

UNITED WISDOM

Friendship in adult life: time, reciprocity, and shared action

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R36 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Friendship in adult life: time, reciprocity, and shared action

Epigraph

> *Friendship needs delicate handling.*

Hugh Black, *Friendship*, chapter II, the author's own sentence, web 218. The accessible Fleming H. Revell edition states copyright 1898 and 1903; a separate printing year has not been established. This is ethical reflection, rather than an experimental finding.

What this article is about

On Friday, two friends once again message each other that they really must meet. One sends a picture of his free evening; the other responds with a heart and goes to cook dinner. A week later, the conversation repeats. There has been no quarrel or refusal, yet the meeting still exists only in the future tense. In this fictional scene, Artyom and Kirill remember how easily they once spent whole days together. Now each has work, travel, other people, and other activities. Their warm feeling remains; the place available for it has become less obvious. This does not yet establish indifference or the final end of the relationship.

Adult friendship raises a question about how desire becomes shared action without becoming an obligation to belong to another person. We will consider time, initiative, reciprocity, help, ordinary activities, and revising the arrangement. This is a voluntary relationship, rather than authority derived from kinship or a demand to appoint one person our most important intimate. All everyday characters and episodes below are fictional. Historical texts and limited research help distinguish questions; they do not establish your friends' motives. The practice does not promise to restore a friendship and does not require contact where threats or coercion are present.

I. A warm intention does not yet specify a meeting

Artyom is sincerely pleased to receive Kirill's messages. When he writes about a future evening, he is not necessarily concealing a refusal behind politeness. But Kirill cannot turn up inside an intention: he needs at least an available time and place. While both discuss how good things used to be, the present meeting still has no conditions. We can notice this absence without accusing a friend of insincerity. Warm feeling, the wish to meet, and an agreed action are different things. The first may exist without the second, and the second without the third. None becomes a lie simply because the others have not yet appeared or coincided.

Let us change one element of the scene. Kirill suggests a walk on Wednesday after work, for about forty minutes. Artyom can now respond to something specific: whether the day, journey, duration, and walk itself suit him. He can suggest another time or decline. His answer does not yet assess their entire friendship. If Wednesday is occupied, there is no need immediately to invoke their shared years as proof that he should have cleared it. But Kirill can also notice that vague promises do not provide the contact he needs. Specificity clarifies the question; it does not guarantee agreement, enjoyment, or the continuation of the relationship.

Sometimes a person does not want to choose a date at all. That refusal deserves to be heard, rather than turning the following week into another round of persuasion. Sometimes he wants to meet but does not know his schedule. They might then leave the invitation open for an agreed period, if that suits them both. We need not appoint a single correct form of response. Artyom does not have to prove intimacy by disclosing his complete timetable; Kirill does not have to wait indefinitely. Friendship acquires a real condition when its participants can distinguish their own desire, availability, and the other's willingness without treating any one as all the others. The work of maintaining contact starts here, rather than a test of feeling.

II. Time cannot be replaced by a moral score

Artyom has an evening but lacks the energy to cross the city. Kirill finishes earlier but must meet a relative. The word “busy” conceals different conditions; it is not always a request to understand everything without explanation, and it need not be a final refusal. If both want to continue the discussion, they can disclose just the circumstances needed to arrange the meeting. Their entire home life need not be revealed. Travel time, a starting hour, or the need to return may provide enough information. A limited explanation does not become disrespectful simply because a friend would like more details or a more convincing justification.

An unhelpful substitution occurs when free hours become a measure of someone's worth. If he cared, he would find time; if he did not come, everyone else must matter more. Such conclusions may seem understandable, but they require grounds beyond a single calendar event. At the same time, an actual promise cannot silently be cancelled. If Artyom agreed to come and did not report that his plans had changed, Kirill can discuss the specific expectation and its breach. That is a different subject from accusing him of a complete inability to be a friend. A named promise gives the conversation something concrete; a general moral score often makes someone defend his entire person instead of considering one action.

Sometimes conditions cannot be reconciled. Friends may love late conversations but no longer have a late night in common; they may want a hike that is presently unavailable to one of them. The absence of a workable solution remains real even when neither is to blame. Instead of obligatory optimism, they can acknowledge the loss of the old arrangement and ask whether

another exists. A short meeting should not be presented as a complete replacement if that is not how they experience it. It may have a separate value. It may also not suit them. Maintaining friendship does not require denying limits; it requires resisting a meaning assigned to those limits before the participants have established it themselves.

III. Research on time does not prescribe a standard of intimacy

The abstract of Jeffrey A. Hall's paper describes two studies of new acquaintances: 355 recently relocated participants estimated shared time; 112 first-year students reported on two acquaintances three times over nine weeks. Time was associated with closeness, and in the second study with changes in closeness. The abstract and metadata were read here, rather than methods or data. This was not an experiment on our meeting arrangement or grounds for assigning every friend a required number of hours. Research on new acquaintances does not assess Artyom and Kirill's established friendship.

Even “time” needs content. Two people may spend long periods beside each other at work and have little opportunity to address one another as friends. Others meet briefly but choose an activity in which each has a place. These fictional possibilities are not additional research findings. They show why the number of hours cannot establish the quality of a particular relationship without other information. If Kirill starts recording meetings in a table, it may help him understand his own schedule. It does not become a gauge of Artyom's affection, an established psychological scale, or a right to demand the missing hours after his next refusal.

It is more useful to ask what the participants want to make possible. One needs an unhurried conversation; the other likes doing a particular thing together. Perhaps both want the same thing but choose an inconvenient arrangement. Perhaps their desires themselves differ. Clarifying this should not produce a ready conclusion that any regularity is better than any infrequent meeting. It lets us consider the life available while retaining the right not to know its future. The scientific publication helps preserve the distinction between an observed association among measures and a prescription for a person. It does not establish that the practice below will increase intimacy, remove loneliness, or restore their former contact.

IV. A habit can support desire and obscure it

In chapter II of Hugh Black's *Friendship*, care for the relationship is considered an ethical responsibility. He connects its continuation with habit and small actions. His argument belongs to Christian reflection on love and service, rather than a modern test of scheduling. We can compare his attention to the ordinary with our question without adopting his entire historical ideal as the reader's duty. It is particularly important not to make his required faithfulness permission to ignore a refusal, caution a vice, or lack of time an established moral defect in an individual person.

Artyom and Kirill might agree to a walk on the first available Thursday of each month. Their agreement will remove some organisational uncertainty if both actually like this arrangement. But a recurring date does not preserve desire on their behalf. When Thursday becomes a heavy obligation, they can examine what has changed: the activity, journey, demands, expectations, or willingness to meet. Every dull moment need not become a final verdict. Equally, someone need not call pleasant what has become difficult for him. A habit has a subject and conditions, rather than a lifetime right to the execution of an old plan.

The opposite extreme is also possible: waiting only for inspiration. Both then want contact, but each waits for a special occasion that never arrives. A small repeated action can be their own choice, rather than a proven universal technique. One might send available dates and the other choose; next time they exchange the organising role if it suits them. Warm spontaneity and advance planning need not be enemies. The question is whether they help these people meet and leave room for revision. Even a successful arrangement does not guarantee an unchanging feeling; it creates a specific place where feeling can become action today.

V. Reciprocity is visible beyond identical gestures

Kirill proposes meetings more often; Artyom more often notices when his friend needs help. In one relationship, that division suits both; in another, constant organisation becomes tiring for the first. We cannot decide this by counting messages alone or declaring that real friends never count anything. They can consider the work: who chooses the place, confirms the time, remembers constraints, cancels the reservation, and returns to an invitation after a pause. Not every gesture costs each person the same. But this does not entitle us to call any difference fair in advance when one is already saying that the present arrangement does not suit him.

Suppose Kirill is tired of guessing Artyom's schedule. He can ask him to propose the next date himself and stop sending options every evening. This step concerns organisation; it need not be punishment through silence. Artyom can accept the task, explain that he is not currently willing, or suggest another method. Kirill should not secretly set a test in which his friend must discover an unannounced new role. If it is safe to discuss the question and both want to, a

named subject is more honest than a hidden examination. The answer may be unpleasant; clarity does not guarantee the reciprocity one participant hoped to obtain.

Variety in participation needs to be distinguished from the absence of an available response. Different gestures may express attention; they may also fail to answer a specific need. Artyom sends funny photographs when Kirill asked whether their meeting would happen. Good humour does not settle the reservation. Conversely, a single refusal does not erase all visible care. We can acknowledge both the photographs and the missing answer without making either cancel the other. Reciprocity here is neither a balanced account nor a promise of equal feelings. It is an opportunity to see what participation exists, what remains unconfirmed, and what arrangement both are willing to maintain today.

VI. A shared activity must not swallow the separate person

In Book IX, section 12 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by W. D. Ross, Aristotle considers friends' shared activities within his ethics of virtue. His historical distinction between good and bad relationships is not a contemporary diagnosis. The relevant question for comparison concerns active companionship: what do people actually do together? Our participants need not share one philosophy or seek to become entirely like each other. A shared activity can be simple and limited. It does not by itself certify the quality of friendship, and not every shared pursuit becomes good merely through being shared.

Artyom likes fixing things; Kirill photographs the city. They might spend an evening beside an old bicycle and another following a familiar route with a camera. Neither first has to become an identical enthusiast for repair or photography. But participation should leave room for real interest, capacity, and refusal. If Kirill always acts as an assistant and never gets his own evening, the shared task may conceal one-sided organisation. If Artyom agreed to help, a specific task exists; it does not give Kirill the right silently to expand repairing one bicycle into permanent maintenance of all his equipment and call an objection a lack of friendship.

A shared action can also be entirely unproductive: watching a film, walking a familiar road, or sitting without a particular purpose. Not every meeting must deliver a benefit, document personal growth, or finish with a declaration of the relationship's importance. Sometimes the absence of an examination leaves room to be together. However, a right to quiet does not cancel a request the other has actually made. If Kirill came to discuss a particular question and Artyom is only ready to watch a film, they need to distinguish their intentions instead of declaring one activity true friendship. Togetherness arises from the participation both can and want to offer, rather than from the name given to the evening.

VII. Help remains an offer with a specific subject

Suppose Artyom needs to move several boxes. Kirill can help for two hours on Saturday but has no car. This is a specific contribution that should not be dismissed because it does not provide the whole solution. Artyom can thank him and arrange transport separately; he can say that this particular help does not suit the task. Declining an arrangement need not mean rejecting a friend. Kirill can also recognise the limits of his energy without an extended justification. Words about friendly participation do not create endless availability or replace clarity about time, expenses, responsibility for belongings, and what the person is not undertaking.

Help should not become an exchange of rights over another's life. If Kirill helped with the move, that does not make him the owner of Artyom's future weekends. Nor should Artyom promise an action he is unwilling to perform simply to obtain what he needs sooner. They can name an actual promise separately from retaining gratitude. Service has an important place within Black's Christian ideal; in our voluntary scene, it is not declared a duty to sacrifice oneself. The ethical meaning of help cannot be inferred from its outward size alone. A small agreed contribution may be significant, while large unsolicited help may not fit.

There are situations in which friendly participation is insufficient. We do not grant professional competence on the strength of intimacy or promise that a personal conversation will ensure safety. Where threats, violence, or coercion exist, an open meeting does not become an obligatory way to maintain the relationship; suitable separate help depends on the circumstances. Limits and refusals are also permitted in ordinary practical questions. We can attend to another's disappointment without turning it into consent on our own behalf. A friend can have a need we cannot meet. Acknowledging that is sometimes more honest than offering unlimited help and then disappearing when a specific task arises.

VIII. Friendship permits different subjects without requiring every conversation

On their walk, Kirill wants to talk about work; Artyom is tired of work discussions. This difference does not establish which is superficial or selfish. One can say which subject is unavailable today and ask whether there is another activity. We should not promise that a gentle sentence will necessarily preserve ease. Kirill may feel upset and Artyom awkward. These feelings do not cancel the stated limit or prove that the refusal was cruel. Friendship allows attention to another's experience, but attention does not always mean being willing to discuss any subject at any proposed time or to share every view.

Perhaps the subject matters right now and no other suitable listener is available. That makes the situation harder, but gives no ready right to direct Artyom. He can offer to talk later if genuinely willing, or acknowledge that he cannot. Kirill can seek another kind of support. An offered delay should not be counted as completed participation: the later conversation still needs to become possible. Nor need a friend be appointed the sole keeper of every difficulty. Mutual care does not require other relationships to disappear. Each person's separate life remains a condition of voluntary participation, rather than an obstacle to remove as proof of friendship's exclusivity.

Discussing different views also has a specific subject. Disagreement about a film, a plan for meeting, and degrading treatment of a person are not equivalent. This article does not ask anyone to tolerate harm for the sake of generosity, or determine an acceptable distance for the reader. In a less dangerous situation, one can identify the particular action that felt unpleasant without presenting a complete revised version of the friend's personality. An apology does not automatically restore former access, and declining one way of talking does not always mean a complete break. Maintaining adult friendship requires leaving these distinctions visible. Otherwise, every difficulty becomes either proof of a final end or a triviality the participant is instructed to ignore.

IX. Different grounds do not produce one recipe

For Aristotle, shared activities belong within the ethics of virtue; for Black, everyday faithfulness is connected with Christian service; Hall studies measures of new acquaintances. These grounds do not add up to a claim that any agreed evening necessarily brings people closer. We can recognise a common question about active relationship while preserving the different aims and limits. We need not attribute the same understanding of personhood, standard of time, or acceptance of the present voluntary character of each meeting to all these sources. Comparison helps us read our own proposal more carefully, but does not make it a validated technique or cancel the other's right to answer differently.

In our fictional scene, nobody has to earn friendship by making the correct amount of effort. At the same time, care need not remain an internal feeling that the other must always guess. Between those extremes lies specific work: naming an available arrangement, hearing the answer, acknowledging one's promise, and revising what does not fit. Sometimes the participants discover they wanted the same thing but could not organise a meeting. Sometimes their differing desires become visible. The second result should not be treated as a failure of the practice to conceal through further attempts. Clarification may make the limits of contact more understandable without turning them into desired intimacy or removing the sadness associated with them.

Friendship need not become a project of continuous improvement. People may already have an arrangement that suits them and requires no investigation. This article's questions are for voluntary consideration of a difficulty, rather than a search for defects in every meeting. Gratitude, enjoyment, calm, and the desire to continue can be noticed without obligatory analysis of their causes. Someone can also temporarily not know what he wants. Acknowledged uncertainty differs from a promise the other treats as a concrete plan. An adult relationship does not become less significant because its participants do not name its final shared meaning. An agreed action today may be a sufficiently precise answer to today's question.

X. A meeting can have a modest continuation

Let us return to Friday's message. Kirill suggests Wednesday; Artyom replies that he can walk near work but cannot travel far. Kirill chooses a short route and brings a photograph he wanted to show. This is one possible outcome of the fictional scene. It does not prove that the two have discovered friendship's universal secret. The walk may be awkward; one may want to talk more and the other become tired. However, the meeting now has an actual arrangement they can experience and then assess without requiring it immediately to restore all their former evenings. The past need not become the standard for every new hour.

In another outcome, Artyom does not want to meet. Kirill can then leave the invitation open, limit his initiative, or stop pursuing it. He need not think his own desire ridiculous simply because it was not shared. Artyom need not promise future intimacy to soften an unpleasant answer. An honest difference can hurt and still remain a difference, rather than evidence of either participant's bad character. If the refusal is clear, further attempts should not be presented as necessary care. Retaining memories of good times does not establish an obligation to maintain present contact in a form one no longer chooses or can offer.

When the desire remains mutual, friendship can continue in different ways: an infrequent long meeting, a brief walk, a shared activity, or a message without a demand for an immediate answer. No outward arrangement certifies the quality of every relationship. What matters is that people can see their actual participation without appropriating the other's. Time makes a meeting possible; reciprocity requires attention to its conditions; shared action makes the relationship available in present life. All three remain changeable. This is neither a promise of eternity nor an obligation constantly to confirm the past. It is a question about what two adults are actually willing to do together now.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one safe friendship in which you lack clarity. In a personal note, distinguish the desire to meet, available conditions, and an actual agreement. Do not enter promises your friend never made in the third category. You might notice that both express warm intentions without choosing an arrangement; you might find that willingness differs. The note need not be shown to anyone. It does not assess the entire friendship or establish motives. If you do not want to continue reflecting now, you can stop without another explanation and without an obligation immediately to turn what you noticed into a conversation.

If contact is appropriate and both permit discussion, propose one small, specific arrangement: an activity, place, approximate time, and the option to decline or change a condition. State what you are willing to do yourself. Do not use the offer as a hidden test whose correct answer is known only to you. After the response, distinguish declining this option from a broader conclusion you feel inclined to draw about the relationship. Where unwillingness to continue is clear, do not turn clarification into repeated persuasion. Where there is agreement, confirm only the necessary conditions; an agreed evening grants no right to all future meetings and does not guarantee enjoyment.

After possible contact, you can ask yourself what actually happened, what did not fit, and whether you wish to repeat this particular arrangement. You need not prove the meeting's benefit or compare contributions against a universal scale. Separately notice any specific promise you made yourself and report a change if possible and appropriate. This is an editorial suggestion for voluntary reflection, rather than therapy or a validated friendship-strengthening technique. A shared step is not prescribed where threats exist. Sometimes the result will be a small agreement, sometimes a more clearly recognised limit. Neither obliges you to pronounce a new final verdict on the past friendship.

Key quotation

> *loyalty, which finds expression in service.*

Hugh Black, *Friendship*, chapter II, web 231; a short fragment of the author's own sentence about the expression of faithfulness. Its Christian ethical context is retained; the fragment does not prescribe unlimited help or self-sacrifice for the reader.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Question	Substantial difference and limit
Aristotle, Book IX.12	What do friends do together?	The ethics of virtue and its historical judgments differ from contemporary research and the article's voluntary practice.
Hugh Black, chapter II	How does attention become an ordinary action?	Christian service and ethical responsibility do not establish obligatory access to a friend or the effect of scheduling.
Hall, abstract of two studies	How does time relate to measures of new closeness?	A limited empirical question does not prescribe required hours for every adult friendship.
Fictional editorial scene	How does an invitation become a shared evening?	A fictional outcome does not validate efficacy; the other may decline, change conditions, or not know the answer.

Primary sources

1. Hugh Black, *Friendship*. Fleming H. Revell Company; the accessible page states copyright 1898 and 1903, rather than an established separate printing year. Gutenberg 20861, updated 1 January 2021. Metadata and chapter II, web 191–260, read; not the whole book. Both quotation roles belong to Black's own prose, rather than nested quotations. Rights UNKNOWN; no universal licence established.

2. Jeffrey A. Hall, *How many hours does it take to make a friend?*. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 36(4), 1278–1296; online 15 March 2018, issue April 2019, DOI 10.1177/0265407518761225. Complete publisher abstract and metadata/rights notice read; methods, data, and full text unread. No direct quotation; rights UNKNOWN.

3. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book IX. W. D. Ross translation, Internet Classics Archive; the translation's printing year not established. Metadata and selected sections 9–12 read; section 12 used. Historical philosophy, rather than current clinical or legal support. No direct quotation; rights UNKNOWN.

Tags

adult friendship, voluntary relationship, time, reciprocity, shared action, intention, agreement, meeting, initiative, availability, promise, refusal, consent, habit, care, help, separate life, shared activities, organisational work, intimacy, contact frequency, limits, respect, uncertainty, memory, safety, Aristotle, Hugh Black, Jeffrey Hall, historical philosophy, empirical limits, United Wisdom

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 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.