


UNITED WISDOM

# When friendship changes: distance without devaluing the past

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R37 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# When friendship changes: distance without devaluing the past

## Epigraph

> *I know, dear,*

George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*, Book VII, chapter IV, Lucy speaking, web 5554. This is a character's voice within a literary scene, rather than the author's instruction to forgive. The printing year underlying the Gutenberg 6688 electronic edition has not been established.

## What this article is about

When their shared project ended, Lena and Oksana stopped having coffee outside the office every day. Lena sees occasional messages as a quiet continuation of friendship; Oksana feels her friend is gradually leaving. They still enjoy memories of their trips, but even those memories have become grounds for argument: do they now mean nothing? In this fictional story, neither person has yet announced a break. The arrangement of their contact has changed, while the meaning of that change differs. Immediately declaring everything lost, or demanding the old availability, may conceal what happens between these extremes.

We will consider distance within a changing adult friendship: distinguishing frequency, topics, and access, acknowledging a valuable past without making it the price of present contact. This question differs from ending a romantic relationship and from general advice to meet more often. People may reconsider one form of intimacy, preserve another, remain uncertain, or decline to continue. All everyday scenes below are fictional. Literature, historical philosophy, and a limited study help refine the language, but do not establish readers' or friends' motives. The article offers no diagnosis, compulsory reconciliation, or technique that guarantees restoration.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

## I. Frequency has changed, but what else has changed?

Lena used to see Oksana even when they had not arranged to meet. Their workplace provided proximity, and separate initiative was often unnecessary. Now a call requires time, and a walk requires a journey. The disappearance of daily coffee may mean the loss of a familiar opportunity, rather than a decision to give up a friend. That is only one possible meaning of our scene. It cannot automatically explain every silence. We can notice the changed conditions themselves and separately consider whether the participants want present contact. The shared reason for earlier meetings should not conceal the separate question of their current wish and capacity.

Oksana says Lena has become distant. That word may contain several subjects: infrequent replies, no meetings, a private topic being closed, a different manner of conversation. If Lena responds only by counting messages sent, she may defend herself against an accusation her friend never made. If Oksana interprets every short reply as a complete loss of trust, she expands an observation without checking it. Where conversation is appropriate and both want it, they can ask which specific change matters. There is no duty to analyse the other's entire character. Clarification may leave disagreement intact while preserving its actual subject, instead of using one word for the whole relationship.

Some changes do concern desire. Lena may no longer want their former openness, although she has the opportunity to write. Her present decision cannot be explained away as a busy schedule for Oksana's convenience. Yet not wanting to discuss a particular topic does not automatically mean rejecting a walk or the whole friendship. Access has different areas. A participant may name a limit without revealing every internal reason. The other may acknowledge that this form is insufficient for her. Both responses can coexist; recognising them is more accurate than declaring occasional messages either exemplary adult freedom or proof of inevitable betrayal.

## II. Distance needs a subject, rather than an attractive name

Lena wants a few weeks without discussing work. Oksana wants to know whether she can still call when things are difficult. Calling the first request complete distance and the second an inability to let go would remove their conditions before anyone answers. A more accurate subject may be small: not discussing the shared project for now, meeting less often, not answering in the evening, or not sharing personal correspondence. There is no need to select one convenient name for every restriction. A limit applies to the extent actually named; it cannot silently be narrowed or expanded to obtain a desired arrangement of the relationship.

Sometimes a person does not know how much time she needs. She should not set a deadline solely to reassure the other when it does not match her intention. She can honestly leave what

is unknown unspecified and name what is known now. However, one person's uncertainty does not require the other to wait in every possible form. Oksana may stop planning a joint trip while Lena's participation is absent. This is not necessarily punishment. Both retain the possibility of living their own lives. Neither acquires the right to reserve a place indefinitely or to force an immediate final answer that makes the entire future comprehensible and convenient.

A restriction may also be sufficiently clear: Lena no longer wants daily calls. There is no need to label it a temporary pause if she has not said that. Oksana may be upset; this does not make her wish for closeness unworthy. Lena may retain care; this does not cancel her new limit. Distance becomes more honest when a word corresponds to an available action. It need not look calm or mutually approved. People can sometimes understand a change's subject and still dislike it. This distinction allows respect without requiring delight in every decision another makes, or abandonment of one's own needs.

## III. A meaningful past does not issue a present pass

Oksana has kept a letter Lena wrote before a difficult exam. The support mattered; today she need not declare the letter empty simply because they communicate less. Yet the letter does not determine access to Lena's present evening. These judgments concern different times and actions. A person can be grateful without receiving the intimacy she wants. She can remember her own help without treating it as grounds to control her friend. The past loses accuracy when turned into a document one side presents to validate every future expectation that was never discussed again with the other.

The opposite extreme turns the past into a complete mistake. If Lena has stopped replying as before, she must always have been using Oksana; if Oksana is upset, her care must always have been control. Such a retelling may briefly make a decision easier, but it requires facts rather than present disappointment alone. Our fictional story may have contained both real interest and an inconvenient distribution of initiative. One does not automatically cancel the other. Acknowledging a complicated record does not require equalising responsibility for harm. If a particular promise was broken, grateful memories do not make that breach acceptable or prohibit naming it.

Preserving the past's value also does not mean continually discussing it together. One person may keep photographs while the other does not want to talk about them. A memory need not receive joint confirmation of every meaning to remain significant to its owner. At the same time, personal memory does not establish the definitive account of another person. You can say why a trip mattered to you without assigning your friend the same experience. Distance sometimes changes precisely the possibility of remembering together. That loss can be

noticed. Acknowledging it requires neither destroying every trace nor offering fresh contact so that the past can count as real.

## IV. A historical distinction should not become a scale of superiority

In Book IX, section 3 of *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by W. D. Ross, Aristotle considers changes in friendship, its grounds, and memory of former intimacy. His argument belongs to historical virtue ethics and presupposes judgments about human development. It is not contemporary proof that one friend has grown while the other has fallen behind. Our application is limited to a question: can the present form change while the past remains meaningful? We do not accept a moral hierarchy of participants as a ready explanation of distance, or assign one the duty to correct the other's character so that the relationship can continue.

Lena is now interested in different work; Oksana wants to return to the old project. Different interests do not make the first more developed and the second less independent. A new shared topic may be possible; their previous conversation may no longer fit. Seeing this does not require first winning a comparison of life paths. A person can choose differently without calling someone else's choice ridiculous. Yet respecting a choice does not require joining every activity a friend pursues. If Oksana wants a shared discussion of the project, she needs an actual response, rather than merely recognition of her right to pursue it. Lena can respect the interest without providing that participation.

An uncomfortable but precise boundary emerges. Not everything valuable to one becomes a shared undertaking for two. Not every divergence needs immediate reconciliation through a new universal topic. Sometimes another meeting is sufficient; sometimes people notice few available shared subjects. This is not an established diagnosis of personal quality. The limitation may be temporary, lasting, or final for a particular form. Its future cannot be known from one conversation. The historical text helps pose the question of change, but grants no right to declare a friend inferior and appropriate her earlier actions into a convenient new story of one's own growth.

## V. A literary meeting does not prescribe restoration

In Book VII, chapter IV of George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss*, Lucy visits Maggie after a painful event. The cousins share intimacy, a history, and hurt; this is not a case of interests quietly diverging. Lucy responds to Maggie's explanation, and they embrace again. The scene preserves the relationship's significance within a particular fictional world. It does not prove that every friendship must undergo a similar meeting, or make an embrace a valid way to check safety, sincerity, or a reader's readiness to forgive someone with whom communication is currently difficult.

It is especially necessary to distinguish acknowledgment from prescription. Lucy's reply belongs to her; readers need not say it when they do not yet know whether they believe another person's explanation. The chapter itself retains time constraints, other people's involvement, the weight of what happened, and discussion of someone else. One tender gesture cannot be extracted and presented as a complete resolution of every question. Lena and Oksana may recognise the question of a relationship's significance after change. They need not imitate the characters, turn distance into guilt, or look for a hidden wrongdoer merely because the selected novel contains a moral conflict absent from their own situation.

An imagined continuation may be considerably more modest than the literary scene. Oksana acknowledges that the letter before her exam mattered; Lena acknowledges that she is no longer ready for daily calls. They do not embrace or make a large promise, and leave their next walk undecided. Such an outcome is not inferior because it lacks a beautiful reconciliation. However, restraint alone does not certify its quality either. If one hides a clear refusal behind indefinite reassurance, the other is left waiting. An action's meaning requires attention to its conditions, rather than how convincingly it resembles a literary ending we have read.

## VI. A changing level of connection does not imply one inevitable path

The complete abstract by Becker and colleagues describes an analysis of turning points among one hundred college students in same-sex friendships, geographically close and long-distance. The authors discuss different sequences of changing friendship levels, including a return to a more casual level and subsequent recovery. The abstract and metadata were read, rather than methods or data. The limited study predicts neither our scene's outcome nor the effect of voluntary distance, and does not promise to restore every adult connection. Its title does not guarantee that the reader's friendship is necessarily flexible.

Change in our imagined lives may also follow an uneven course. After several quiet months, Lena and Oksana might have a long conversation and then return to infrequent messages. One

meeting need not cancel the whole new arrangement. It cannot automatically establish that their former intimacy has entirely returned and daily replies can again be expected. The participants can accept a good evening as a good evening. The reverse is also possible: a conversation might be difficult despite warm contact beforehand. One episode merits attention, but its scale needs consideration rather than declaration as a complete prediction of every subsequent year of connection.

Neither scientific nor everyday uncertainty permits ignoring a clear message here. If Lena explicitly says she does not want to continue communicating, returns observed among other people do not justify waiting for the right moment to persuade her again. If she wants occasional contact, that concerns a different subject. If she does not yet know, the unknown does not become a promise. Attention to variability means avoiding an assigned trajectory in advance, rather than compulsory optimism. We can respect what is available today while retaining the limits of knowledge about the future. The abstract establishes neither the participants' motives nor their psychological state or a moral judgment of their chosen distance.

## VII. Partial continuation does not always suit both sides

Lena suggests visiting an exhibition together every few months, but no longer wants to discuss personal relationships. Oksana can enjoy the exhibitions and simultaneously feel the loss of their former openness. She need not select one of these experiences as the only correct one. However, she may also decide the proposed arrangement does not fit. Partial continuation is not automatically a compromise simply because it looks moderate. It needs actual consent to the contact being offered. A participant can accept it, propose a change, or decline, without turning her response into punishment for insufficiently generous access to another person's life.

If Oksana agrees, it matters not to insert a hidden plan for gradually returning to the past into that agreement. An exhibition should not become a test after which Lena must discuss personal matters. Nor may Lena silently expand Oksana's answer into willingness to accept any uncertainty. For example, agreeing to occasional meetings does not mean agreeing to endless postponement of an already chosen date without a message. A specific promise exists separately from a general limit on intimacy. Its breach can be discussed without declaring the new arrangement itself impermissible. Partial contact does not release participants from attention to what the other actually relies on now.

Sometimes the difference in wishes is too large for an available shared arrangement. Limiting one's own participation may then be an honest answer. People need not first prove that the other contributed nothing good before stopping unsuitable meetings. Nor need they declare themselves ungrateful for that choice. They can acknowledge the value of an offer and their

own inability to participate. Yet acknowledgment does not remove the other's disappointment or guarantee preservation of friendship. Adult voluntary participation includes the risk of divergence. It does not promise a middle ground where all needs coincide, or make disagreement an error to be corrected with the right amount of patience.

## VIII. A shared circle need not become a court

Others from the previous project notice that Lena and Oksana no longer arrive together. They ask what happened, suggest arranging a meeting, and recount particular messages. Help is sometimes appropriate, but a shared circle's curiosity grants no right to the whole story. Oksana can name only the available arrangement, while Lena can decline to discuss her reasons. Privacy, however, is not a requirement to remain without needed support. Conversation for specific help differs from public retelling to allocate who is right. No single quantity of detail can be established for every circumstance in advance; the subject of help and information about other people need consideration.

An imagined intermediary could offer to pass on an invitation if both genuinely agree. This gives her no right to pursue an answer, display another person's correspondence, or tell Lena that Oksana is suffering and therefore a meeting is compulsory. Sympathy for one participant does not replace the other's consent. If an invitation has already been clearly declined, mutual acquaintances should not become a way to repeat pressure in another voice. Yet an ordinary evening with the whole group need not be directed reconciliation either. People can be present together without returning to former intimacy or explaining their relationship's final status after the event to every observer.

Public comparison with a new friend also readily changes the subject. If Lena begins seeing someone else more often, Oksana may be upset. However, another person's new connection does not automatically explain the change in theirs or establish the participants' rank. Discussing a specific loss of contact is more precise than demanding exclusivity they never promised. At the same time, an actual promise to meet cannot be cancelled without attention simply because a more interesting plan appeared. Freedom to choose friends and responsibility for what was said do not contradict each other. Both questions remain visible if the group does not turn them into a competition in human worth.

## IX. Care does not require enduring harm for memory's sake

Acknowledging the past is not an instruction to continue harmful contact. Where threats or coercion exist, the article does not prescribe a direct meeting, shared experiment, or disclosure of plans as a test of goodwill. Suitable separate support depends on circumstances; calm wording does not guarantee safety. We neither diagnose a participant nor provide local legal procedures. Even in a less dangerous difficulty, a person may limit communication without first obtaining a collective judgment from acquaintances. Preserving a good memory does not cancel evaluation of a present action or establish a duty to trust where trust is currently absent.

Not every unpleasant experience has the same scale. One unsuccessful joke, repeated humiliation, and different interests require different questions. Clarifying a particular action is possible if safe and wanted; it does not guarantee an answer or correction. An apology can matter without restoring former access. Oksana can accept Lena's acknowledgment of an error and still not want a meeting for now. Lena can change one way of treating her without demanding immediate intimacy as a reward. Care then concerns real participation rather than a compulsory ending in which both must confirm they are entirely ready to continue as before.

Different sources help retain different questions. Literature depicts a particular scene of acknowledgment; historical philosophy raises changes in friendship's grounds; an abstract describes limited observations about transitions. Together they do not establish that distance benefits or harms everyone. We can decline the previous arrangement without declaring every good event false. We can keep a memory without accepting today's offer. We can change a decision without a duty to promise that change beforehand. These possibilities do not guarantee ease. They leave room for precise ethical consideration where an attractive general name might otherwise replace two people's conditions and consent.

## X. A new form does not need a final name

Imagine Lena and Oksana do go to the exhibition. They discuss paintings without returning to the shared project. Oksana notices the evening was good, but misses their former confidential conversation. Lena enjoys the meeting without wanting another one the following week. This is one fictional outcome in which a connection exists while wishes remain different. It need not immediately be named restoration, collapse, or mature friendship. Those names might conceal precisely what needs consideration: what contact occurred, what each experienced, and what participation is now actually offered without a promise of complete agreement.

A later conversation about the arrangement is possible. It does not retroactively cancel the previous limit or prove the original distance was pretence. People can change their wishes, but new consent must be recognised rather than assigned on the basis of one smile. If Oksana

raises a personal topic, Lena can accept it or retain her limit. If Oksana is no longer willing to attend exhibitions, that too is her current answer. Reconsideration belongs to both. Each occasion need not require a reassessment of their entire history or a justification of every change through personal growth so that a decision sounds sufficiently worthy to themselves and their shared circle.

A preserved past and a changed distance can coexist without an attractive conclusion. The letter before the exam may remain important; today's call may remain unwelcome. A walk may begin a new arrangement or remain a single evening. No one must know all this in advance. A modest orientation is not to present memory as current consent, a restriction as a complete absence of value, or a clear refusal as a promise of an unspecified return. Friendship, if it continues, then has room for real change. If continuation does not fit, acknowledging this does not require turning everything experienced together into a mistake that must be forgotten.

## What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one change in friendly contact that does not involve danger. Privately name what has changed in fact: frequency, a topic, a shared activity, the manner of replying, or willingness to meet. Separately notice the meaning you assign to it. You need not abandon your judgment; the point is not to treat it as the other's already confirmed motive. Finally, name one past event that remains personally important. It should not become a demand on your friend. You need not write anything, can keep the reflection private, or stop at one distinction without an obligation to begin a conversation immediately.

If discussion is safe, appropriate, and wanted by both, you may clarify one limit or propose one available arrangement. Name your own participation and leave room for a response. Do not use the question as a request to refute every fear, acknowledge an identical past, or guarantee a return in advance. Where there is a clear refusal, do not turn clarification into persuasion through mutual acquaintances. Where uncertainty remains, you can separately decide how you are willing to participate now; waiting is not the only worthy answer. The proposed new form need not please both or establish friendship's final status.

After possible contact, distinguish what happened from what you hoped for. A good evening does not promise the next one; an uncomfortable conversation does not necessarily describe the entire relationship. A separate actual promise merits attention regardless of how often you communicate. This practice is an authorial suggestion for voluntary reflection, rather than therapy or a validated restoration method. A joint step is not prescribed where threats exist. The result may be a small agreement, no shared arrangement, or acknowledged uncertainty. None requires destroying memory; no memory requires accepting present contact you no longer choose.

## Key quotation

> *...they clasped each other again in a last embrace.*

George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*, VII.IV, web 5573; a short fragment of the narrator's sentence about Maggie and Lucy. This is a gesture of characters depicted in the novel, rather than an instruction for readers to repeat the meeting or reconciliation.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Question | Difference and limit |
|---|---|---|
| Aristotle, IX.3 | How does a change in grounds relate to memory? | Historical virtue ethics includes hierarchical judgments which are not accepted here as a diagnosis of a friend. |
| Eliot, VII.IV | Can acknowledgment occur after painful change? | Cousins and a moral conflict in a novel do not establish a compulsory script for distance in friendship. |
| Becker and colleagues, abstract | Must a change in level follow one line? | A limited analysis of college friendships predicts neither an individual outcome nor the practice's effect. |
| Fictional editorial scene | What remains available today? | An imagined exhibition proves neither distance's benefit nor an inevitable return of intimacy. |

## Primary sources

1. George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*. Gutenberg 6688, updated 15 April 2023; the underlying printing year has not been established. Metadata and the whole VII.IV, web 5507–5573, with returned adjacent context were read, rather than the whole novel. The epigraph is Lucy's voice; the key fragment is narration. Rights UNKNOWN, rather than a universal licence.

2. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book IX. W. D. Ross translation; printing edition unestablished. Metadata and selected context within IX.1–5 were read; IX.3, web 50–59, is used. Historical normative comparison. No direct quotation; rights UNKNOWN.

3. Jennifer A. H. Becker, Amy Janan Johnson, Elizabeth A. Craig, Eileen S. Gilchrist, Michel M. Haigh, Lindsay T. Lane, *Friendships are flexible, not fragile: Turning points in geographically-close and long-distance friendships*. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 26(4), 347–369, 2009, DOI 10.1177/0265407509344310. The complete abstract,

metadata, and rights notice were read; methods, data, and full text were not. The page separately reports an issue date of June 2009 and first online publication on 2 December 2009; the chronology is not corrected by conjecture. No direct quotation; rights UNKNOWN.

## Tags

changing friendship, distance, adult friendship, frequency of contact, conversation topics, access, past, memory, gratitude, consent, refusal, uncertainty, separate life, waiting, new form, partial contact, reciprocity, interests, shared circle, privacy, promise, acknowledgment, forgiveness, safety, limits, dignity, literary scene, George Eliot, Aristotle, Becker, 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 coauthor 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.