

UNITED WISDOM

Kinship without closeness and closeness without kinship

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-13-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Kinship without closeness and closeness without kinship

Epigraph

> *Only connect!*

E. M. Forster, *Howards End*, chapter XXII; a short exhortation through which the narrator represents Margaret's ideal. The next paragraph reports that her attempt failed; this phrase does not promise a result. Primary text.

What this article is about

In an imagined scene, Egor receives an invitation to a family celebration. His cousin announces the time and adds that relatives need no separate invitation: they should come of their own accord. Egor has known this cousin for years and remembers shared summer holidays, but rarely discusses his own life with him. That evening, his friend Vera asks whether she should collect his parcel while he is busy. She knows his schedule because he told her himself and does not assume that she can now control the following weekends. These two relationships have different histories and different present degrees of closeness; neither has to destroy the other.

Difficulty arises when shared origins are taken as access already granted, and voluntary closeness as a promise of endless assistance. Egor can respect a relative without wanting to share personal details. Vera can be close to him while being unable to come tomorrow. The question is not a competition for the title of real family, but the arrangement of particular participation: what time, information, care, and responsibility are people willing to share? This article examines these distinctions without requiring closeness with every relative, the severing of kinship ties, or new names for friends. Legal rights, medical decisions, and safety need their own grounds; a feeling of closeness does not establish them.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Shared origins describe a history, not the whole present arrangement

Egor's cousin is indeed his relative. That name does not require daily contact or identical views about life. Their shared history may matter: familiar places, elders' stories, events they lived through. But its existence does not, without a further step, establish a right to every account, visit, or form of assistance. Kinship answers one question: how are these people connected? Present consent answers another: what participation do they accept now? Conflating the questions makes an ordinary refusal resemble a denial of origins, even when someone merely declined a Sunday journey without disputing their shared family memory.

In Cicero's *Laelius on Friendship*, section 19, the continuing name of kinship is distinguished from friendship, which depends on goodwill. This is historical philosophical reasoning, not contemporary family research. Its ideal of friendship involves virtue and the social assumptions of the Roman elite; this article does not adopt the entire model as obligatory. The distinction between a relationship's name and its content is sufficient for our question. An absence of confidential conversation does not change someone's origins, while shared origins alone do not establish the possibilities of trust, mutual assistance, and free participation.

Egor can say that he remembers their shared summer but is not ready to discuss his work now. He need not declare his cousin a bad person. The cousin may be disappointed; his wish for greater closeness deserves attention but does not replace consent. A refusal need not be explained through the whole history of the relationship. Sometimes a particular limit is enough. Nor should a single refusal be taken to mean that no other contact is possible. Some relatives freely share a great deal; others maintain occasional conversation or participate on particular occasions. An outward arrangement alone certifies neither people's dignity nor the quality of every event between them.

II. Respect need not perform intimacy

At a family celebration, someone can be polite without discussing a personal decision. They can congratulate a relative without inviting them into their difficulties. Respect for a person does not always include trusting how they will handle what they hear. If previous accounts were passed on, that is a specific history of access to information, distinct from a general verdict on the family. Even without such a history, a person need not create one to earn the right to keep a detail private. Closeness is not an examination requiring sufficient vulnerability to deserve being called a grateful relative.

Sometimes politeness becomes an excessively broad mask. Egor promises to come while already knowing he does not intend to, because he does not want to appear cold. The question

then concerns a promise actually made, rather than only a right to separateness. A meeting can be declined directly and considerately when it is safe; inability to fulfil an agreement can be acknowledged. Limited contact does not justify repeatedly offering false availability. But acknowledging one broken promise does not entitle someone else to every future weekend. Responsibility concerns a particular action and should not quietly become indefinite availability.

Warmth cannot be assigned by command either. Egor may want easier contact than currently exists without knowing how to approach it. He may not want it at all. These are different positions, and the article does not choose for him. Someone can be honest about an available arrangement without pronouncing the relationship's final destiny. The cousin need not consider that arrangement sufficient for his wishes. Agreement does not mean that disappointment vanishes. What matters is that disappointment does not become permission to test someone's love through unannounced visits, public accusations, or demands to reveal matters they are unwilling to discuss.

III. Closeness outside kinship grows through actual participation

Vera knows how Egor drinks tea, which music he chooses on a journey, and when he prefers silence. This does not prove that she knows him completely. But this knowledge emerged through their own contact rather than being granted with the relationship's name. Particular events can help someone consider such closeness: who heard a request, fulfilled a promise, clarified a limit, or noticed a change? This is an authorial way of examining a relationship, not a friendship scale or a proven account of how it develops. It leaves room for a history people have made together, even if no family record confirms its significance.

A relationship outside kinship may be a friendship, cooperation between neighbours, a partnership, or another form of closeness named voluntarily. Not every useful act needs to be called chosen family. A neighbour agrees to look after plants; this does not create an expectation that they will become the principal participant in every difficult decision. Vera may want a family name while Egor prefers the word friend. Different names do not always imply different care, but may reveal different expectations. Those expectations can be discussed: which promises do people put into the name, and are they willing to accept them together, rather than presuming identical meanings?

Voluntary closeness is not infallible either. A friend can break a promise, overlook something important, or make excessive demands. Comparison with an inconvenient relative should not release them from responsibility. If Vera passes on a secret, the name chosen family does not erase the event. If Egor expects constant help from her, gratitude for previous support does not make that expectation accepted. Voluntariness continues where new participation can be discussed and refusal does not automatically prove that closeness was imaginary. This

concerns the subject of an agreement; it does not promise that free choice always creates more dependable relationships.

IV. Closeness does not grant access to all information

Egor has different people with whom he discusses different subjects. His relative knows details of their shared childhood; Vera knows about a current work decision; another friend discusses music with him. Such differences need not imply a divided, dishonest life. A conversation has an addressee and a purpose. Someone can discuss a difficult feeling with one person and a practical action with another without promising each a complete archive. Article R18 examines private space in greater detail; the present subject differs: origins and emotional closeness do not establish identical access for every participant. A relationship’s history does not remove distinctions between permission to hear an account and permission to pass it on.

Vera can ask about news she considers important while leaving room for no answer. Egor can explain that he does not yet want to discuss a decision. This does not amount to a demand that she never ask questions again. When information concerns an accepted shared task, a separate answer about that task is needed: for example, whether he can receive a delivery as agreed. The absence of an obligation to disclose everything should not conceal information already promised. But a right to know about a delivery does not establish a right to investigate every reason for a personal choice. The distinction preserves responsibility without extending it to every curiosity.

Some information concerns other people. A relative tells Egor about a difficulty; being close to Vera does not necessarily authorise sharing the entire account with her. The reverse also holds: family interest does not make a conversation between friends common property. When seeking assistance, someone need not remain silent about their own circumstances, especially with threats or harm. The listener and necessary information matter, without promises of complete anonymity or a universal rule of disclosure. Legal and professional conditions can differ. Our everyday scene merely shows that one person’s relationship title does not grant them a ready-made right to a third person’s private life.

V. Assistance has a size even when feeling is great

Vera collects a parcel today. She need not become the permanent organiser of all Egor's affairs. A relative once gave him money; this does not establish complete access to later decisions. The importance of a gift can easily be confused with the extent of future authority. Someone can be deeply grateful without accepting new work that has never been discussed. They can want to help in return without knowing in which form. It is more honest to distinguish gratitude, a particular promise, and another person's expectation. None should silently replace the others, turning yesterday's contribution into an endless account.

The other person need not help without limits either. Egor asks Vera to come at night, but she cannot leave her work or care for a loved one. Her refusal does not make previous support fictitious. Yet the circumstances may be serious, and a phrase about the right to decline is insufficient to resolve the task. The absence of necessary assistance can be acknowledged, and other available options considered. This article does not replace emergency services, medicine, or social support, and does not prescribe a particular route without location and circumstances. It does not promise that several loving people will necessarily meet every need that arises.

Nor should a particular kind of gratitude be demanded from someone receiving assistance. The parcel has been collected; Egor can give thanks without telling his entire personal history or accepting unsolicited advice. Vera can say that she needs acknowledgment of the time spent. This is a separate subject for discussion, not a right to demand emotional closeness in payment. Mutual obligations may exist, but their content needs to be established through actual conditions. Calling help voluntary is insufficient if refusal conceals a threat to withdraw necessary resources. In such dependency, direct discussion is not proposed as a universally safe test of intentions.

VI. A literary ideal of connection is different from success

In chapter XXII of *Howards End*, Margaret hopes to connect inner aspects of Henry's life that seem disconnected to her. The narrator presents her ideal and then reports that the attempt failed: Henry does not notice what matters to her. This is a literary scene, not an observation about patterns in all couples. The novel contains class, gender, and religious judgments of its period; this article does not accept them as contemporary knowledge. The proximity of a wish for closeness and an actual response matters. An attractive ideal cannot establish that another person is already included in it.

Egor may dream that his cousin will one day speak as freely with him as Vera does. That dream need not be mistaken, but it cannot be treated as an agreement already reached. His cousin may prefer another kind of contact, misunderstand the proposal, or be unready. Nor must Egor

wait for change indefinitely. Distinguishing a wish from a present response leaves room for both people rather than cancelling hope. In an imagined scene, he proposes one separate conversation, receives a refusal, and preserves the possibility of limited contact. This outcome proves neither the hopelessness of kinship nor his personal blame for closeness that did not emerge.

The same mismatch can arise with someone outside kinship. Vera is willing to help with particular tasks but does not want to be the sole recipient of every troubling feeling. Egor may experience the loss of an expected arrangement. He can name his need; she can name her limit. A real question about available contact remains. Repeating an attractive title is not enough to change the answer. The literary epigraph opens a question about separate aspects of life. It does not prescribe overcoming another person’s reserve, guarantee closeness, or oblige one participant to construct wholeness for the other. Consent matters even with a good intention to connect.

VII. Religious kinship and everyday choice have different grounds

In Mark 3:31–35, a family name is extended to those who do God’s will. The context includes the mother and brothers who have come and people sitting around Jesus. This is a theological understanding of belonging, not a rule requiring a contemporary reader to choose friends or end contact with relatives. The comparison shows that the word family can have a basis other than origins. It does not make a religious community automatically safe or establish that all traditions understand closeness identically. For someone outside this faith, a voluntary relationship may have quite different grounds of significance.

A religious text should not be appropriated for a ready-made family verdict. If Egor does not feel close to his cousin, this scene does not certify that the cousin has lost a moral status. If Vera shares his convictions, this alone does not establish the reliability of every action she takes. Shared faith can be part of a relationship, while a particular promise, consent, and action retain their own subjects. This article does not establish the participants’ correct faith or propose testing someone’s belonging through everyday favours. Grounds for a name are compared; authority to exclude people or demand obedience is not granted.

Cicero’s historical philosophy, Margaret’s literary wish, and the Gospel scene do not combine into one identical answer. Each text has its own question and language. A contemporary discussion of time, information, and assistance is an authorial everyday analysis. It can compare differences but should not portray agreement among all sources or a proven practice. A reader remains free to reject one comparison while considering a particular event in their own life. Belonging to a tradition is not required to notice differences between origins,

feeling, and promised participation; nor must that tradition be erased to make the distinction visible.

VIII. Limited kinship need not compete with friendship

Egor can maintain occasional contact with his cousin while speaking closely with Vera. He need not declare one authentic and the other merely formal. Sometimes competition makes each encounter into evidence: who shared a holiday, who was called first, who knows more? Different relationships can concern different matters. Shared memory need not compete with present trust on a single scale. Egor can want a family occasion and a separate conversation with a friend. When time is limited, particular decisions are needed rather than an overall ranking of people’s worth. Meanwhile, no one receives a promise always to occupy their previous place in the schedule.

The relative may fear that friends are completely displacing family. The contact he is losing and seeking can be heard without recognising a right to appoint someone else’s social circle. Vera may feel that her care is overlooked amid relatives’ demands. She too can identify a particular subject without requiring Egor to reject his family as proof of loyalty. The participants may not reach their desired allocation of time. A conversation does not guarantee agreement. Yet a specific subject distinguishes an invitation, an accepted promise, and a demand to choose one person against another, rather than treating every mismatch as betrayal in advance.

Sometimes contact with a relative or friend does cause harm. Comparing forms of closeness should not obscure the threat. This article neither requires reconciliation because of origins nor idealises separation as compulsory liberation. Suitable separate assistance depends on circumstances and location. Intentions should not be tested through a direct meeting when refusal or disagreement is dangerous. Good memories can be retained while present access is limited; earlier support can be acknowledged without continuing current coercion. These combinations need not appear consistent to every observer to have a subject in the participant’s actual life.

IX. A name does not replace an agreement about participation

The words close person can mean different things. For Egor, they mean discussing important matters; for Vera, dependable mutual assistance; for his cousin, participation in family events. No definition should be taken as already shared merely because the words sound familiar. One can ask which next action is expected from them. Sometimes a small mismatch appears: Vera will collect a parcel on request but will not track deliveries in advance. Sometimes the difference is substantial: one person wants a shared future, the other a separate friendship. Each requires its own scale, and a small clarification should not pretend to resolve a major mismatch.

Agreed participation can be revised. Work, health, housing, or other commitments have changed; the previous arrangement is no longer feasible. This can be communicated about the particular task rather than waiting for another person to guess. It matters especially when someone is already relying on a promise. But notification does not guarantee that replacement help will be found or disappointment will disappear. People may need another arrangement or outside support. This article calculates neither resources nor legal responsibility. It proposes avoiding the presentation of a relationship’s emotional significance as proof of an actual ability to perform every necessary task.

When no agreement exists, its absence can honestly remain visible. Egor asked; Vera has not answered yet: that is not consent. His cousin said he was pleased to see him: that is not a promise to discuss a personal difficulty. A relative called the family united: that is not a confirmed plan to help everyone. This perspective may seem less warm than broad assurances. Yet it does not forbid warmth. It distinguishes feeling from a promise, so that someone is not held to words they never spoke. Future participation may emerge later; meanwhile, what is unknown remains unknown without compulsory accusation or invented readiness.

X. Closeness can be seen without a single verdict on family

Return to the evening with two messages. Egor thanks Vera and explains to his cousin when he can come. He need not make this into a final account of where his real family lies. Tomorrow may bring different circumstances: the friend cannot help, the relative listens attentively, Egor himself breaks a promise. Each event deserves its own examination rather than an immediate reversal of a general ranking. Origins, current closeness, and particular dependability remain related but different questions. Distinguishing them allows an action to be seen without requiring an entire history to be cancelled after one successful or unsuccessful day.

Someone can want a family name for closeness outside kinship and use it by mutual agreement. They can also decline it. They can experience an absence of closeness with

relatives as a loss or find a limited arrangement sufficient. This article does not appoint a uniquely mature feeling. These positions have different costs and possibilities which an attractive general word cannot establish. When help is needed, attention should concern who is actually available and what they can do, rather than only who is closest on a family diagram. The recipient retains their own voice insofar as they can participate in the decision and does not become a prize between groups of loved ones.

A modest substantial orientation remains: do not require a name to convey more than it does, and do not make particular care invisible because a preferred name is absent. Kinship can preserve an important history without intimacy. Friendship can be deep without kinship. Any closeness allows separateness, disagreement, and limits of capacity; none certifies the safety of every action. This neither releases someone from an accepted promise nor requires accepting a new one. People retain the possibility of naming a real subject of participation, hearing an answer, and considering it in the next step. Sometimes that is insufficient for the relationship desired, and insufficiency can also be acknowledged honestly.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one safe relationship in which names and expectations diverge. In a private note, separate its history from present participation. Record one event rather than an overall judgment of a person: an invitation, a request for assistance, a personal account, or a promised call. What was proposed? What did the other person actually accept? What remained your expectation? You need not show the note to anyone or reveal a third person’s private details. With threats, a joint conversation is not prescribed; this article does not assess your situation’s safety or suggest testing it through one candid admission.

When discussion is appropriate and both people are willing, one subject can be clarified without first requiring recognition of real family. For example, when is a meeting possible, or which part of an everyday task can someone undertake? Describe your availability and leave room for refusal and modification. After the answer, distinguish an unpleasant feeling from the answer’s content. Declining to come tomorrow does not necessarily mean declining every form of care; a clear refusal of regular participation should not be reduced to incidental busyness. Clarification should not become repeated pressure. A mismatch can remain visible while other available options are considered, without promising a common solution.

Examine one commitment of your own. Have you replaced a precise promise with a general assurance that you are always there? Do you expect work from a friend or relative merely because of a meaningful name? Perhaps stating a limit or recognising assistance already given without a new demand is enough. This is a voluntary authorial reflection, not a diagnosis of relationship quality or a validated technique for increasing closeness. It does not guarantee agreement, safety, or the relationship’s continuation. Its subject is one kind of access, one

actual promise, and one answer that can be considered without forcing people to share every other meaning of closeness.

Key quotation

> *Live in fragments no longer.*

E. M. Forster, *Howards End*, chapter XXII, the same paragraph representing Margaret's hope. A literary ideal stands beside the description of failure; the reader is not obliged to achieve another person's wholeness.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Substantial difference
Cicero and present kinship	What remains in a name when goodwill changes?	A Roman ideal of virtuous friendship is not a contemporary model of every relationship.
Forster and a wish for greater closeness	Does an ideal of connection coincide with the other person's response?	The fictional scene depicts failure; it does not demonstrate the effect of a practice.
Mark 3 and belonging outside kinship	What grounds a family name?	A theological basis differs from a voluntary everyday agreement.
Three primary frames and particular assistance	What does a name convey about the next action?	The authorial analysis of participation is neither a shared doctrine of the sources nor a legal rule.

Sources

1. E. M. Forster, *Howards End*. English novel, 1910, Project Gutenberg 2946; selected scenes and the beginning of chapter XXII read, not the whole novel. Both short quotations come from one narrator's paragraph representing Margaret's ideal.

2. Cicero, *Laelius on Friendship*. Translation by William Armistead Falconer, Loeb Classical Library XX, 1923; selected sections 17–32 read, particularly section 19. A historical philosophical distinction, not research on relationship effectiveness.

3. *Mark*, chapter 3, King James Version. Chapter read; the context of verses 31–35 is used. Religious kinship is not presented as a universal instruction for a contemporary family.

Tags

kinship, closeness, friends, relatives, voluntary relationship, family history, access, personal information, consent, respect, intimacy, assistance, promise, gratitude, expectation, refusal, separateness, dignity, chosen family, reciprocity, particular participation, limited contact, safety, uncertainty, revision, family name, Cicero, Forster, Gospel of Mark, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, connections between 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.