew retains an instruction to observe what is said within its context, rather than a contemporary rule to endure a breach. The conclusion about ending participation belongs to the imagined story, rather than to both texts.

2. **Grounds for trust: MN 95, observing a teacher; Matthew 23:4–7.** The sutta considers a teacher’s conduct; the Gospel passage addresses burdensome demands and public status. The limited similarity is a question about what accompanies someone’s words. For this topic, the mechanism makes treatment of people a separate subject of attention instead of automatically transferring trust from a title. The Buddhist sequence leads toward its own path

of realization, while the Gospel retains a Christian foundation. Neither comparison nor external signs supplies an infallible test of motives. Our learner considers an established action, rather than claiming knowledge of another person's inner life.

3. **Conviction and assimilation: MN 95, safeguarding truth; Epictetus §49.** The sutta distinguishes conviction from knowledge; Epictetus distinguishes understanding an interpretation from application. The shared question is which transition remains incomplete after accepting someone's words. Comparison makes the limit of what has been received explicit instead of declaring the whole history settled. This lets the learner say a useful session happened while some explanations still require checking. The distinction remains: Buddhist realization and Stoic following of nature are not reduced to contemporary fact checking. The editorial notebook exercise only clarifies subjects; it promises neither source's account of attainment.

4. **Public image and work: Matthew 23:5–12; Epictetus §46.** The Gospel addresses appearance and exaltation; the Stoic passage addresses showing principles through action. The similarity concerns work's irreducibility to a displayed image. In our story, the mechanism prevents a teacher's reputation from answering a question about a private promise. The learner can retain a particular assessment when others defend a general image. Christian service and Stoic exercise nevertheless have different foundations; neither provides a sociological explanation of the group here. This extension requires neither searching for a hidden vice in every public action nor opposing external recognition to all genuine work.

5. **Suspending judgment and proportioning conclusions: MN 95, conviction without a conclusive assertion; Epictetus §45.** The former limits a conclusion drawn from conviction; the latter distinguishes observation from assessment when motives are unknown. Their shared comparative mechanism avoids adding more than has been established. The learner can name an action and disagreement while leaving motives unknown; participation can still end. Stoic caution in assessment differs from the Buddhist path to truth, and the contemporary consent boundary is our conclusion. What remains unknown creates no duty to endure treatment and does not remove the need for appropriate help where required.

Primary sources

1. Epictetus. Enchiridion §§45–49, with §§48–50 context. Thomas W. Higginson translation in the displayed Project Gutenberg edition; the 1948 editorial introduction is not adopted.

2. MN95, Canki Sutta, displayed Access to Insight excerpt. Thanissaro Bhikkhu translation, ©1999; site edition30November2013. Conviction/knowledge distinction and observation of a teacher.

3. Matthew23:1–12; short quotation from the end of23:3. Historical King James Version English translation, displayed Bible Gateway text.

Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations from the named English translations; direct quotation of Greek or Pali originals is not claimed. Historical comparison is bounded; the contemporary scene and consent decisions are editorial argument. Full sources are not imported or vectorized. Restrictions on the modern MN95 translation are retained; commercial licensing of its raw text is not established here.

Tags

disappointment, teacher, mentor, spiritual biography, trust, independence, belonging, consent, boundaries, conduct, explanation, teaching, reading, personal experience, gratitude, revision, past, uncertainty, Epictetus, Enchiridion, Stoicism, MN 95, Buddhism, Matthew, Christianity, traditions, attribution, promise, participation, questions

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 co-author 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.