

UNITED WISDOM

Who becomes family: kinship, choice and actual involvement

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R35 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Who becomes family: kinship, choice and actual involvement

Epigraph

...I won’t stand in your way...

George Eliot, Silas Marner, chapter XIX; words of the fictional Silas, a fragment.

What this article is about

Different people come to mind when we name our family. Parents and children, a sister in another city, a spouse, a long-standing friend, someone who has shared everyday life for years. One is connected to us through origin, another through a shared choice, a third through involvement that has become part of life. These grounds can coincide or diverge. Someone remains a relative after a long absence; a friend becomes very close without a shared designation in documents. There is no need to search for one word that cancels all the other ties. It is more useful to distinguish what we call family, which history we recognise and what involvement is actually available.

This article considers family belonging without prescribing one compulsory arrangement. A fictional episode, an official statistical glossary and a limited qualitative study will help reveal different ways of speaking about the subject. None establishes legal rights or the proper composition of a family on the reader's behalf. Our everyday examples are invented and our practical distinctions are editorial. We make no promise that chosen relationships are always safe, that kinship always requires closeness or that assistance automatically purchases a family name. We will keep origin, designation, actual involvement and formal status distinct, so that a particular question can be answered without settling people's entire history in one gesture.

I. Questions about family arise for different reasons

Imagine a fictional scene. Irina invites people to a small celebration at home. She wants to include her cousin Pavel and Sofia, a friend of twenty years. When Irina calls Sofia family, Pavel is surprised: they are not relatives. For Irina, the word connects with a shared history, ordinary meetings and mutual involvement. Pavel is thinking about origin. While they argue over the right word, a simple question about the gathering remains unsettled: whom does the host want to invite, and what sort of occasion can she organise in her apartment?

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The same question changes in another setting. Origin may matter for a family history; for everyday assistance, the question is who is willing to come; for an official document, it concerns a specified category and actual requirements. A single designation does not automatically answer all these questions. Becoming close to Irina does not, without verification, authorise Sofia to sign any document on her behalf. Being a relative does not mean Pavel knows her schedule or has agreed to participate in a particular task. We distinguish areas here, without establishing a legal result for any of them.

It helps to first ask which decision is needed. Making a guest list, recognising someone's significance, dividing an everyday task and clarifying information for an institution are different actions. When combined into a dispute about real family, the answer becomes excessive. A person seems obliged either to recognise everything at once or to deny the connection entirely. But Irina can invite Sofia without declaring that her cousin has ceased to be a relative. She can respect Pavel's history without promising him involvement in every event of her life. A particular occasion helps avoid a decision much broader than the present task.

Sometimes the word itself matters greatly. A person wants a relationship of many years to stop being described as a casual acquaintance. That request should not automatically be reduced to a list of services: a family name can express recognition of history and closeness. Yet no one has to adopt another person's designation immediately. Its meaning to the speaker can be explored without turning the conversation into a test of gratitude. In our scene, Irina can explain her meaning while Pavel retains a different vocabulary. Their difference alone does not establish who cares more or who has final authority to define someone else's relationships.

II. Kinship speaks about history, rather than the whole present

Kinship can have value in its own right. Shared memories, language, family stories and recognisable habits connect a person with a history they did not entirely choose. That is not necessarily a burden or a restriction. Pavel may remember Irina's childhood in a way Sofia does not. This information cannot be declared insignificant simply because they seldom meet now. Family history and the current frequency of involvement are distinct. The absence of one form of closeness neither erases origin nor requires the entire past to be considered empty.

But a shared history does not imply complete knowledge of someone's present life. Pavel may remember Irina as a shy schoolgirl and miss changes in her interests. If he speaks on behalf of the family as though that earlier image were final, kinship becomes a reason not to ask. Irina can clarify that something different suits her now. This is not a rejection of the past. We can recognise who we were without remaining in the same role for other people's convenience. A close witness to our history can also be mistaken about a person who continues living and changing.

In some families, kinship supports both history and everyday life. There is no need to invent a conflict between origin and choice in these circumstances. Someone may want to remain close to relatives, agree on involvement and experience kinship as a meaningful gift. Our map does not rank these grounds by moral value. It helps distinguish them where a discrepancy has arisen. If Irina and Pavel have a warm relationship, Sofia need not take his place in order to matter too. Several ties can have different functions without competing to be the only legitimate form of closeness.

There can also be a painful history. It does not become good because the people involved are relatives. But this article does not decide from one memory whether someone should maintain or end contact. That is a separate decision based on particular circumstances. Here, it is enough not to treat kinship as ready-made proof of safety, consent or availability. Origin can be recognised while a present limit is honestly described. This distinction leaves room for the actual past without assigning it authority over every present question or requiring one emotional attitude towards an entire family history at once.

III. A chosen tie does not arise from one announcement

Irina calls Sofia family because they have a long shared history. Yet one warm announcement does not create an identical meaning for both. Sofia may value their friendship without using that word. She may accept it but understand it differently. Choosing a relationship is therefore not the same as unilaterally assigning a role. If a family name is meant to describe shared involvement, it helps to hear whether the other person agrees with that meaning. This need not be a compulsory ceremonial procedure. An ordinary conversation about what has actually developed can sometimes be enough, without demanding an immediate solemn affirmation.

A chosen tie can include a consistency that origin does not reveal. Sofia knows Irina prefers meeting without a large feast, helps with one everyday task and remembers a difficult period. These actions matter in the fictional scene, but they are not a universal family qualification test. Someone with limited resources can remain close even when unable to visit or help financially. Actual involvement must not become a ranking of availability. We are examining a particular form of connection, rather than assessing human worth through hours and services.

The word choice does not mean relationships are completely controllable. People meet through circumstances, change, experience differences and sometimes lose a familiar capacity to support each other. A family designation does not remove those limits. Irina and Sofia can remain important to each other while revising how often they meet. The meaning of the tie itself may change. That does not automatically make the original acknowledgement deceptive. Chosen involvement needs room to clarify conditions, rather than an obligation to reproduce forever the amount that was once available in a different period of life.

Nor should a chosen family be declared necessarily better than kinship. It can contain pressure, unequal conditions and unpleasant expectations. Kinship can include free choice and attentive care. The origin of a tie does not provide enough information about its present arrangement. For this topic, the more useful question is what has actually been accepted, fulfilled and made open to discussion. That question does not cancel the cultural significance of a family name. It prevents the name from replacing observation when a person needs to understand what they can rely on and which unknowns remain.

IV. Involvement matters, but does not purchase a person

Pavel has helped Irina move several times. Sofia was present during a difficult period. Both contributions can be recognised without concluding that either person acquired a right to control her life. Assistance has a particular subject; it does not establish the entire content of future decisions. Even substantial involvement does not make someone an acquired member of another's family without their own response. In our scene, gratitude can be warm and specific without becoming a promise to always invite, disclose everything or accept any proposal from the helper. This is an editorial distinction between contribution and power.

Not every supportive action looks the same. One person remembers the history, another brings groceries, a third offers company without conversation. Different forms can matter differently to Irina on different days. That does not establish an exchange rate. We do not determine how much care is sufficient to earn a family name. If she wants to describe the significance of Sofia's involvement, she can identify something particular without presenting it as proof that Pavel loves insufficiently. Comparing people through one kind of assistance often misses each person's actual circumstances.

Agreed involvement differs from an unspoken expectation. Sofia may habitually visit on Fridays without promising to be available every evening. Irina can consider her family and still check whether a new request suits her. Closeness does not remove the need for that question. If assistance concerns a task already accepted, the consequences of a change matter, but the agreement does not thereby become indefinite. Irina's need remains real when Sofia declines; Sofia's refusal does not prove that all her earlier care was false. Continuing will require a particular available option, rather than an accusatory dispute about the designation.

Accounting for involvement also has limits. Some ties matter through memory or presence that cannot conveniently be measured. Others rest on specific commitments whose non-fulfilment needs to be noticed. Both areas can remain visible. There is no need to define closeness solely through actions or to deny actions for the sake of a beautiful word. The article asks about consistency: which family name is used, what does it mean here and does present involvement fit an accepted expectation? The answer may be incomplete. Incompleteness calls for clarification, rather than an immediate final judgement on the entire history of a relationship.

V. Several grounds can coexist

Return to Irina's celebration. She can seat Sofia and Pavel at the table without staging a contest over whose closeness has the correct basis. A shared gathering does not force everyone to call each other family. Each retains their own history with the host. Sometimes that difference allows people to participate without false agreement: the cousin need not adopt friendship as kinship, the friend need not deny her significance, and Irina need not choose one word for every relationship to produce an untroubled guest list. Agreeing on the actual form of the gathering is enough.

Different grounds sometimes produce incompatible expectations, however. Pavel thinks family celebrations should include relatives alone; Irina wants something different. This concerns her particular gathering, rather than proof that every other arrangement of family is generally wrong. She can explain how the evening will be organised and leave Pavel to decide about participating. The article does not guarantee that the difference will be accepted calmly. There is no need to declare him a less valuable relative because he declines. Nor does his displeasure automatically prohibit the guests Irina has chosen for her own event.

Sometimes a plurality of ties concerns different periods. A person grew up in one family, formed another, maintains a friendship and recognises the significance of people no longer present. These histories do not necessarily compete. New closeness does not cancel earlier closeness; the earlier tie should not prohibit every new one. If an actual obligation arises between them, it should be considered separately. We provide no rules about inheritance, custody or property. The distinction is intended to avoid making the existence of several ties a moral violation that can only be corrected by rejecting one biography in favour of another.

Plurality does not mean unlimited capacity. Time, energy and space are scarce; sometimes a person can host only a few guests or assist with only one task. That limit does not necessarily identify whom they consider real family. Irina may postpone seeing Pavel because her table is small, rather than because she denies their kinship. Yet a formal explanation can also conceal a significant change in a tie. The meaning should not be assigned in advance. The particular circumstance and available continuation can be clarified while preserving uncertainty where the other person is not yet willing to discuss the broader history.

VI. A novel presents conflicting grounds, not a contemporary rule

In chapter XIX of George Eliot's Silas Marner, Eppie, who grew up with Silas, receives a visit from her biological father Godfrey. He wants to acknowledge his daughter and offer a more prosperous life. His idea of correcting the past encounters an attachment already formed and the young woman's choice. Silas experiences the possibility of separation but turns to her own response. This is a fictional conflict involving origin, upbringing, resources and involvement. It establishes no contemporary child right, adoption procedure or universal norm under which a biological father always matters less than the person who raised the child.

The characters' voices differ. Godfrey considers kinship the strongest ground, Nancy sees the move as beneficial and Eppie does not want the offered life. The novel lets us notice that a sincere intention to correct the past does not determine another person's response. But the plot is not a study of contemporary families, and the characters' experiences provide no diagnosis. Nor do Silas's words about his life being saved become a child's duty here to protect an adult from loneliness. We retain a limited question about consent and a history already lived, without importing all the work's moral, religious and class assumptions.

In the U.S. Census Bureau's official glossary, family is used for particular statistical purposes and connected with birth, marriage or adoption. The page itself emphasises the specialised meaning of familiar words in the bureau's products. Such a category serves the relevant counting task, but does not exhaust the personal meaning of family for Irina. This illustrates different languages of description. We do not turn the statistical definition into a law about access to assistance or documents, judge the moral quality of relationships by it or claim that the same category applies in every country.

The abstract of Jackson Levin and colleagues' 2020 study describes eleven semi-structured interviews about chosen family among queer and transgender young adults. The authors identify themes of navigating medical systems, leaning on each other and mutual aid. The published abstract was read here; the full methods section was unavailable and is not presented as examined. This limited support identifies a particular research question, rather than prevalence across a whole population or established effectiveness of chosen family. Its specific social context cannot be erased for a general slogan that every friendship is arranged in the same way.

VII. Formal status needs separate verification

When a family name is used in a document or institution, a separate task arises. The actual requirements for that particular action, place and situation need to be established. Calling Sofia close in everyday life does not replace that check; Pavel's kinship also provides no pre-established result here. This article supplies no list of powers, duties or permissions. We retain a distinction between how people name their tie and which conditions apply to a particular official procedure. They sometimes coincide and sometimes do not; the answer cannot be obtained from general emotional closeness alone.

That distinction does not make a chosen tie insignificant. When an institution requires a specified category, someone can have valuable closeness outside it. Recognising that value does not automatically remove the practical limit, however. Irina can check the available procedure for a particular task in advance, without requiring Sofia to obtain authority through devotion alone. Such work does not establish coldness in the relationship. It concerns actual conditions, which can prove complex. A legal question requires competent local verification, rather than a universal formula inferred from a fictional episode or a statistical glossary.

A formal designation also does not guarantee everyday involvement. A record can be accurate for its purpose while the person is unavailable on the needed day. This does not permit anyone to cancel their status arbitrarily. It does remind us that practical assistance needs actual coordination. Who will come, what can they do, what information is needed and what alternative is available? These questions concern action. They do not replace a legal procedure or make the helper a full participant in every decision. Formal conditions can be observed while available support is built separately, keeping both areas clear.

In some circumstances, the cost of an error is high. There is no need to await general agreement about real family before clarifying necessary conditions for assistance. But urgency does not authorise the article to invent a local procedure. We do not guarantee access to an institution, service or information. For our topic, the distinction is enough: a family name has human meaning, while an official action has conditions to be verified. If they diverge, that is a particular practical problem, rather than proof that the tie is imaginary or that every formal participant can automatically supply the support needed.

VIII. Belonging does not require identical closeness

People can be considered family while differing in closeness. Irina discusses family memories with Pavel, ordinary plans with Sofia and sees another relative infrequently. That is not necessarily a concealed hierarchy of worth. The ties have different histories and available forms. A family name does not imply identical access to every experience. We do not settle the question of personal boundaries in detail here; it has its own subject. The point is not to make a designation into a promise of identical closeness for everyone, a promise the person never made and cannot fulfil through one decision.

A child's family belonging should not depend on usefulness either. They do not earn their place only after good behaviour, emotional support of an older person or obedient acceptance of a new adult. This is an ethical distinction made by the article, rather than an account of a particular local rule. Adults are responsible for care according to their actual role; the child must not be assigned to secure family harmony in order to retain their place. A new family after divorce, gradual relationships or adult disagreements bring separate age-sensitive questions. This overview does not replace them with a promise that accepting one designation will make difficulties disappear.

Involvement can be a different matter for an adult. They can accept a task, decline a form of help or change their availability. But a family tie should not become a threat activated by every limited request. Sofia can decline to visit on Friday without denying their shared history. Pavel can decline part of a conversation without erasing kinship. If familiar involvement changes for a long time, that should be named separately. One evening does not necessarily provide a complete answer; persistent discrepancy cannot be concealed indefinitely by saying that real family withstands everything without clarification.

It is especially important not to use belonging to justify dangerous treatment. Kinship or a chosen designation does not establish safety or require reconciliation. Immediate danger needs assistance appropriate to the actual local situation; our exercise is not a condition for beginning protection. Services have not been verified here and no complete safety plan was prepared. We do not diagnose from a conflict or prescribe one outcome. It is enough not to turn a dispute about family composition into a reason to endure threats or disclose personal matters against one's capacity and consent simply to confirm the correct family role.

IX. Family history continues changing

Irina and Sofia may one day live in different cities. Their involvement will change, but that does not necessarily cancel the family name. Pavel may become closer after a long gap; new involvement will not rewrite his earlier absence. A history contains different periods. A present change can be recognised while the past remains factually accurate. This approach does not promise easy renewal of relationships. It avoids requiring every new step to immediately establish someone's definitive character and replace all earlier information. Closeness develops through actual episodes, rather than only a general story about an everlasting family.

A family designation sometimes stops fitting one participant. That can be heard as a change in meaning, rather than automatically as a denial of everything received. Yet the other person may be hurt. The article does not promise to remove that experience through an accurate explanation. Time, a limit to the conversation or assistance from suitable people may be needed. A personal word should not be declared an irrevocable obligation. At the same time, changing a designation does not release someone from a particular task already accepted without considering the consequences. History, feelings and a practical commitment remain distinct: none should be used to silently decide all the others.

Ties with deceased or absent people can continue to form part of a family's meaning. Actual involvement is not expressed through a present response here, yet memory remains significant. Family therefore cannot be defined solely through a list of those available today. Nor does memory require every present choice to be surrendered to it. Irina can retain someone's history and form new relationships. We prescribe no way of experiencing loss and do not assert that a new tie will replace anything. The example preserves a distinction between actual availability, a past biography and someone's place in a personal story.

Change can leave the question open. Irina does not yet know whether she will call a new close acquaintance family. She need not accelerate a definition to justify the friendship. She can observe what develops, clarify particular involvement and avoid promising more than is known. Uncertainty is sometimes more honest than a ready-made solemn formula. It does not establish coldness or guarantee well-being. A next step in a relationship is possible while its name is still being sought. This overview asks vocabulary to help describe and recognise life, rather than force life to match a predetermined correct picture.

X. Naming a tie without cancelling differences

The celebration may produce no common definition. Pavel continues to understand family through kinship; Irina includes Sofia in the word. They can clarify participation in the evening even while the broader dispute remains. That is one possible outcome of the fictional scene, rather than a guaranteed result of conversation. Irina's concern is not to win a philosophical argument before everyone, but to hold a gathering consistent with her available conditions and recognised ties. If agreement is impossible, it need not be imitated. An actual difference can remain visible without a final judgement on each person.

R35's central question differs from the distribution of contributions in R05 and interdependence in R16. Those concern the arrangement of cooperation; this article concerns the meaning of belonging across different grounds and languages of description. We can cooperate with someone without calling them family, and consider someone family who is currently little available. Nor does our overview settle boundaries of contact with relatives in detail. Thematic links identify neighbouring questions, rather than any material's readiness or a duty to read the entire catalogue. The distinction prevents a useful account of assistance from becoming the final definition of every family relationship.

A family name need not be empty in order to remain free of one prescribed composition. It can express a profound history, involvement and chosen closeness. Checking its meaning helps where uncertainty or a cost has arisen. Not every warm meeting needs analysis. But when a designation justifies a promise, right or demand, its area should be clarified. What exactly has been recognised? What have participants actually accepted? Which action is available? Which formal question still needs verification? That precision does not guarantee agreement, but prevents one word from silently settling several different tasks on people's behalf.

Who becomes family is not always determined by one event. Kinship comes with history, choice is expressed through a response, involvement develops over time and official status is established under its own conditions. A person can recognise several grounds without finding identical words for them. This does not require differences to be eliminated immediately. A modest next step is to name the meaning of one tie and an available form of involvement while preserving limits and uncertainty. Family then does not become a contest of merit. It remains a human area in which history matters, care needs reality and the other person retains their own response.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one tie whose name or involvement has become a question. Do not rank all your close relationships. Write separately what connects you historically, which name you use, what actually happens now and which expectation has not yet been discussed. You need not disclose a personal account to another person to complete the exercise. Memory and an absence of contact can also be named without an invented outcome. If a document or institution is involved, identify that as a separate task for actual local verification; do not infer the answer from a relationship's warmth.

Choose one available subject for conversation, if conversation is appropriate and safe. It might be the meaning of a family name, participation in a particular gathering or a change in a familiar task. The other person may understand the tie differently, decline to respond now or reject the proposed form. Do not demand to be called family as payment for past help. Do not declare the absence of one action proof that love is entirely absent. Clarify what is available and leave unknowns open, without using the exercise as a hidden test of loyalty. Where threats exist, protection does not await family agreement or completion of this trial.

Later, check only the chosen area: did the meaning become clearer, did agreed involvement occur and which limit emerged? The answer can be negative or incomplete. This optional exercise does not guarantee closeness, recognition, safety or formal authority. Its aim is to distinguish the grounds of one tie without assigning a person solely through a name, expectation or contribution. Legal, medical and dangerous circumstances need separate, verified assistance. Even without a final definition, an actual history can be recognised, a free response retained and a proportionate next step chosen.

Key quotation

> *...doesn’t alter the feelings inside us...*

George Eliot, Silas Marner, chapter XIX; a fragment of Silas's words about the years already lived and Godfrey's late acknowledgement.

Connections between traditions

Source	Limited question	Difference and limit
Eliot, chapter XIX	Origin, upbringing, resources and a young woman's response	A fictional conflict, not contemporary law, family research or a child's duty to save an adult
U.S. Census Bureau, statistical glossary	A familiar word can have a specialised meaning for counting	One country's statistical context, not a universal moral or legal criterion
Jackson Levin and colleagues, 2020, abstract	Chosen family is examined through support and mutual aid	Eleven interviews with queer and transgender young adults; full methods were not read, prevalence and causal effect not established
This article's proposal	History, designation, involvement and formal questions are distinct	An editorial map, not agreement among all traditions; free responses, limits and uncertainty remain

Sources

1. George Eliot — Silas Marner. The 1861 novel in Project Gutenberg digital edition 550, updated October 27, 2025. The complete chapter XIX and neighbouring context were read; quotations belong to the fictional Silas. Wordsworth's epigraph and other embedded fragments are not used. No contemporary legal or psychological evidence is inferred.

2. U.S. Census Bureau — Families and Households Glossary. A page marked revised December 16, 2021. The introductory limitation, Family and Family Group definitions and metadata were read. Only the distinction between statistical language and personal meaning is used; linked detailed definitions and local legal procedures were not verified.

3. Nina Jackson Levin, Shanna K. Kattari, Emily K. Piellusch, Erica Watson — study of chosen family and mutual care. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 17(19), 7346, October 8, 2020; DOI 10.3390/ijerph17197346. The published abstract and author metadata were read. Full methods were not obtained; eleven interviews do not represent an entire population or establish a family arrangement's effectiveness.

Tags

family, kinship, chosen family, belonging, involvement, history, biography, closeness, friendship, care, origin, designation, consent, response, expectation, assistance, gratitude, reciprocity, formal status, statistics, different families, uncertainty, memory, change, dignity, boundaries, Eliot, Silas Marner, chosen relationships, United Wisdom, R05, R16

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.