

UNITED WISDOM

Waiting: How to Live While Something Important Remains Unresolved

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P27 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Waiting: How to Live While Something Important Remains Unresolved

Epigraph

> *Hope deferred maketh the heart sick*

Proverbs 13:12, first clause, King James Version. This is a wisdom-language image, not a medical diagnosis.

What this article is about

When an important answer has not arrived, an ordinary day can start to feel provisional. A letter has been sent, a conversation has taken place, or an application has been accepted, yet the person is mentally living beside the next message. This article examines the period of waiting itself: how to remain involved in your life when a substantial part of its immediate shape is still unknown. It offers no technique for making someone answer, guaranteeing a favourable outcome, or removing every concern. Its subject is the distinction between facts and assumptions, your actions and another person's decision, hope and a promise. References to Seneca, Epictetus, and biblical texts retain their different foundations. They help us ask more precise questions about the present: what has changed, what remains possible, and which agreements already require clarity? While the outcome is open, these questions can give today substance beyond the next piece of news.

I. An open question has a place within life

Consider an invented situation: someone has attended an interview and is waiting for a decision. At breakfast they check their email, on a walk they return mentally to what was said, and in the evening they postpone seeing a friend because perhaps everything will become clear tomorrow. The answer really matters. Income, a move, and other people's plans may depend on it. Yet waiting quietly expands its territory. It occupies activities that do not require knowledge of the outcome. The person starts to confuse an open question about a job with the claim that their entire present life lacks a sufficient basis. Seeing that distinction restores proportion. An answer may substantially change a life that is nevertheless already taking place.

It helps first to name what you are waiting for. It may be a particular person's decision, a document, completion of a procedure, or an opportunity to talk. Sometimes the expected thing is less definite: a sign that will supposedly reveal how to live. Then it becomes difficult to know what could bring waiting to an end. Every event permits another interpretation, and there is no

clear boundary. A more precise description need not be final. You can say that you do not yet know whether a certain meeting will happen, or that a specified question remains unanswered. This keeps uncertainty within its actual limits. It neither turns hope into an agreement nor requires a prescribed mood throughout the period.

Recognising an intermediate position differs from devaluing it. You can know that immediate plans may change and still prepare a meal, do the work currently available, or answer someone you promised a conversation. These activities are not merely rehearsals for life because the future is open. They already have recipients and consequences. Today does not have to justify itself by preparing a wonderful resolution. A meeting, a modest completed task, some rest, or a careful request for information can be sufficient parts of it. Participation is not proof of inner strength. It preserves contact with what presently exists while the anticipated event has yet to acquire a definite form.

II. An assumption is not yet news

In Letter XIII, Seneca distinguishes what is happening from the trouble a person anticipates. In paragraphs 8–10, he asks his correspondent to examine the grounds of a future fear without treating a possible event as a present fact. This is philosophical counsel, not an established psychological law. It does not show that every concern is imaginary or that a known danger should be ignored. What matters here is the act of distinguishing. A message saying that a decision has been postponed establishes a postponement. The thought that the delay necessarily means rejection is an interpretation requiring further grounds. Both may feel equally convincing, yet they do not provide the same knowledge of the situation.

Sometimes the distinction can be written down. One line says that no answer arrived today. Another says that you assume you have been forgotten. You can then ask where the assumption came from. Is there an explicit condition, a usual timetable, or relevant experience with this particular person? Or have several details been assembled into an overall interpretation? The note delivers no verdict. Even a reasonable assumption remains an assumption until it is checked. Its more modest purpose is to help you choose an action that fits the information available. A request for an update may be appropriate because an agreed date has passed, rather than because silence has reliably revealed someone else’s attitude.

Uncertainty does not need to be decorated with a favourable story. If rejection is possible, it can honestly remain among the possibilities. If there is no information about a timetable, that absence can be acknowledged. Replacing dark certainty with bright certainty preserves the original mistake: assigning knowledge to the future that you do not yet possess. Seneca also discusses hope in the same letter, but his advice to incline towards a favourable view must not become a modern rule for verifying facts. Hope can sustain a desire without certifying its

fulfilment. A more accurate position is that you want a particular outcome, know certain circumstances, and do not yet know the answer. Both feeling and reality retain their place.

III. Participation is not power over the outcome

The first section of Epictetus's Enchiridion separates our own actions from things we do not fully command. Within Stoicism, this is connected with freedom of judgment and living according to nature. A cautious distinction is useful for waiting today: you can send a clear question without being able to ensure the answer you want. You can prepare a document without determining every participant's decision. That does not make the action pointless. It changes the part of the situation available to you and may produce new information. But if each action is measured solely by the desired outcome, even careful participation will keep appearing inadequate. Another person's decision becomes an examination whose conditions you cannot set.

In the invented example, the applicant checks that the requested materials were sent and makes one appropriate inquiry after the stated date. This fulfils their part of the communication. If the message remains unanswered, the lack of response becomes something they can consider in their plans. Yet sending an inquiry every few minutes does not gradually create a right to someone else's agreement. The amount of your effort does not add up to control over another person. You might explore other opportunities, retain your current work, or state how long the possibility remains open for you. These actions change your participation. They are not concealed ways of making an employer confirm your worth.

The distinction has limits. The body, money, housing, and reputation, which Epictetus classifies as external, can substantially affect a person's present possibilities. They should not be treated as unimportant, nor should every obstacle be made the person's responsibility. Waiting may require help, specific information, an institution's involvement, or a changed agreement. Your own action need not mean solitary action. Asking for assistance, discussing the situation together, and approaching a suitable professional can also be forms of participation. The condition is straightforward: help is discussed as help with actual limits, rather than as promised power over the entire outcome. Independence is expressed through understanding and agreement, not through refusing other people.

IV. Contact with the news needs a form

While an answer is unknown, checking for a message seems the most direct action. Sometimes it is: a changed meeting time or a requested document needs to be seen. But the next check may provide no new information. There is a distinction between receiving actual news and repeatedly looking for a sign. Someone rereads an old email, examines the last time the other person appeared online, or returns to a page displaying the same status. Each movement resembles participation, although the situation remains unchanged. This is no reason to condemn yourself. You can notice which check concerns the actual channel for news and which seeks certainty from a detail that does not contain an answer.

The form of contact depends on the circumstances. One question may require being available for a call during an agreed period; another may allow email to be read after a particular activity. There is no universal number of checks. You can make a temporary arrangement with yourself: remain available through this channel and return to it after a walk. An actual deadline or requirement for an urgent response is considered separately. The arrangement guarantees neither calm nor a fixed routine. Its purpose is to give participation a recognisable boundary. Closing the inbox then completes a particular check, rather than signalling abandonment of the important question or a danger of forgetting everything that matters.

The dinner-party image in section 15 of the Enchiridion suggests waiting without prematurely seizing what is unavailable. Desire does not bring a dish within reach before it is served. This is a Stoic metaphor for our relation to external things, not an instruction about electronic messages. Its application here is the article’s own: a channel of communication can be maintained without trying to extract an answer before it appears. The other side matters too. When news actually arrives, it needs to be read, understood, and answered within the relevant agreement. Stepping away from checking should not quietly become withdrawal from participation. Both waiting and returning to a message need their boundaries.

V. Present commitments have their own dates

Not every plan can remain open until the main answer arrives. A payment, a meeting, a shared project, or care for someone close has its own timing. Sometimes waiting really reduces available resources, and earlier agreements need clarification. Sometimes it simply makes planning the next day feel uncomfortable. Those situations differ. Not knowing whether you can join a trip next month does not necessarily prevent you from confirming today’s conversation. Uncertainty about next week’s income may require a concrete discussion of expenses now. An open question does not cancel the consequences of silence for others. People whose plans depend on your participation need to know its actual limits.

In another invented example, a family awaits confirmation of a move. One person suggests discussing no domestic matters because everything may change. Another continues handling shopping and appointments but does not know what they can count on. Waiting is unevenly distributed. An uncertain shared future has become a definite additional burden for one participant. The conversation can begin with that burden without demanding an immediate decision about the entire move. What needs doing this week, who will undertake it, and which expenses are possible before the next update? A temporary agreement about those matters does not choose the final future. It allows people to participate together in the intermediate position rather than wait separately.

In James, the patient farmer appears beside an instruction not to grumble against one another. Waiting in 5:7–9 has a Christian basis related to the coming of the Lord; it does not describe a contemporary family agreement. Yet the neighbouring themes keep an important comparative question visible: how does waiting affect relations with those nearby? Your unanswered question does not make someone else responsible for every uncomfortable day. Equally, naming a concrete burden should not be prohibited in the name of patience. A conversation today can combine respect for an open situation with clarity about a present obligation. It need not resolve uncertainty. It can avoid transferring its hidden consequences to someone who never agreed to carry them.

VI. Hope need not become a prediction

Proverbs 13:12 describes deferred hope through the image of an ailing heart and fulfilled desire through a tree of life. This is wisdom language conveying waiting’s weight; it neither diagnoses a condition nor establishes a medical consequence of delay. A reader can hear an acknowledgment that hope is difficult without turning it into proof of eventual fulfilment. Sometimes people demand either confident optimism or complete abandonment of what they want. There remains a space between them: wanting without knowing, recognising importance without making promises, and allowing different outcomes without declaring them equally attractive. The position does not make waiting easy. It makes it possible to describe waiting without adding unwarranted certainty.

Honest hope has a relation to action. If the desired answer arrives, its conditions will need reading, the circumstances considering, and the consequences discussing. A different answer will also require participation. Imagining both movements does not require experiencing every possible loss in advance. You can make preparations that leave present life available: keep necessary information, consider one accessible alternative, or ask who could offer a conversation. Elaborately rehearsing every bad outcome is not a compulsory price for responsibility. Equally, ignoring known circumstances should not be called trust. Preparation is

better tied to a concrete need: what would actually help with the next piece of news, and what merely repeats a picture already imagined many times?

Hope does not oblige other people to share your estimate of the likelihood. Someone close can want a good outcome for you while not knowing how possible it is. Their caution does not necessarily mean a lack of support. Your desire does not turn reassurance into knowledge they possess. It helps to distinguish requests: wanting a conversation about why this matters, wanting help with a particular action, and wanting to hear that everything will certainly work out. The first two can be discussed directly. The third asks for certainty the other person may not have. Support sometimes becomes more honest when someone offers no guarantee, stays alongside uncertainty, and helps you consider the actual circumstances.

VII. What matters can coexist with other things that matter

Waiting can produce a moral demand: if the answer really matters, you must not turn your attention elsewhere. Enjoyment starts to look like neglect, seeing a friend like carelessness, and interest in a book like proof that the desire is insufficiently serious. But continual attention does not govern another person’s decision. It occupies your own time. You can want an outcome deeply and still laugh at a table, read, work, or discuss something else. These activities need not serve waiting. A friend deserves attention as a person, a book may be interesting in itself, and work has its own recipient. Several meaningful connections do not automatically weaken the central hope. They show that life has more than one content.

Not every available activity will suit today, and a list of things to do need not become a new obligation. If an open question occupies some of your energy, participation can be smaller. A meeting can be short, work limited to a clearly defined portion, and rest allowed without a demand to enjoy it. In an invented example, someone tells a friend that they would like to meet but can stay for only an hour. That is a concrete agreement about presence, more honest than promising to forget an important piece of news completely. The friend can consent to the actual meeting. The person waiting need not first demonstrate complete inner readiness. Ordinary life returns through an accessible action, not a certificate of an ideal state.

Participation elsewhere sometimes reveals how narrowly the situation was described. After a conversation, you may see that an important answer affects one part of work rather than all your abilities and relationships. Sometimes no such insight occurs: the activity is completed and uncertainty remains. That too is a real outcome. Each hour should not be judged by whether it made you stop waiting. Otherwise an ordinary activity again becomes an instrument of the main question and loses its own meaning. Your thoughts are allowed to return to waiting. You can notice the return, see whether there is actual news, and continue the chosen activity as far as is possible. There is no demand for uninterrupted control of attention.

VIII. Waiting can be reconsidered as circumstances change

An open situation does not necessarily stay the same. A stated date passes, available resources change, new information appears, or someone clarifies participation conditions. Reconsidering waiting begins with those changes. It need not mean abandoning hope. You can still want the original result while no longer leaving every plan open indefinitely. Reconsideration should not become punishment. Choosing another possibility does not prove that the original desire was insincere. Continuing to wait does not certify exceptional loyalty. The grounds matter more: what is known now, and what participation fits the changed circumstances? That question makes action possible without a grand conclusion about your personality.

A point for reconsideration can be tied to an actual event: a promised response date, a need to confirm another plan, or the end of an available interval. If there is no such date, you can choose when to return to the question and tell those affected. You might say that you can leave a meeting open until Friday, after which another commitment needs confirmation. This is not an ultimatum when it honestly states the boundary of your participation. It becomes pressure if the deadline is invented to compel agreement or accompanied by a threat to punish an unwanted answer. The difference lies in the action’s content. Reconsideration governs your availability; manipulation attempts to govern someone else’s consent.

There are circumstances in which further waiting is unnecessary: conditions have become unacceptable, a request has lost its point, a danger has appeared, or another person has clearly refused. A general thought about patience does not cancel those facts. James speaks within Christian expectation and Epictetus within a Stoic path; neither brief passage supplies a universal instruction to retain every contemporary connection. This article does not advise enduring threats, violations of consent, or indefinite dependence on an unknown decision. Where a question involves a particular procedure, its actual sources must establish the applicable rules and dates. A philosophical text can assist discrimination without replacing that knowledge. Sometimes your action is to stop waiting for something specific and clearly communicate changed plans.

IX. An answer closes a question without defining the whole person

When news arrives, accumulated waiting can give it additional meaning. Agreement is taken as proof that an entire life is correct, while refusal becomes a final judgment of the person. Yet an answer usually concerns a particular proposal, date, conditions, and the participants' possibilities. Even a very important decision does not reveal everything about your capacity to act, love, learn, or cooperate. Rejection may have serious consequences that should not be minimised. But an event's consequences differ from a verdict on a person. Begin by understanding what has actually been answered, what it changes, and what it does not establish. Unclear news may need clarification; favourable news may require careful reading of conditions. The end of waiting does not replace participation in what follows.

It helps to retain a connection between the previous day and the new one. Activities completed while waiting do not disappear because the resolution differs from what was hoped. A conversation with a friend was a conversation, help given to someone was help, and a clarified agreement created shared understanding. If the outcome is favourable, these things were not an empty interval. If it is unfavourable, they do not become mistakes. Recognising this resists explaining the past solely through the outcome. Yesterday's participation rested on what was available yesterday, not information obtained today. You can see where an assumption was excessive or clarity insufficient without declaring the entire period wrong. Reconsidering a particular action is more accurate than retrospectively judging your whole self.

Waiting does not have to reveal its meaning as a special lesson. Sometimes a person learns something substantial about themselves; sometimes they receive an answer and the need to act next. A difficult period need not be justified by compulsory growth. A more accessible outcome is to preserve distinctions: hope has not become knowledge, another person's decision has not become your fault, and a temporary agreement has not become a permanent obligation. These distinctions may support greater precision next time, without guaranteeing that waiting will be easy. While something important remains unresolved, you can remain a person with an open question and an actual life. That life is not entirely determined by the news, although the news really matters within it.

What this means in practice

Choose one open question about which you are genuinely waiting for news. Write down the answer expected, the person or channel through which it may arrive, and what is known about the timetable. Do not fill gaps with a convenient story. Separately name one fact about today's situation and one assumption you make about it. If the assumption rests on a particular message, identify that message. If its basis is unclear, leave the uncertainty visible. The note neither verifies another person's intentions nor guarantees calm. It helps show which information the next action concerns.

Then name one available part of your participation: supplying missing material, asking about a date that has passed, remaining available for a message, or temporarily ending a check. Take account of the actual communication requirements. Identify a present activity that matters independently of the answer. Choose a manageable amount of participation and, where someone else is involved, agree on that actual amount. Do not promise a state you cannot ensure. You can consent to a short meeting or complete a defined part of your work while leaving the main question open.

Finally, identify grounds for reconsideration: new information, a real date, or changed conditions. If waiting affects shared responsibilities, tell those concerned what is known and what they can presently count on. After the chosen action, examine only the actual result: what was done, what information appeared, or which agreement became clearer. Do not judge the exercise by whether waiting disappeared. This is an author-proposed way of organising a question, not a psychological method with established efficacy or an instruction to continue an unacceptable connection. Its modest outcome may be that the future stayed open while one action today acquired grounds of its own.

Key quotation

> *Some things are in our control and others not.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion 1, first sentence, translated by Elizabeth Carter as displayed by the Internet Classics Archive. The distinction belongs to a Stoic framework; it is not an instruction to refuse assistance.

Connections between traditions

1. **The future and a present fact.** In Seneca's Letter XIII 8–10, anticipated trouble is distinguished from what is already happening; James 5:7–8 uses the farmer's waiting within expectation of the Lord's coming. Their shared comparative field is the relation to what has not occurred: attention to the future does not make it a present event. This supports an editorial distinction between being ready for news and transferring the whole of life to it. Stoic examination of the grounds of fear and Christian patience nevertheless have different purposes and foundations. James does not promise a successful worldly application, and Seneca does not establish that every real danger is imaginary.

2. **The time of participation and premature grasping.** In Enchiridion 15, Epictetus compares our relation to external things with a dinner party: do not reach for what has not been served. James 5:7 describes waiting for fruit and rain. In both specific images, the desired thing has a timing that desire alone cannot shorten. The article uses this to distinguish availability for news from repeatedly trying to find news in its absence. The comparison has limits: the Stoic image includes public office and family, while Christian waiting concerns the Lord. Neither becomes an empirically established email-checking schedule or a rule to endure every condition of participation.

3. **Hope's weight and examination of its content.** Proverbs 13:12 recognises deferred hope's difficulty through an image of the heart; Seneca XIII 10–13 considers both feared troubles and hopes. The common mechanism is that a desired future participates in present experience without having become a fact. In contemporary reasoning, this permits acknowledging an outcome's importance without promising its fulfilment. The difference remains: biblical wisdom conveys an image and contrast, while Seneca offers philosophical counsel to a correspondent. His advice to incline towards a favourable view is not a rule of evidence. The image of an ailing heart supplies neither a diagnosis nor a clinical causal model.

4. **Waiting and another person.** James 5:9 addresses a community with an instruction not to grumble against one another; Enchiridion 1 distinguishes our own action from external things we do not command. The shared field is the boundary between our relation to waiting and other people's participation. A missing answer does not grant a right to blame someone or govern their consent. A present-day agreement about a burden is nevertheless the article's development, not the literal teaching of both passages. Christian communal responsibility and Stoic freedom of judgment are not identical. The comparison does not prohibit naming actual harm, asking for assistance, or identifying a broken commitment.

5. **Difficulty and available action.** Proverbs 13:12 presents hope as significant and difficult; Enchiridion 1 separates our own actions from things dependent on external conditions. Together, they let a comparison retain two sides of waiting: it may be hard, while some

participation remains available. The article expresses this through a manageable action today without requiring complete calm first. One passage offers a wisdom image and the other a Stoic classification; their combination does not establish an exercise's efficacy. Available action depends on actual conditions. Assistance and bodily limits do not disappear because of a philosophical distinction.

Primary sources

1. **Proverbs 13:12.** Checked verse, KJV. The epigraph is its first clause. Its metaphor is not used as a diagnosis.

2. **Seneca, Moral Letters to Lucilius, XIII.** On Groundless Fears, translated by Richard M. Gummere. The checked edition title states first printing 1918 and reprinting 1925. Complete paragraphs 1–17 and three displayed notes read; bounded paraphrases of 6 and 8–13 adopted. Death exempla in 14 not adopted.

3. **Epictetus, Enchiridion 1 and 15.** Displayed Elizabeth Carter English. The key quotation is the first sentence of 1. The printing or modernization date of this site text was not established; no entire-manual reading is asserted.

4. **Epistle of James 5:7–11.** Checked passage, KJV. The complete displayed passage was read. The farmer's image and communal instruction are adopted within their Christian frame. English quotations distinguish displayed KJV from a named historical translation; the RU renderings are United Wisdom's own, with no claim of comparison against a separate published Russian edition.

Tags

waiting, uncertainty, life transition, important answer, open question, hope, facts, assumptions, present life, personal action, another person's decision, participation, dates, message, availability, information checks, manageable step, temporary agreement, shared responsibilities, support, boundaries, reconsidering plans, consent, ordinary life, Seneca, Epictetus, Stoicism, Proverbs, James, patience

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.