

UNITED WISDOM

When Kindness Goes Unanswered

Relationships and care

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

UW-AUTHOR-DOBRO-BEZ-OTVETA-20261027 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When Kindness Goes Unanswered

Care, expectations, and another person's freedom

Epigraph

> *“let us give in the way in which we ourselves should like to receive.”*

Seneca, *On Benefits*, II.1, translated by Aubrey Stewart; the edition's preface is dated March 1887. Text.

What this article explores

Sometimes substantial help is followed by silence. Someone for whom we rearranged our plans does not call; someone we supported chooses a different life. The hurt then reaches beyond the present relationship. The past itself comes into question: what were all those evenings, money, and patience for, if the warmth we expected never arrived?

This article examines the moment when care begins to feel wasted. We distinguish a helpful outcome, the helper's intentions, a hope for closeness, and an actual agreement. We consider the recipient's perspective and ask why generosity requires neither unlimited involvement nor the abandonment of our own needs. Research appears alongside philosophical and religious texts, without being used to verify their theological claims. The focus is voluntary help between adults in ordinary circumstances. A short reflective exercise offers a way to reconsider one episode while respecting both people and leaving the whole history open to a more nuanced judgment.

I. The message that went unanswered

Imagine a fictional situation. For several months, Vera helped her friend Nina look for work after a move. They edited a résumé, discussed vacancies, and prepared for interviews. Sometimes Vera postponed her own tasks. Once Nina found a position, their meetings became infrequent. An invitation received a short reply about being busy; the next message received no reply. Looking at the conversation, Vera thought for the first time: all of it was pointless.

Until that moment, the story contained many different events. Nina had been navigating unfamiliar requirements. Vera had been able to contribute. Some evenings were warm, others exhausting. Now one present feeling seemed entitled to judge them all. If their friendship had not grown closer, the help began to look like a mistake. If Nina was not replying, Vera's

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

generosity felt humiliating. This shift deserves attention: disappointment in an outcome becomes a verdict on the entire act.

Yet we do not even know what response Vera would have considered sufficient. A thank-you message? An invitation to dinner? A more enduring place in Nina's life? These are different wishes. One might be met with a few words; another concerns the relationship itself. Perhaps Nina had already thanked Vera for the résumé, while Vera wanted something gratitude does not promise. Perhaps the help really was overlooked. The imagined scene does not settle either possibility.

It helps to pause before calling someone ungrateful. The word may accurately describe an unpleasant action, but it may also combine several different losses. Vera invested time, misses companionship, feels unimportant, and doubts her judgment about people. Each question requires its own information. A general accusation connects them quickly without revealing what she now wants or what might change.

The difficult move is to acknowledge hurt without making it the sole historian. Today's silence belongs to the story. It does not yet tell us whether the help was useless, the earlier warmth false, or Nina's intentions dishonest. Inquiry becomes possible when present disappointment can remain real without erasing everything that preceded it.

II. An action has several different consequences

When asking whether helping was worthwhile, we can separate at least three questions. What happened to the practical task? How did we treat the person? How did the relationship change? A good answer to one does not guarantee the same answer to another. The résumé may have improved, the help may have been offered respectfully, and the friendship may still have fallen short of Vera's hopes.

This distinction does not make every benevolent impulse valuable by definition. If someone requested comments on one paragraph and we rewrote their entire biography, good intentions do not erase the intrusion. If advice was mistaken, correcting it matters. If the cost became unmanageable, that cost deserves recognition. Equally, the absence of hoped-for closeness does not prove that every other result disappeared. Nina may have received useful support even though the subsequent relationship disappointed Vera.

In *On Benefits*, I.1–3, Seneca challenges the treatment of a benefit as an investment earning interest. His argument also contains a tension: nearby, he proposes surrounding an ungrateful person with further benefits until a response follows. Even a discussion of generosity can restore the demand for a particular reaction. We retain the question about an action's value without adopting this ancient strategy of securing gratitude as a rule for relationships.

Vera need not rescue her past by insisting she did everything perfectly. She might recognize several things together: the document work helped, some evenings exceeded what she could comfortably give, and she never discussed her hope for closer friendship. This account makes her neither a deceived saint nor someone whose care was never sincere. It describes a particular choice with several outcomes and limitations.

There is freedom in this more precise assessment. We can regret the extent of our involvement without despising the wish to help. We can stop repeating an action without declaring the past empty. We can treasure a memory while acknowledging that the current relationship is unsatisfying. Nina need not issue a final certificate of Vera's worth before Vera can distinguish these grounds for judgment.

III. A hope for closeness is not an agreement

Vera may never have planned an exchange. She enjoyed time with her friend, wanted to ease her difficulties, and liked feeling useful. Alongside this, she may have hoped that the experience would bring lasting closeness. Discovering that hope after disappointment can feel uncomfortable, as though a concealed calculation has invalidated everything good. But ethical reflection need not begin by demanding that our motives have always been perfectly uniform.

The more useful question is what entitlement we derive from a wish. A hope tells us that a relationship matters to us. It does not demonstrate another person's consent to a particular future. Vera can say that she expected more frequent meetings. That does not establish that Nina promised closeness in return for job-search help. The conversation becomes clearer when an expectation is presented as one's own rather than as a shared contract discovered retrospectively.

The opposite case matters too. If Nina explicitly promised to perform a task in return and then disappeared, the issue is no longer merely an unspoken hope. There is a particular commitment to recall and discuss. An appeal to generosity must not erase an agreement. Nor is an ordinary request for acknowledgment automatically a demand for submission: its meaning depends on what is requested, how, and whether another response is possible.

Consider three wishes Vera might express. She wants her contribution noticed. She wants meetings that include more than Nina's difficulties. She thinks that, after all her help, Nina should follow her advice. The first two identify needs that can be discussed. The third uses an earlier service as authority over the future. The distinction lies in the demand, not in the intensity of the feeling.

Instead of asking whether the care was absolutely pure, we can examine what happens to the newly recognized expectation. It can be acknowledged, clarified, discussed, or revised. It can

also remain denied while compliance is demanded as an obvious moral duty. Disappointment itself does not choose between those paths. The next action is still a separate decision.

IV. Reciprocity is more than returning the same service

The suggestion to expect nothing can feel liberating until it becomes an instruction to live without responsive care. Within a friendship, Vera may want to be listened to, asked about her life, and have her time respected. She need not justify this wish by pricing the résumé she edited. It concerns the relationship she wants to participate in now. Closeness can matter without being presented as payment for earlier services.

Margaret Clark and Judson Mills's 1979 study distinguishes relationships organized around comparable benefits from communal relationships responsive to needs. In the latter, a particular benefit does not create an exact debt, although mutual concern still matters. This is a research model, not a division between selfish and good people. Two student laboratory experiments cannot establish the universal structure of every friendship or family.

The distinction makes room for two different conversations. In one, Vera demands an equivalent for the hours she spent. In the other, she says that she misses a friendship with room for her own life. The second conversation may be painful: Nina need not want the same closeness. At least, however, the subject is visible. Comparing hours will not establish whether both people want to spend time together.

Symmetry need not exist at every moment. During a difficult move, one person may receive more support. Circumstances might change later, or they might not. Temporary inequality alone does not explain the quality of a connection. What matters includes how it is understood, what each person can offer, and whether the burden can be discussed. This differs from simply counting who last sent a message and who therefore owes the next gesture.

Vera might learn that Nina values her but cannot meet often. She might discover a persistent lack of interest or hear about difficulties she did not know. None follows automatically from a brief reply. After clarification, Vera must still decide whether the available relationship suits her. Dropping a claim of indebtedness preserves Nina's freedom; reconsidering participation preserves Vera's.

V. Help also has a recipient's side

So far, we have mostly heard Vera. Now imagine Nina describing the same months. She appreciated the first meetings but later tired of daily questions about vacancies. She felt awkward saying that some advice did not fit. This is one possible account, not a solution to the mystery of her silence. Its purpose is to show how the same help could consist of different things for each person.

The quality of support cannot be assessed solely by the helper's effort. Five hours of work may be invaluable, or they may solve a problem the recipient never chose. Even a useful result tells us little about every part of the process. Someone can welcome a new job while regretting that their correspondence was discussed without consent. Acknowledging one does not require denying the other. Gratitude need not certify the perfection of everything a helper did.

In a 2010 study, Weinstein, DeHaan, and Ryan examined anticipated responses to help in scenarios involving different helper motivations. Across three student samples of 80, 115, and 120 participants, attributing autonomous motivation to the helper was associated with greater anticipated gratitude. The authors identify a limitation: these were imagined situations and self-reports. The findings cannot reveal a particular helper's motives or recipient's history from an absence of thanks.

The question for Vera therefore remains open: what did Nina actually find useful, what felt excessive, and where were the terms unclear? An answer could revise Vera's account of the past. It might be uncomfortable or incomplete. Vera can also describe what she did and what she knows. Hearing another account does not mean accepting every accusation without examination.

This matters especially in writing about ingratitude. Offering readers only the role of an undervalued benefactor provides comfort by making the other person disappear. A more honest inquiry leaves room for help that was useful, partly suitable, intrusive, or misunderstood. In every case, it distinguishes what is known, what someone has said, and what we are still explaining on their behalf.

VI. Kindness that needs a witness

Sometimes a good outcome is not enough: we want it noticed and connected with us. Vera can welcome Nina's job while feeling hurt that accounts of the success seem to omit her contribution. It is easy to call this vanity. First, however, we can ask what feels lost: recognition of work, a place in shared memory, respect for effort, or confirmation that we are indispensable. These wishes have different consequences.

In Matthew 6:1–4, almsgiving is contrasted with seeking public praise; secrecy is connected with the Father who sees and rewards. It would therefore be misleading to summarize the passage as the absence of all reward. Its moral horizon extends beyond human approval. This is Christian instruction, not experimental evidence that the need for acknowledgment should disappear.

In Qur'an 2:262–264, reproach and injury following charitable giving are condemned, while reward from God remains part of the religious perspective. For our inquiry, what happens after the gift matters. An act does not end with the transfer of an object or money: later treatment

can humiliate its recipient. A resemblance to Matthew does not make these passages one doctrine or erase their distinct contexts.

Returning to Vera, a practical choice emerges. She can describe feeling overlooked. She can ask that her work not be attributed to someone else. Or she can turn every meeting into a ceremony affirming her exceptional importance. The first possibilities concern recognition of a particular contribution. In the last, the relationship serves the helper's image. Less room remains for Nina's own story, including achievements that do not belong to Vera.

These religious texts do not settle the worth of a person who feels hurt. They raise a question about an act's orientation: for whom is it done, and what does it demand afterward? A nonreligious reader can consider that question without accepting a theological promise. A believer need not turn a personal standard of generosity into a command for the recipient. Choosing to give without human praise remains the giver's responsibility; it cannot compel another person either to thank or to keep giving beyond their means.

VII. Generosity needs discernment

The absence of payment does not make every form of help suitable. We may ask for nothing in return while failing to notice that a gift is inconvenient, advice premature, or intervention unwanted. Disinterestedness describes one aspect of an action. It still requires attention to circumstances. Otherwise, recipients become obliged to accept everything we consider good, losing the freedom to assess the help even as they are released from material debt.

In *Bhagavad Gita* 17.20, with Swami Sivananda's commentary, a sattvic gift is associated with no expectation of return, as well as place, time, and a worthy recipient. The selected commentary gives these conditions religious content, including sacred places and auspicious times. They cannot simply be replaced by a modern communication rule. The limited point of comparison is that freedom from repayment does not exhaust the conditions of giving.

Vera could examine her next offer more specifically. Does Nina currently want help with a task? Is the proposed approach suitable? How much time can Vera genuinely offer? An absent reply is no reason to increase the amount until her kindness becomes undeniable. Sometimes clarification is the next step. Sometimes an offer can remain available without pressure. Sometimes the proposed form is no longer needed.

Discernment also concerns what we agree to do. We can decline a task that requires deception, intrudes on privacy, or costs too much. Establishing such a limit does not require declaring the recipient bad. Naming the action and our involvement may be enough. It allows a disagreement to remain about the matter at hand instead of becoming an argument that the other person's whole life is wrong.

Another uncomfortable discovery is possible: the help is wanted, but we no longer wish to provide it. Then our changed willingness and any existing promises need attention. Invoking generosity must not conceal resentment; invoking freedom must not erase an agreement. An honest answer can be limited and imperfect. It still offers clearer information than outwardly generous consent accompanied by a steadily accumulating bill.

VIII. Independence cannot be made a punishment

After disappointment, we may want the absence of help to demonstrate its former value. Let Nina try alone; then she will understand. With that thought, ending support becomes a test, and another person's difficulties become evidence we hope will vindicate us. Outwardly, it may resemble an ordinary refusal. The difference lies in the story surrounding the decision and the consequences we want to see.

This does not oblige Vera to continue until every trace of resentment disappears. A reasonable limit does not require perfect calm. She can nevertheless separate her decision from a project of teaching Nina a lesson. She can stop editing a résumé because she lacks time or willingness. There is no need to add that failure would be good for Nina. Vera does not know what Nina will learn, or whether any lesson will follow.

In Maimonides's *Mishneh Torah*, Gifts to the Poor 10:7–8, a high form of support strengthens a needy person's position through a gift, loan, partnership, or work that reduces the need to request alms. The following level concerns mutual anonymity between giver and recipient. This is a Jewish normative classification of tzedakah with its own communal context. Reduced dependence is pursued through the organization of support, not by withholding help as a lesson.

An ordinary story about two friends cannot be extended to every dependence on care. Essential assistance, accepted responsibilities, and risks to a person require separate consideration. This article supplies no procedure for ending care and no medical or legal instructions. For its limited question, it is enough to recognize two distinct circumstances: a helper's limits and a recipient's provision for essential needs. Neither automatically establishes the other.

Vera and Nina might identify the end of a particular task, complete an already promised step, or discuss a different extent of involvement. Vera can also stop making offers that are not taken up. None requires waiting for Nina to repent. Refusal ceases to be a final means of control when its meaning no longer depends on the other person's defeat. It can remain painful while becoming a decision about one's own life.

IX. When being useful is no longer our role

Suppose Nina replies. She thanks Vera, explains that the first weeks at work consumed her attention, and suggests meeting next month. Vera still feels empty. The reply does not restore her previous position: she used to be needed daily; now she is not. In this version, the hurt concerns more than gratitude. A role has ended around which she organized some of her time and sense of closeness.

That distinction changes the possible conversation. Another thank-you can acknowledge the past without reinstating dependence. If Vera wanted friendship, they must discover what connects them beyond solving problems. Do they share interests, activities, or curiosity about each other? Nina might welcome that connection or prefer occasional contact. Helping created opportunities to meet without issuing a permanent right to occupy the same space in the same way.

In chapters 2 and 10 of the *Tao Te Ching*, translated by James Legge, activity and generation are described without ownership of what emerges or attachment to accomplishment. This is a Daoist philosophical framework involving the Tao and the sage, not a contemporary boundary-setting technique. It allows us to ask whether our contribution must leave us owners of the result and permanent participants in its subsequent development.

The answer need not involve a graceful disappearance. People may properly continue working together, acknowledge their contribution, receive agreed payment, or retain attribution for their work. Non-possession does not erase these distinctions. Vera's situation concerns something more specific: Nina's new job belongs to Nina's life, even if Vera's help was substantial. It does not become jointly owned property to be managed together.

Vera may miss evenings when everything seemed clear: a difficulty, her contribution, a visible result. She can mourn a period that has ended without making Nina responsible for every change. New forms of connection and room for her own life can remain possible. Another person's independence then need not prove that she is generally unnecessary. It tells her something narrower: a particular task and her former role within it have changed.

X. Keeping what was good without promising to repeat everything

The story may end less reassuringly. Nina may never reply, dismiss the help, or say she does not want further contact. Avoiding premature accusation does not require endlessly inventing excuses. A known action can be named as rude or dishonest. Even then, a question remains: what does it change? Our assessment of the current relationship, our trust in future promises, or the value of every past action?

Vera can decide to stop investing in this connection without proving that Nina cannot love, always uses people, or needs a special life lesson. Her assessment of the available relationship and her own limits can be sufficient. A complete theory of someone else's character is not required for a particular decision. Otherwise, permission to stop becomes dependent on condemning the person as a whole.

An accurate memory of what was good can also remain. They worked through a difficult requirement. Vera listened carefully one evening. One suggestion helped, another did not. These events promised no happy future, but they happened. Acknowledging them allows the past its actual extent. It need become neither a meaningless sacrifice nor moral capital that another person must keep servicing.

Regret can exist without a final accusation against oneself. Vera now sees that she named her limits late, assumed a great deal, and asked too little about her own wishes. This knowledge can change future offers. It does not require contempt for her earlier self, who did not yet know the outcome. Reconsideration becomes useful when it points to a discernible next action: clarify a request, specify an amount of help, or separately propose meeting socially.

In the opening scene, Vera looked at an unanswered message and wondered what everything had been for. A more precise answer is now possible: some actions helped with a task, some cost too much, and a hope for closeness was not fulfilled. Future participation must be chosen afresh. Good in the past does not require endless repetition. A free future does not require first declaring the past empty. Between those acknowledgments, care can leave both people visible.

What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary episode of helping that now causes regret. Do not start with your hardest experience or use this exercise to assess a relationship involving threats or coercion. This is an editorial framework for reflection, not a diagnostic test or an established therapeutic procedure. You can stop if writing only intensifies an argument with someone who is not present.

First, record the action without character judgments. You helped prepare documents over three evenings, for example. Separately record the known outcome: the documents were sent, a reply is pending, or the recipient said the changes helped. Do not fill in how grateful they ought to feel. If the effect is unknown, uncertainty is the accurate entry.

Next, name the response you wanted. A message? Repayment? Help with another task? A closer relationship? Check what was discussed and accepted. If you remember the conversation differently, certainty alone cannot resolve that difference. Having no agreement does not make your wish ridiculous. It changes how you can speak about it.

Consider the cost of your involvement. What was manageable? What did you accept after you no longer wanted to? Where did the recipient ask for more, and where did you continue without being asked? These questions do not allocate all blame between two people. They locate a point where a future choice could become clearer. One episode need not establish a permanent personality type.

Distinguish what you want to preserve from what you want to change. You can value earlier support while declining to repeat its extent. You can acknowledge a fulfilled promise and ask for mutual attention. You can refuse new tasks while honoring a remaining specific agreement. Where essential care or special obligations are involved, this written reflection alone is insufficient to decide whether participation can end.

If a conversation is appropriate and safe, choose one subject: “I miss spending time together beyond your work concerns. Would you like to meet just to enjoy each other's company?” Or: “Next time, I can spend one evening reviewing the document.” One invites a different connection; the other describes available help. Neither guarantees the desired answer.

Afterward, notice the information received as well as relief or disappointment. What became clearer? What did both people accept? What remains only a hope? A decision may still be unavailable. The question can nevertheless become more specific, allowing the past to stop answering for the entire future.

Key quotation

> *“(The Tao) produces (all things) and nourishes them; it produces them and does not claim them as its own”*

Tao Te Ching, chapter 10, §3 in James Legge's division. Text. The subject is the Tao. Relating the image to human help is a comparison, not a literal instruction in the ancient passage.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	What it brings into view	Important boundary
Seneca, *On Benefits* I.1–3 ↔ Clark and Mills on exchange and communal relationships	A gift need not require an equivalent return. Expectations can be examined without making every service an exact debt.	Stoic moral argument and a laboratory model answer different questions. Seneca also proposes the questionable pursuit of gratitude through further benefits.
Matthew 6:1–4 ↔ Qur'an 2:262–264	Public self-display and humiliating reminders can alter the meaning of giving. Conduct after the gift matters.	Both passages retain God and reward. Their different theological contexts cannot be reduced to a secular demand for no expectations whatsoever.
Bhagavad Gita 17.20, Sivananda ↔ Maimonides, Gifts to the Poor 10:7–8	The conditions and organization of help matter alongside willingness to give.	Sattvic giving belongs to the teaching of the gunas; tzedakah belongs to Jewish normative tradition. Recipient criteria and communal contexts must remain visible.
Tao Te Ching 2, 10 ↔ Maimonides, Gifts to the Poor 10:7	Contribution can be considered without permanent ownership, through non-possession or strengthening a recipient's position.	Daoist generation and a legal classification of assistance are not identical. Supporting independence does not mean everyone must manage without ongoing care.
Weinstein, DeHaan, and Ryan's help scenarios ↔ Matthew 6:1–4	The orientation of helping matters both to its perception and to moral reflection.	Anticipated student responses and religious instruction are different kinds of evidence. Neither diagnoses a particular acquaintance's hidden motives.

This map identifies limited intersections of questions, not historical borrowing or a unified doctrine. The practical distinctions remain the article's own reasoning in dialogue with the sources below.

Primary sources

1. **Seneca. *On Benefits*.** Aubrey Stewart's translation, preface dated London, March 1887; Project Gutenberg 3794. I.1–3 and II.1 support the discussion and epigraph. Selected passages and context were read, not the entire treatise.

2. **Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979).** Interpersonal Attraction in Exchange and Communal Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 12–24. DOI:

10.1037/0022-3514.37.1.12. Introduction and experimental design; a limited research distinction, not a universal norm.

3. **Weinstein, N., DeHaan, C. R., & Ryan, R. M. (2010).** Attributing autonomous versus introjected motivation to helpers and the recipient experience: Effects on gratitude, attitudes, and well-being. *Motivation and Emotion*, 34, 418–431. DOI: 10.1007/s11031-010-9183-8. Abstract, conceptual distinctions, samples, scenarios, findings, and limitations in the inspected passages.

4. **Matthew 6:1–4.** New American Bible, Revised Edition, USCCB. The passage and nearby context on almsgiving, public approval, and reward.

5. **Qur'an 2:262–264.** Al-Baqarah, Quran.com. Paraphrase of the displayed English translation; its translator was not identifiable in the accessible text output. No direct quotation is used.

6. **Bhagavad Gita 17.20.** Sanskrit text and Swami Sivananda's English commentary, Gita Supersite, IIT Kanpur. The particular commentary on giving and its conditions; no automatic agreement by other schools is implied.

7. **Maimonides. *Mishneh Torah*, Gifts to the Poor 10:7–8.** Eliyahu Touger's translation, Moznaim Publications, hosted by Chabad.org. Selected provisions and context on strengthening a recipient's position and anonymous giving; not evidence of modern program effectiveness.

8. **Tao Te Ching, chapters 2 and 10.** James Legge's translation, Internet Classics Archive, MIT. Selected chapters on non-possession; chapter 10 supplies the key quotation. No full-work reread or independent verification of the Chinese original is claimed.

The starting material was a post from the account kasperr_82 supplied as screenshots. Its original authorship and publication date have not been established. It prompted an independently written inquiry; factual and historical claims rely on the sources listed above. This English edition follows the Russian master.

Tags

help, care, gratitude, ingratitude, reciprocity, exchange, gifts, generosity, expectations, disappointment, closeness, friendship, recognition, dignity, freedom, consent, responsibility, agreements, personal boundaries, independence, non-possession, memory, charity, tzedakah, Stoicism, Daoism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Judaism, Seneca, Maimonides, motivation, ethics

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is an author and the 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 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.