

UNITED WISDOM

Irritation and accumulated demands

The Person and Inner Life

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-07-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Irritation and accumulated demands

Andrey Zarinsh · Maria Evilkut

Epigraph

> *“swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath”.*

James 1:19, excerpt, King James Version. Context, 1:19–20.

What this article is about

Sometimes the last request seems small, yet the answer is sharp. The person is surprised: why did an ordinary message produce so much irritation? One possibility is that the request became the final addition to an already crowded day. Overload, however, does not explain every instance. The conversation's content, an actual conflict, pain, environmental conditions or other circumstances may matter. A single reaction cannot identify the cause or establish a diagnosis.

We examine accumulated demands while preserving responsibility for how others are treated. Sleep research helps assess one specific factor; philosophical and religious texts raise different questions about measured responses and speech. None replaces the person's history. Our practical direction is to reconstruct a sequence, understand how tasks are distributed and choose what could change in the next episode. A clearer limit on participation or acknowledgement of harshness may follow. Rest, an agreement and an apology can address different questions; one step need not accomplish them all.

I. The final straw does not describe the whole day

Irritation at a particular moment can be considered alongside the preceding sequence without treating that sequence as a ready-made explanation. A small request after hours of pressure occurs under different conditions from the same request on a quiet day. That difference needs checking. Consider a specific period: the tasks already underway, interruptions, unfinished demands and what has just been added. Saying one is tired can begin an inquiry; when it ends every conversation, it conceals causes and consequences alike.

Imagine a hypothetical evening. Someone has spent the day fixing urgent mistakes, answering messages and collecting a child, then hears a request to buy groceries. Outwardly the episode begins at the door, but its conditions developed earlier. Irritation might concern being unable to finish the day, having one's labour unnoticed, or an impossible deadline for the shopping.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Different interpretations suggest different changes: redistributing errands, discussing contributions or changing the deadline. Naming the feeling does not automatically choose among them.

In Nicomachean Ethics IV.5, Aristotle recognises varied causes of anger and considers the circumstances of responding. This is not a theory of accumulated stress. Here it reminds us to distinguish a response's recipient from its subject. Whoever asks for groceries may not be responsible for the morning's mistakes. Even when the sequence helps explain intensity, it does not make the latest participant guilty of everything before their arrival. A response's history and the allocation of responsibility are separate questions.

Reconstructing the sequence does not require a detailed life journal. A few significant events and a check for recurring combinations can be enough. If a similar day produces a different response, that observation matters too: the workload explanation requires refinement. Tone, clarity or the ability to refuse may be significant. A counterexample improves inquiry rather than defeating it. Seeing beyond the final event makes it easier to change available conditions. Yet nobody needs to label the entire day overload when a specific unjust demand is the main problem.

II. Demands involve more than the number of tasks

Two days with the same number of tasks may require different levels of participation. Complexity, uncertainty, frequent switching and inability to choose the order can matter. Five familiar errands may be manageable; one task without a clear outcome may occupy the day. This is an editorial description of conditions, not an overload scale. It moves beyond arguing over externally counted accomplishments towards what was hard to finish and which other obligations remained in attention at the same time.

In a hypothetical team, an employee not only answers clients but ensures colleagues answer theirs. That second job was never included in her role. Her own message count looks low, yet she maintains the shared process. Another reminder about a forgotten message may provoke irritation. It does not establish that colleagues deliberately offload work. Responsibilities need clarification: who tracks deadlines, who sets priorities, and what happens if she stops quietly catching others' tasks? An unclear role can sustain demands even among well-intentioned people.

Another condition is whether work can genuinely end. If every opening is filled immediately with a new task, the day's end becomes a dispute rather than a time. Harshness may start protecting it. Recognising this possible function does not justify every form of defence. It is more useful to examine whether an explicit limit can be created: which tasks finish today, which move, and who receives notice of insufficient time. Such a limit requires authority and

agreement. Attention to oneself alone does not create it, and actual circumstances may prevent it.

The ethical question about listening and hasty speech in James 1:19–20 does not replace the organisational question. The Christian text judges anger in relation to God, not through a work-role chart. Our comparison holds two levels together: avoid unnecessary verbal harm and make the disagreement visible. Omitting the second asks for endless improvement of tone under unchanged demands. Omitting the first makes workload permission to humiliate whoever is nearby. Neither outcome is necessary for an honest examination.

III. Sleep is a factor to examine, not a ready diagnosis

Insufficient sleep deserves a separate question if it was actually present. It cannot be inferred from irritation: someone may have slept enough and encountered an important violation. Nor does one calm day establish that sleep is irrelevant. Distinguish information about sleep, a subjective assessment of state and a hypothesis about the response's cause. This allows a possible contribution to be considered without declaring everything physiological and making relationships irrelevant. A source can support a factor without establishing its role in another person's history.

In the randomised study by Krizan and Hisler, 2019, 142 community residents maintained or restricted sleep for two days, then rated products alongside aversive noise. Restriction increased reported anger. We read the abstract: this is a particular experimental task, not proof of every everyday cause. Palmer and colleagues' 2024 meta-analysis combines 154 experiments with 5,717 participants aged 7–79; effects differed across emotional measures and forms of sleep loss. Reduced positive experience does not mean every negative feeling universally increases. We do not reproduce the complete review's detailed findings.

These findings challenge the moral shortcut that someone simply lacks patience. The opposite shortcut, attributing everything to sleep, is also inaccurate. If a hypothetical person answers an unfair request sharply after a short night, both their state and the request's content matter. More opportunity for rest might change the response while the unfair arrangement remains. Conversely, clarified responsibilities need not remove the need for recovery. One factor should not claim exclusive explanatory authority, since a convenient hypothesis would then make an important part of the situation disappear.

This article prescribes neither sleep duration nor treatment nor self-directed remedies for persistent disturbance. Its practical questions concern organisation: was there an opportunity to finish work, who created nighttime obligations, and could one's state inform the timing of a discussion? Not everyone can change their schedule. Work, caring duties and housing impose real limits. Recognising them is useful even when the immediate change is small. State may

help explain an unexpectedly harsh answer; responsibility for that answer and the need to change conditions remain separate questions. Scientific evidence expands the picture without turning partial support into a final cause.

IV. Invisible work changes the shared account

Accumulated demands can remain hard to see because some tasks exist only in someone's attention. Remembering deadlines, noticing shortages, arranging a sequence and reminding others are forms of participation too. This does not establish that every organiser is overloaded. But comparisons of contributions remain incomplete without these actions. One person may count completed assignments; another may have created the list as well as completed theirs. Irritation at being told simply to ask can concern this additional layer rather than an unwillingness to communicate clearly.

In a hypothetical family, one adult prepares a child for a trip while the other helps when asked. They bought clothes together, but the first tracks weather, documents, departure time and spare items. When asked what else needs doing, they answer sharply. They may need an entire responsibility transferred rather than another isolated favour. The discussion would then concern independently handling documents or packing, rather than carrying out another command. This remains a hypothesis: another cause may matter, and the person's account is needed to check it.

Transferring responsibility differs from assigning a task because it includes a clear result and the capacity to achieve it. Giving someone an area while prohibiting their own method leaves the arrangement unchanged. Accepting it while waiting for every reminder also leaves the original person monitoring it. Clarify what counts as finished and when limitations should be reported. This is organisational work, not evidence of psychological types. Even well-intentioned people may find it difficult because they judge detail, deadlines and acceptable uncertainty differently. Difference does not always mean malicious intention.

Shared responsibility cannot be replaced with a call for composure. The Stoic distinction between action and external outcome in Enchiridion §1 can be applied narrowly to participation: state more clearly what you accept and what you will no longer automatically catch. Philosophy creates neither money nor time nor a reliable helper. Sometimes no one is available to take a task. Clarity then helps acknowledge the actual demands and seek an available reduction rather than promise elegant freedom. The absence of an immediate solution does not falsify the original account or require invisible work to disappear again.

V. Recovery need not become another obligation

Recovery may require reducing obligations before adding another correct activity. Someone whose day is full may experience a new list of helpful practices as an additional examination. This article offers no self-improvement programme. Its question is smaller: is there a point where demands actually stop, and what prevents that point from existing? Timing, shared care, accepting every task or a genuine lack of alternatives may matter. Naming self-discipline in advance is insufficient; actual conditions come first.

In a hypothetical evening, twenty free minutes disappear into checking whether anything important was forgotten. Worry does not make that check pointless. Responsibilities may genuinely be arranged so that only this person notices an error. Ask what happens if checking is delayed, who else can take over, and which consequences are acceptable. Someone cannot be required to stop caring when another depends on it. Necessary participation can, however, be distinguished from additional checks that provide no new information. That distinction requires facts, not a blanket assurance that all monitoring is excessive.

Ethical traditions often value delaying a hasty response. In James 1:19, slower speech accompanies listening; in Enchiridion §20, delay creates room before answering an impression. These are not evidence for one recovery technique. Our comparison suggests a pause may help when it actually reduces haste without leaving another in dangerous uncertainty. Sometimes a brief message must come first: I cannot discuss this now and will return later. The ability to send that message also depends on circumstances.

Rest does not require proof that someone has reached their limit, but making it possible may require negotiation. Giving one person free time by transferring all work to another merely changes the recipient of strain. The question therefore concerns distribution as well as personal state. Who can finish the day, who remains on duty, and on what basis? Not every arrangement changes immediately. A sufficient first outcome may be acknowledging finite resources and declining to promise additional work without discussing its cost. This guarantees no composure, but makes future demands less hidden.

VI. Repeating an accusation differs from understanding an episode

Returning to an unpleasant episode can clarify it or reproduce the same accusatory story. The difference concerns whether new distinctions, information or choices appear, rather than the number of repetitions. Someone may notice an unclear request, or rehearse proving another's inadequacy ever more vividly. This editorial boundary is not a diagnosis of obsession. Strong experience can take time, and lack of immediate clarity does not make every reflection harmful. Nevertheless, repetition need not solve the problem it originally served.

In Bushman's 2002 experiment, provoked participants hit a bag while thinking about the provocateur or fitness, or sat without a bag. The final analysis included 600 undergraduates; two women who declined bag hitting were excluded. The provocateur-focused group reported more anger and aggressive responding measured through noise blasts. This tests a particular combination of provocation, physical action and assigned attention in a laboratory. It does not establish that every discussion or every physical activity increases irritation. We derive no prohibition on exercise or discussing experience.

In a hypothetical workplace episode, an employee repeatedly rehearses a speech about lazy colleagues. No information appears, and distributing deadlines remains unresolved. Ask what the story should accomplish: recognition of demands, preparation for discussion, justification for refusal or imaginary punishment? If preparation is needed, a brief account of responsibilities and one specific request may help more. If support is needed, a suitable conversation may provide it. Wanting understanding is not weakness. Support should be distinguished from jointly increasing certainty about another's motive without additional evidence.

The Stoic pause and the experiment are not identical teachings. Epictetus §20 concerns philosophical freedom from hasty judgement; Bushman tests particular behaviour after laboratory provocation. They meet only in the limited possibility that immediately developing an accusation does not always improve the next response. Preparing a decision may take time, or ending demands may come first. Someone can preserve recognition of injustice without returning each minute to an inward trial. This offers a possible direction, not a promise that changing attention immediately removes the feeling.

VII. Explaining harshness does not erase its consequences

Workload may help explain a sharp answer without obliging others to forget it. Raised voices or humiliation require distinguishing an account of causes from acknowledgement of conduct. Both are compatible. Someone can describe an overloaded day and identify a regretted sentence without declaring the original request fair. An episode can contain an unjust demand and unnecessary cruelty in response. Avoiding a single guilty party improves accuracy when it also preserves differences in power and consequences.

A hypothetical parent snaps at a child asking to show a drawing. Daily demands may be severe, but the child is not responsible for their arrangement. Repair can address what happened between them: the answer was harsh, the child is not responsible for the parent's tiredness, and the parent can now look or specify another time. This is an illustrative scene, not a universal parenting method. The promised time still needs to be honoured. Merely explaining overload can leave the child guessing again when asking for attention is safe and when it brings punishment.

In Gita 17.15, speech is a domain of religious discipline. Our limited application asks what words do to the listener, not only whether they express our state accurately. Being very tired may be true while its expression is harmful. Care in speech does not require always sounding pleasant to someone who crosses a limit. A clear, firm refusal can be unwelcome without containing insult or threat.

After apologising, avoid impossible promises never to feel irritation again, always to answer calmly or to withstand every request. A more answerable change concerns the next condition or action: earlier notice that another task cannot be accepted, assigning a responsibility, or returning after a pause. Where those possibilities are absent, honestly naming limits is better than a polished guarantee. Another person need not restore trust immediately. Explanation, apology and changing conditions address distinct aspects; combining them does not entitle someone to demand confirmation of improvement before it becomes visible.

VIII. A limit becomes useful when it can be recognised

A participation limit helps when it changes an identifiable part of life. The general thought of avoiding overload easily remains unaddressed. Choose a task, time or form of agreement. A hypothetical team might stop assigning evening work without checking existing deadlines; a family might allocate trip preparation beforehand. Nobody promises composure. They change conditions that may have sustained pressure. The outcome is assessed through the agreement's performance and manageable participation, not solely through the disappearance of an unpleasant feeling.

A limit can cost others something, so communicate it as clearly as safety and role permit. If former work suddenly stops, another may discover the change only after an error. Sometimes this is unavoidable because continuing is impossible. Where available, notice prevents unnecessary harm. Distinguish naming an actual limit from threatening someone into agreement. Declining another task tonight describes participation; inviting others to fail without you adds a punitive intention. The same refusal may have different consequences through these different formulations.

Change need not always be individual. Where an arrangement repeatedly overloads several people, one personal pause cannot repair it. Available discussions of roles, resources and deadlines matter. This article promises neither that they will happen nor that they will produce fairness. An individual may lack authority. They can still see more clearly which risks they assume, what another option would require, and where responsibility for someone else's organisation ends. Recognising an external limit does not remove choice; it makes its scale more honest without casting the obstacle as personal weakness.

After changing something, allow unexpected results. Irritation may diminish, persist or arise elsewhere. That provides information rather than an immediate verdict on personal success. Reduced demands with continuing difficulty suggest an incomplete hypothesis. Improved mood with continuing unfairness should not erase the organisational question. An honoured agreement is an observable outcome even if fatigue persists. Separating these allows explanations and participation to be revised instead of endlessly repeating one interpretation. Irritation need not become an enemy required to disappear before any reasonable action is possible.

What this means in practice

Choose one recent episode in which the response was sharper than intended. First reconstruct the response itself: what was said or done and who received it. Then describe the preceding period: tasks, interruptions, uncertain responsibilities and the possibility of finishing work. There is no need to prove irritation legitimate. Identify the conditions actually present. If the cause is unknown, retain that uncertainty instead of substituting a convenient story about character, family or hidden trauma.

Distinguish performed tasks from responsibilities held in attention. A home episode may involve travel, shopping and knowing what else needs checking. At work it may involve one's tasks and continuously catching others'. Ask what would happen if one area were left undone: who would notice, who could take over, and what consequences would follow? This reveals actual duties and what might be renegotiated. It does not require endangering a dependent person's welfare to demonstrate a limit.

If short sleep was a fact, consider it as a factor without drawing a treatment conclusion. If sleep was sufficient, do not preserve that hypothesis at all costs. Where irritation followed an unfair request, the request may be the discussion's subject. Choose an available step: report insufficient time, reduce one commitment, transfer an area or delay discussion with an identifiable return. Safety and dependence come before direct objection. Where the arrangement cannot change, at least avoid treating the absence of an option as a moral defect.

Repair unnecessary harshness separately without cancelling the original problem. Identifying the act, recipient and possible repair is more accurate than explaining a whole personality. After a small change, observe whether conditions changed and what happened in the next comparable episode. Continuing irritation does not mean all benefit is absent; its disappearance does not establish fairness. This is a way to observe and choose, not treatment or a commitment to become convenient for others. Its purpose is to reduce hidden participation, clarify manageable commitments and avoid transferring overload's cost to whoever happened to arrive last.

Key quotation

> *“Speech that causes no shock (hurt and fear etc.) and which is true, pleasant and beneficial”.*

Bhagavad Gita 17.15, excerpt from Swami Adidevananda's translation on Gita Supersite. The full verse also includes scriptural recitation; only its description of speech is quoted here.

Connections between traditions

The table compares questions illuminating different parts of an episode. It neither declares religious discipline experimentally confirmed nor derives modern work organisation from an ancient text.

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Aristotle IV.5 ↔ describing a sequence	The response's subject and circumstances matter	Character ethics is not a theory of accumulated overload
James 1:19 ↔ Epictetus §20	A hasty response can be delayed	Christian listening and Stoic freedom have different grounds
Gita 17.15 ↔ repairing harshness	Speech's quality and effects on another matter	Sacred discipline does not guarantee a pleasant response
Krizan/Hisler experiment ↔ Palmer meta-analysis	Sleep can contribute to emotional conditions	A narrow task and heterogeneous review do not explain every episode

Comparison	Similarity	Limit
Bushman ↔ Stoic examination of impressions	Developing accusation need not improve a response	A laboratory action and a philosophical exercise are not identical

Primary sources and research

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

• New Testament, Letter of James. James 1:19–20, King James Version — 1:19–20, KJV; listening and hasty responding.

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

• 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.

• Cara A. Palmer and colleagues. Sleep loss and emotion: A systematic review and meta-analysis of over 50 years of experimental research (2024) — Psychological Bulletin 150(4), 440–463; DOI 10.1037/bul0000410; abstract read, not the complete review.

• Zlatan Krizan; Garrett Hisler. Sleepy anger: Restricted sleep amplifies angry feelings (2019) — Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 148(7), 1239–1250; DOI 10.1037/xge0000522; abstract read.

• Brad J. Bushman. Does Venting Anger Feed or Extinguish the Flame? (2002) — Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 28(6), 724–731; DOI 10.1177/0146167202289002; laboratory methods and results.

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, Irritation and accumulated demands, workload

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.