

UNITED WISDOM

Resentment: which expectations remained unspoken

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I16 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Resentment: which expectations remained unspoken

Andrey Zarinsh · Maria Evilkut

Epigraph

> *“Be ye angry, and sin not”.*

Ephesians 4:26, opening words, King James Version. Context, 4:26–32.

What this article is about

Resentment often begins with a brief inward protest: I should not be treated like this. Yet different situations can lie behind those words. Someone expected attention that nobody had promised. A clear promise was broken. Someone was humiliated and then told to expect less. Several of these circumstances can coexist in one conversation, and asking about expectations becomes helpful only after acknowledging what actually happened.

This article examines an unspoken expectation as one possible part of resentment, not its universal cause. We distinguish wishes, agreements, established practices and the demand for respect; consider why examining our expectations does not release another person from responsibility; and separate forgiveness from renewed trust. Philosophical and religious texts offer different standards of judgement, not a diagnosis. The practical question is modest: what happened, what supported my expectation, and what change do I need? Depending on the relationship and available safety, the answer may lead to a conversation, revised participation or cautious distance.

I. Resentment keeps a question about the relationship alive

The everyday Russian word obida combines hurt with a judgement about a relationship: an event feels not merely unpleasant but significant for our place in each other's lives. This is a working description, not a definition encompassing everyone. One person means an unfulfilled wish, another a continuing sense of injustice, another a mixture of sadness and anger. Understanding their use of the word comes first. Otherwise an explanation about expectations answers a question nobody asked, and confident advice adds misunderstanding to the original hurt.

Consider a hypothetical episode. A woman spends several evenings helping her brother move, and he leaves for the weekend without offering to help her. The distribution of actions is a fact

if the account is accurate. The thought that he sees her only as free labour interprets his motive. She may feel resentment, exhaustion, disappointment or all three. A possible request is assistance on a particular day. Mixing these layers can turn a conversation into a trial of character before establishing whether he understood the help as reciprocal and what he will actually do.

In Nicomachean Ethics IV.5, Aristotle considers appropriate anger through its object, recipient, degree and timing; he does not reduce every instance of anger to the feeler's mistake. This supplies a useful limit: composure alone does not establish correctness, and a strong feeling does not establish the entire situation. Our editorial application moves from the general label of being oversensitive to a specific episode. What was affected here: an agreement, dignity, hoped-for closeness, the division of labour or the ability to influence events?

Clarification does not require feeling differently straight away. It changes the subject of reflection. Instead of demanding a different personality, we ask about the actual relationship and available action. An expectation may exceed what this relationship offers; the relationship may also have ceased to be reciprocal. Both possibilities must remain open while facts are considered. Predetermining the answer as a personal deficiency turns examination into accusation, even though avoiding a premature accusation was its purpose.

II. A wish, a custom and a promise carry different weight

An unspoken expectation should be identified by its basis, not only by the strength of the feeling. A wish means I wanted a particular response. A custom means this is what happened previously. A promise means someone accepted a specific obligation. The requirement not to humiliate a person may have an ethical basis even when nobody has stated it. These four forms can coincide but cannot substitute for one another. Deep disappointment does not turn a wish into a contract; the absence of a contract does not make humiliation acceptable.

In a hypothetical family, adult children have always visited their mother on her birthday. One year nobody comes, without a prior discussion. She may feel hurt because the custom signified belonging. They may believe adulthood permits them to choose their own plans. Examining expectations here does not identify the guilty party through a single rule. It asks what each understood as established practice, whether they knew its significance, and whether they could have warned each other. Repetition gives some basis for expecting continuity, but does not guarantee it indefinitely without revision.

Now consider a colleague who promises in writing to finish work that evening but neither finishes nor warns anyone. Saying that others expect too much diverts attention from an accepted commitment. The deadline, responsibilities and obstacles can be examined, including legitimate explanations. Explaining the reason differs from pretending there was no

promise. Clarification helps when it preserves the history rather than rewriting it around a convenient conclusion. Giving up excessive expectations must not become a rule under which every broken agreement is the problem of the person who relied on it.

In Ephesians 4:26–32, anger, speech and forgiveness are considered within a Christian community. An ethical demand concerning treatment of others does not depend solely on an arrangement of convenience. Our contemporary conclusion is editorial: before asking what remained unsaid, identify what was said and what required no special request. Someone can then clarify a wish without relinquishing another's intelligible responsibility. Giving wishes, customs and promises distinct names also gives their consequences a more accurate measure.

III. What remains unspoken may be the meaning

Sometimes another person knows what we want but not what it means to us. Both may remember the same request while understanding it differently: one hears practical convenience, the other is expressing belonging or the possibility of trust. This does not establish insensitivity. Meaning is not transferred automatically with a list of actions. Yet someone who has explained the meaning several times need not keep assuming inadequate clarity. The specific conversation history matters, as does whether behaviour changes after an understandable explanation.

Consider a hypothetical couple. One asks for a message when evening plans change. The other replies that adults do not need supervision. Beneath the outward disagreement over notifying each other lie different definitions. A message lets the first person plan time without being left uncertain. For the second it may resemble earlier surveillance. Clarification does not magically resolve this, but identifies the agreement to discuss: sharing significant information while preserving personal space. Neither every demand must be accepted as care nor every disagreement as indifference.

In Enchiridion §20, Epictetus advises against immediately surrendering one's response to an initial impression. His Stoic account of insult is more radical than our working approach, assigning judgement the decisive role. We use a narrower distinction between what occurred and the meaning assigned to it. A blow, threat or humiliation cannot be erased by saying everything is opinion. However, the conclusion that failing to give notice proves complete indifference may exceed the evidence. Delay helps examine that inference rather than deny the event.

Naming the meaning produces new information, but does not prove agreement. Someone may understand a need without wanting or being able to participate in the proposed way. Accuracy then reveals incompatible capacities without unnecessary mind-reading. Another way of

notifying, level of help or distance may be possible. If every explanation is mocked, the question shifts to whether this relationship permits discussion of important matters. The unspoken ceases to be the main explanation when words have already been heard and repeatedly rejected. Repeating that attempt need not become a condition of self-respect.

IV. The ability to speak is not equally distributed

An expectation may remain unspoken because speaking has a real cost. Someone may depend on another's income, housing, managerial decisions or access to children. Candour in these circumstances has consequences invisible in the abstract instruction to speak up. Before assessing clarity, examine the power each person holds and what happened after previous objections. Silence may help someone wait out a risk; it does not by itself establish immaturity, manipulation or inability to recognise a wish.

A hypothetical employee expects overtime assignments at least to be discussed but remains silent after a colleague was publicly humiliated for refusing. Part of the expectation may indeed be unstated. This does not transfer responsibility for the whole arrangement to the silent employee, who has evidence of possible punishment. Useful questions concern ways of reducing risk: can terms be clarified outside a public confrontation, can a written agreement provide support, or can an alternative be prepared? These options depend on actual rules and resources. This article offers no legal advice and no promise that careful language will stop abuse.

In Quran 42:40–43, proportionate response, praise for forgiveness and recognition of responding after injustice appear together. Their theological basis is the person's relationship to Allah, not a ready-made instruction for an employment dispute. Yet their proximity resists the convenient claim that religious virtue always requires yielding to whoever caused harm. Our comparison preserves both a limit on responding and acknowledgement of the wrong. Holding both is harder than applying one slogan about patience or retaliation to every case.

Even in a relationship with formally equal rights, the ability to influence a conversation may differ. One person trusts their social support; another fears losing their only close connection. This single feature cannot establish that a relationship is unsafe, but it adds a question about the cost of refusing. Where a request could bring coercion or violence, available safety and support come before the perfect wording of an expectation. Self-examination need not mean immediately presenting the result to someone else. The right to understand a need remains even when no safe way of expressing it directly is currently available.

V. Reciprocity does not always resemble an exchange

Resentment can arise where participation was voluntary but an expected response quietly became someone else's inward debt. This is one possible arrangement, not a description of all care. Wanting reciprocity is legitimate; the question is what form it took and whether the participants accepted it. Help, a gift, friendship and a joint commitment follow different rules. Applying an unannounced hourly ledger to a gift reveals a supposed contract only when accusation begins. Yet calling continuing exploitation a gift does not make abandoning the ledger fair.

In a hypothetical friendship, one person always pays for trips because the other has less money. Later, the payer expects their friend to answer every call. The friend values the help but never accepted that obligation. Two facts can be recognised together: the imbalance of contributions is real, and constant availability was not agreed. Examining the expectation turns an unclear debt into something discussable. Participation might need to become more manageable, or reciprocity might take another form. The friendship may also have ceased to offer enough, but that judgement should concern its actual life rather than one financial entry.

Aristotle's ethical discussion in IV.6 distinguishes appropriate social conduct from pleasing everyone and constant opposition. The relevant possibility is that pleasantness need not be the sole criterion of a good relationship. This is an account of character, not an empirical reciprocity scale. Our application asks what someone accepted when helping and what has now become too costly. A limit can be recognised without imagining that another must return everything in our chosen form at our preferred time.

The distinction matters particularly in sustained care for a relative. Care may be unequal because capacities differ, not because one person loves less. Arithmetic equality may be impossible while the allocation of burdens still needs discussion. Someone else might handle organisation, find resources or provide free time. If help is currently unavailable, that limit needs acknowledgement rather than treating patience as a bottomless obligatory resource. Resentment may signal that an established form of participation is exhausting someone; it does not prove their care was selfish from the outset.

VI. A request makes an expectation answerable

A good request does not guarantee agreement but makes the response's subject clearer. It connects a specific episode, a meaningful consequence and a possible action. In the hypothetical episode with the brother, someone could explain that helping with his move left their own task unsupported, say reciprocity matters, and ask whether he can come for two hours on Saturday. This differs from claiming he always exploits people. It permits an answer, refusal or alternative proposal. The speaker can also state that the previous level of help will no longer continue automatically.

A request containing a concealed test remains difficult to answer. Asking someone to do something without instruction requires guessing what counts as enough; saying that love should make them understand turns guessing into proof of love. Beneath this may be an understandable wish to be noticed without giving instructions. That wish can be acknowledged too. Wanting initiative does not give another person the ability to read our exact internal script. Independent participation can be discussed as its own aspect of the relationship, including signs that burdens are genuinely shared rather than one instruction followed.

In Bhagavad Gita 17.15, discipline of speech combines truthfulness, agreeableness and benefit with scriptural study. This is a religious practice rather than a universal negotiation technique. Our limited comparison asks about the quality of one's own words. Speaking without an intention to hurt may still provoke displeasure. Another's reaction is not the sole measure of a request's truthfulness or appropriateness. Beneficial speech does not entitle the recipient to reject every uncomfortable attempt to name a problem.

Clarification ends when the response becomes intelligible, not when a polished sentence has been delivered. The answer may be agreed action, definite refusal, a countercondition or evasion. Silence cannot count as agreement when someone could not respond freely. A promise is not performance before the corresponding event occurs. Resentment need not vanish after the first agreement: new information changes understanding, while trust also depends on subsequent behaviour. A request creates an answerable fork, allowing participants to see what is agreed, what remains open and when the outcome can be assessed.

VII. Forgiveness and trust address different questions

Forgiveness has several everyday meanings, and understanding what someone means comes first. It may mean forgoing revenge, accepting an apology or returning to former closeness. These need not occur together. Someone can wish no suffering on another while withholding former access to their life. They can accept that an apology is sincere without yet seeing sufficient grounds for trust. Combining these meanings into one demand requires them to confirm reconciliation before circumstances have changed.

The Christian appeal to forgiveness in Ephesians 4:32 rests on God's forgiveness in Christ. In Quran 42:40–43, forgiveness accompanies response to injustice and divine reward. These distinct theological grounds cannot be replaced with a generic psychological formula. Our editorial distinction concerns another level: declining to inflict retaliatory harm does not establish that further participation is safe. Judging an intention ethically and assessing a practical risk may require different information and support different actions.

In a hypothetical friendship, someone twice tells outsiders a private story entrusted to them. They ask forgiveness, and their friend accepts that the regret is real. Nevertheless, the friend chooses a less vulnerable subject next time. This can be consistent conduct rather than evidence of concealed revenge. Trust in confidentiality depends on the ability to maintain confidentiality. If caution is experienced as punishment, its subject can be named: I am not trying to hurt you; I am currently choosing differently what to share. No explanation guarantees approval or restoration of the former connection.

Changes may become sustained enough for trust to grow; they may not. Neither the speed nor the slowness of that process measures moral maturity by itself. The violation's nature, repetition and continuing consequences matter. Resentment may ease before access is restored or persist after useful external change. In either case, feeling should not be the relationship's sole judge. Whether to participate, how to participate and one's attitude to the harm are separate questions. Freedom from an inward story need not demand returning to conditions that remain destructive or unsafe.

VIII. New clarity changes the next agreement

Examining expectations aims at a more honest form of future participation, not at discovering the final cause of resentment. The past may remain painful and incompletely understood, while what will no longer happen automatically can still be clarified. In the moving example, the person need not promise never to help their brother again. They can decide to discuss extent, timing and reciprocal participation beforehand. This concerns an available action rather than requiring another to change character permanently or feel the required degree of gratitude.

The distinction between available and unavailable control in Enchiridion §1 offers a Stoic reference, but its strong promises of inward freedom do not become guarantees here. People do not exercise unconditional power even over every response of their own; skills, dependencies and limits matter. Our narrower application is choosing what help to give, what to agree and what event will prompt revision. Another's understanding may be welcome, but need not be the sole condition under which one's limit exists. A practical decision can retain incomplete certainty.

A new agreement also requires checking its meaning. Two people can agree to help each other and again envisage different amounts. Important conditions should be as specific as the situation requires, without trying to contract for all of intimacy. A one-off task may need only time and extent. Recurring care may need a review point. Dignity requires clarity about unacceptable treatment. Detail should serve the relationship and safety rather than create endless tests in which every departure already counts as betrayal.

After the next episode, compare the expectation with the actual event. Was the agreement fulfilled? Was an obstacle communicated? Did the burden change, or only the language? The answers allow participation to be revised without a final verdict on character. Conversation may open more active reciprocity or reveal its limits. Both outcomes provide information. Resentment need not become pleasant for that knowledge to appear. It is enough that painful mismatch no longer remains the relationship's only language and that requests, commitments, refusals and actions become distinguishable. This makes the next choice more definite, though not necessarily easier.

What this means in practice

Start with one specific episode if you currently have the capacity to examine it. There is no requirement to describe the relationship's entire history or immediately find the right emotional name. Reconstruct the event as accurately as memory permits: what was said, what happened and what consequence remains. An account remains an account, not independent proof of another's intention. If details are missing, keep that incompleteness visible. Name the feeling in your own language rather than correcting it merely because someone else prefers a more convenient definition.

Then ask what supported the expectation. Was it a wish, an established practice, a promise, or treatment you object to regardless of a prior request? More than one answer may apply. Someone might rely on an agreement while also hoping for initiative beyond it. Distinguishing these avoids demanding mind-reading without cancelling actual responsibility. If the expectation was already stated, remember that conversation rather than automatically classifying it as unspoken. Repeating a clear request does not always increase understanding; sometimes it simply confirms a lack of participation.

Identify the desired change in an available form. Is it an apology, help with a specific task, notice of changed plans, an end to particular words or a more honest refusal? One change may matter more than general recognition that we were right. Practicality does not require choosing only what suits another. Also assess the cost of speaking: can participants answer freely, and might humiliation, coercion or danger follow? Depending on that answer, the first action may be private clarification, preparing support or safer distance. Candour is not the universally obligatory next step.

When conversation is possible, a request should permit an identifiable answer and a condition for review. Two hours of help on Saturday can be agreed or refused; demanding a proper brother does not specify an outcome. Afterwards, assess what happened rather than the promise's eloquence. A feeling may persist despite a useful external change, or disappear while the arrangement remains unchanged. Neither establishes the relationship's reliability by itself. The practical outcome is a clearer connection between what mattered, what was learned and what is chosen next. A person retains their own pace, the right not to converse, and the ability to revise an expectation without being required to excuse harm.

Key quotation

> *"There is no blame on those who enforce justice after being wronged".*

Quran 42:41, the English translation displayed on Quran.com. Context, 42:40–43. The surrounding verses discuss proportionality and forgiveness; the quotation does not authorise arbitrary retaliation.

Connections between traditions

The similarities below concern particular questions, not an identical account of human nature. Religious grounds remain distinct, and contemporary practice is an editorial proposal.

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Aristotle IV.5 ↔ Ephesians 4:26	Feeling anger differs from judging a response	A virtuous mean and a Christian command have different grounds
Epictetus §20 ↔ examining an episode's meaning	An initial conclusion can be examined before responding	Stoicism takes a more radical position on external insult; actual harm is not denied
Quran 42:40–43 ↔ limiting the response	Responding after injustice retains a measure	Divine reward is not an empirical forecast

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Gita 17.15 ↔ a specific request	Truth and the quality of one's words matter	Discipline of speech includes sacred practice and does not guarantee agreement
Ephesians 4:32 ↔ forgiveness and trust	Declining hostility can change one's attitude	Contemporary access and risk assessment do not follow automatically from the verse

Primary sources and research

• Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, IV.5–6 — IV.5–6, W. D. Ross translation; anger and social disagreement.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §§1, 5, 20 — §§1, 5, 20, Elizabeth Carter translation; control, judgement and delay.

• New Testament, Letter to the Ephesians. Ephesians 4:26–32, King James Version — 4:26–32, KJV; anger, speech and forgiveness in the Christian community.

• Quran; translation displayed on Quran.com. Ash-Shura 42:40–43 — 42:40–43, displayed English translation; proportional response and forgiveness.

• Bhagavad Gita; translated by Swami Adidevananda. Bhagavad Gita 17.15 — 17.15, Gita Supersite translations, especially Swami Adidevananda; discipline of speech, accessible indexed verse text read.

Tags

inner navigation, human experience, emotions, distinctions, life episode, interpretation, responsibility, consent, dignity, safety, boundaries, relationships, dialogue, choice, consequences, uncertainty, attention, ethical judgement, hypothetical example, philosophy, religion, research, United Wisdom, practical reflection, facts, Resentment, expectations

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.