

UNITED WISDOM

Caring for a loved one when a family’s capacities differ

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-14-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Caring for a loved one when a family’s capacities differ

Epigraph

> *“within my power”*

George Gissing, *The Odd Women*, chapter II. A fragment of Virginia Madden’s request for affordable lodging. This is a character’s speech in a particular financial situation, rather than a general law of family care.

What this article is about

When a loved one needs help, a family may quickly agree that everyone should participate. Yet one person has more money, another lives closer, and a third has a spare hour that is insufficient for a journey. Equal amounts or equal numbers of visits do not yet show what participation is actually possible or what it will provide for the recipient. Care is difficult to arrange when a wish for fairness becomes a ready measure for everyone before conversation begins.

Consider an imagined scene. After moving home, Elena needs help with ordinary tasks over the next two weeks: unpacking several boxes, receiving an agreed purchase, and preparing documents for a scheduled meeting. Marina lives nearby but has limited money. Anton lives far away and can offer a particular amount. Leonid works close by, but his schedule remains unknown. The article examines differences in money, time, distance, and accepted participation. It assigns no shares according to love, assesses no health, and does not promise that the family will find every resource. Its central question is how to avoid replacing actual assistance with an attractive equality of contributions.

I. A general request conceals different tasks

Someone proposes helping Elena equally in the family messages. The word sounds convincing while nobody has clarified the subject. Does equal mean paying for a purchase, spending time at her home, preparing papers, or organising everything? Those actions have different conditions. Money for one part does not complete another; an hour on the phone does not replace being present to receive a delivery. Before participation is compared, they need to establish which tasks Elena actually wants to hand over and what result is expected from each.

Suppose she wants someone to unpack boxes with her and help check that documents are complete against an existing list. This is ordinary organisational help, rather than a professional conclusion about their contents. Anton can pay for an agreed purchase but does not know who will receive it. Marina is willing to visit in the evening but not accept unknown expenses. Leonid has not replied. This examination does not automatically establish a fair arrangement. It shows that the shared wish to help has several subjects, none fulfilled by wishing alone.

It matters not to invent Elena’s needs for her either. Relatives may want every box cleared quickly, while she wants some belongings kept accessible and their location unchanged. They may regard papers as urgent though the meeting is later. The imagined example does not establish who is right: it shows that the family’s goal and a loved one’s request can diverge. Clarifying wanted participation begins with her voice. Equal diligence by helpers does not correct a mistake where everyone equally performs a task that was never requested.

The question of contribution can therefore be deferred briefly until the task is described. What is needed, for how long, which conditions are known, and which part requires separate knowledge or assistance? An exhaustive inventory of Elena’s life is unnecessary. One approaching task is enough for distinction. Where the subject becomes medical, urgent, or connected with a particular risk, this article’s household discussion does not replace suitable competence. We consider ordinary voluntary participation, rather than distribute responsibility for a decision the family cannot assess.

II. Equal quantities do not settle the question of fairness

Anton suggests dividing expenses into three. The amount is affordable for him; for Marina, it means foregoing a necessary purchase of her own. This does not make the proposal inherently malicious or establish which share Anton must accept. Yet an equal figure describes arithmetic rather than participation’s entire cost. If the family wants to discuss a feasible option, different capacities cannot be removed from the conversation merely because identical amounts look neat in a table.

In book V of the Nicomachean Ethics, sections 3–4, Aristotle distinguishes proportionate distribution from another kind of equality in correcting injury. His political reasoning about merit and participants’ standing is no present-day rule for family assistance. We do not adopt the historical grounds for ranking people. The narrow comparison only reminds us that before calling distribution equal, we need to establish what is compared and on which ground. The contemporary application here is authorial.

In our scene, participants can be asked whether they are willing to discuss different kinds of contribution. That does not establish an exchange rate between money, hours, and journeys. Marina is not obliged to compensate for a smaller sum with all her spare time. Anton is not

obliged to finance every wish because he lives far away. Leonid does not become the performer of every task because his address is closer. A possible arrangement requires consent, rather than an automatic calculation turning one resource into an unlimited obligation of another kind.

Participants' equal dignity is not measured by amounts either. Anton can be thanked for payment without his views about Elena's life becoming decisive for that reason. Marina's presence can be valued without making her the sole responsible person. The fairness of a particular distribution remains a question these examples do not settle in advance. Something more definite can be checked: whether participation's subject is understood, capacities are stated, and someone actually agreed. Without that, neat shares may conceal identically written expectations rather than an agreed arrangement.

III. A short distance is not free time

Leonid works ten minutes from Elena. Relatives therefore assume that visiting is easiest for him. This may be true for one evening; perhaps work ends late or the journey overlaps with another accepted obligation. An address does not supply the answer. An accessible route and willingness to perform a task are different information. Appointing someone through proximity skips their own participation in deciding, then leads to surprise when an option convenient on the map never materialises.

Marina lives closer still and has already visited several times. Completed visits can readily become an assumption that she can always come. A past action does not establish an indefinite promise, however. She can be asked directly about the approaching evening with room to decline. If she accepts one part, its boundary needs preservation rather than addition of everything encountered along the way. Someone physically present beside an unfinished task does not automatically become responsible for arranging all of it.

Time has different contents too. Anton has an hour free at home but no day for travel. He can call an agreed place, clarify known conditions, or prepare questions if Elena actually needs that. Remote assistance does not replace every visit, however, and may require information Elena does not want to share. A specific possible approach is preferable to a general formula that modern communication eliminates distance. We assume no devices, skills, or available service where they have not been checked.

Clarifying time does not require proving busyness before the whole family. A person can state what participation they are willing to accept without a complete report on work and private life. Their promise still needs to be understood by those affected. If Leonid said he would answer tomorrow, today's absence of an answer establishes neither willingness nor refusal. A known waiting period is part of the situation too. Relatives need to distinguish an available hour, an

assumed hour, and an hour nobody has asked about, rather than infer love from response speed.

IV. Money does not perform unnoticed coordination

Anton transfers an amount for the agreed purchase. He considers his participation complete; Marina now finds a seller, checks conditions, arranges a time, and informs Elena. These actions may never have entered the discussion about money. A monetary contribution is then visible in one transfer, while organisation fragments into messages, waiting, and further clarification. This is an imagined scene, rather than research into family labour. It lets us notice that a paid task can still require participation nobody explicitly accepted.

There is no need to put a price on every message. Sometimes counting helps reveal the extent; sometimes it merely adds another dispute. The task itself can nevertheless be named: who coordinates the order and who is willing to answer questions until receipt? If Marina declines that part, Anton's transfer does not appoint her performer. Anton can offer different participation or state his limit. The purchase is then paid for but not yet organised; both states need to be retained without devaluing money or presenting it as sufficient completion.

Elena can accept some coordination herself if she wishes and is able. Assistance need not exclude her from every action. Relatives should establish what information she needs, which approach suits her, and what she wishes to do herself. Yet participation should not become a condition for human respect. If Elena asks for different assistance, the question remains specific: who is able and willing to provide it? The article determines no capacities from one response and establishes no obligation to manage independently in order to deserve support.

This subject neighbours R39 about unnoticed household labour while keeping a different central question. There, attention concerns noticing a task's full cycle. Here, parts already noticed meet several relatives' different resources. Our work is not only seeing coordination but identifying its actual participant, conditions, and remainder. If each accepts one convenient part, an action essential to making assistance happen can remain between them. A total of contributions does not show that gap.

V. A historical scene preserves an available option's cost

In the second chapter of The Odd Women, Virginia Madden seeks affordable lodging, then discusses sharing a room with her sister and increasing the payment. The landlady allows the option if the women can manage living that way. This depicts limited choice in fiction, rather than a contemporary norm for accommodation or family help. The narrow question matters: a suitable price and the arrangement's feasibility are discussed separately. A cheaper or available option does not automatically become comfortable.

For Marina, accepting more visits instead of contributing money also has a cost invisible in the amount. Suppose she can visit on two evenings but cannot accept other tasks then. That limit needs to be known, rather than an accessible solution praised as though nobody has sacrificed anything. Naming its cost does not mean accusing the family of harm either. Someone can voluntarily choose inconvenient participation. What matters is that the inconvenience has not been erased from the description and the decision was not made for them.

The novel contains historical judgments about women's work, marriage, appearance, and health. They are not used here as contemporary knowledge or norms. Nor are the characters' monetary amounts and life options carried into recommendations for a reader. The chosen dialogue only helps retain the distinction between suitable means and an arrangement's feasibility. Our family scene is built afresh: Elena is not Gissing's character, and relatives' proposed actions are not derived from Victorian women's situation. An analogy does not replace actual circumstances.

An uncomfortable counterexample shows agreement's limits. Everyone may acknowledge capacities while a necessary option remains unfound. In our scene, Marina cannot contribute money, Anton cannot visit, and Leonid is unavailable at the required hour. Respectful language has not created an absent resource. The task remains unarranged, and another permissible option needs to be sought with uncertainty preserved. The article does not promise such an option or designate someone responsible merely because their limit was the last stated in the conversation.

VI. A recipient is not an object of family exchange

Imagine that relatives find a distribution convenient to them all: Anton pays, Leonid visits, Marina communicates the time. Elena, however, does not want Leonid sorting particular belongings and never agreed to hand him personal documents. Family convenience does not cancel that response. A recipient has preferences and information of her own. Without attention to them, helpers' consent establishes an arrangement between themselves, rather than agreement about participation in Elena's life.

Different decisions can be clarified. Is Elena willing to receive a purchase but not accept a visit? Does she want help with boxes while leaving one closed? Does she need the proposed approach itself or only its result? Her response may change distribution and leave one part without a performer. That does not prove ingratitude. Nor does Elena's preference oblige another person to every action. The recipient's voice and helper's limit must both remain audible even when compatibility has not yet been found.

Money does not buy general access either. Paying for an agreed task may require Anton to receive information about completion, but does not confer the right to know everything about

Elena’s life. The necessary extent is better discussed through the subject. She may agree to report receipt of a purchase without discussing her private conversation at the meeting. We establish no legal rules for data or authority here. We do not let an everyday transfer become unlimited permission to direct another person.

This article’s main question remains different from dependency, examined at length in R20. Our scene concerns several helpers with different resources and the feasibility of particular actions. One limit from the neighbouring topic matters, however: where refusal brings threats, coercion, or deprivation of necessities, ordinary voluntary discussion may be inapplicable. There is no need deliberately to test another person’s reaction. A specific situation requires circumstances and suitable assistance; its safety is not established here, nor is compulsory disclosure of personal information proposed.

VII. Religious generosity supplies no ready family formula

In 2 Corinthians 8, verses 11–14, Paul connects acting on willingness to help with available means and discusses meeting need through others’ abundance. The context is church giving, grace, and religious community; the chapter’s opening also contains an example of voluntary generosity beyond capacity. We do not make this a financial instruction or a rule about what each relative must give. Theological appeal and household distribution differ.

The comparison matters because willingness, action, and resources are not identified as one subject. Someone can sincerely want to help while needing to define feasible participation. This does not establish that every stated limit settles every moral question or that a family may ignore need. The article does not decide religious duty for a reader. It leaves a practical question: what action is actually offered and what can it accomplish in this task, without attributing what someone does not have to them.

One helper might call personal presence care; Anton in our scene might name paying for a purchase. Neither a religious quotation nor a philosophical scheme makes one kind of participation universally better. A particular task may require a visit, or remote action may suffice. That is established by the subject and agreement, rather than which form appears nobler. The possibility of a voluntary generous choice remains, but another person’s ideal cannot be used to declare it already accepted on someone’s behalf.

The three sources read therefore differ. Aristotle offers a historical structure of reasoning about justice. Gissing depicts a particular scene of limited means. Paul speaks within a religious context of giving. Our article compares questions of quantity, capacity, and participation without claiming that every source proposes one theory of family care. None establishes that the proposed conversation improves health, removes need, or produces a fair outcome. Similarities between particular meanings do not make those promises acceptable.

VIII. Declining one form does not establish an absence of every capacity

Marina cannot contribute Anton’s proposed amount. This does not yet establish whether she is willing to participate through time, coordination, or presence. She can be asked without turning the question into a demand to compensate immediately for declining. She may offer another kind of help or accept no new participation now. The response needs to retain its extent. Declining to pay is not a promise to visit, just as inability to travel does not automatically mean willingness to finance every option indefinitely.

Anton may offer payment, but his income does not establish the amount available. He has obligations the family may not know about. Complete disclosure of his budget need not be required before a limit is acknowledged. Where a particular promise is accepted, however, those affected need clear conditions and timely notice of changes. Discussion can concern one task and period without becoming a general financial examination. A stated capacity supports agreement only in the part the person actually accepts.

There is a reverse risk too: an excessively cautious helper decides for someone else that a request will be burdensome and never asks. Elena may never learn of an available offer, Anton of a particular need. Clarification is possible where conditions permit voluntary conversation, with refusal remaining possible. This is no technique for extracting hidden resources. Sometimes a precise question receives a precise no. What matters is not the amount obtained but the difference between a genuinely absent capacity and a capacity nobody has asked about.

An unknown can be named as such. We do not know Leonid’s schedule; he has not replied. We do not know the chosen delivery’s cost; it has not been checked. We do not know whether Elena accepts another helper. These states should not become claims that everything is available or everything impossible. One significant gap can be selected for the next step. Lacking a complete picture does not require presenting it as finished. An answer about one resource does not establish every remaining part of assistance.

IX. Different contributions do not require ranking human worth

After a week, Anton sees a transfer, Marina two evenings, Leonid a journey and a conversation. If each counts only their own action, a dispute arises about who did more. Particular records are sometimes needed to check expenses or an agreement. Yet they cannot produce an overall price of love. Money, hours, and attention have different contents, and a familiar family unit of measurement may hide other work. The purpose of counting needs to be established before its result is taken for a moral ranking.

For example, a list may show that an agreed purchase is paid for, boxes partially unpacked, and documents still unprepared. This describes a result rather than declaring Anton good, Marina middling, and Leonid a bad relative. An unfulfilled promise can be discussed specifically. If nobody accepted a task, someone cannot be assigned blame through the last available name. Records then help reveal assistance to Elena rather than perpetually prove one’s superiority before other family participants.

Its cost to each person can be compared too without demanding identical experiences. Marina finds it difficult to state a limit to visits, Anton an amount he will not increase. Both may dislike the distribution. Dislike does not prove unfairness, just as calm does not establish each person’s consent. The question concerns what was accepted, performed, and proposed for change. The article sets no objective exchange rate for family care. It leaves room for a mismatch that sometimes needs another conversation and sometimes reveals a real limit to a shared option.

Elena has a result of her own: what assistance she wanted and actually received. It need not match the family’s report of diligence. Her answer can be heard without demanding confirmation that everyone tried hard enough. Her dissatisfaction does not appoint one helper responsible for every further wish either. A recipient’s response is another important basis for discussing the subject, rather than a means to cancel someone else’s limit. Care allows gratitude alongside a question about unfinished tasks and a need to state that greater participation is unavailable now.

X. Reconsidering capacity does not mean rewriting the past

For the second week, Marina may accept only one evening, Anton the same amount, and Leonid finally name an available day. Capacities have changed or become known; remaining tasks need examination now. This does not automatically make the first agreement deceptive. What was actually promised, what changed, and who needs notice should be distinguished. New distribution does not emerge by itself because a list of available people grows longer. Each proposed transition requires appropriate participation and consent.

They may also discover that part of the task is no longer needed. Elena unpacked one box herself and wishes to leave another until next month. A family plan need not finish its own initial picture for a neat report’s sake. Its aim is agreed help for a person, rather than completing a project upon her. Changes still need discussion with people who already accepted participation: a cancelled visit may affect someone’s day, while cancelling a paid option involves separate conditions. There is no promise that reconsideration will carry no cost.

A gap may remain after every clarification. Nobody is found for the required time or the chosen resource is unavailable. This needs to remain a factual state while suitable further participation is sought in actual circumstances, rather than distribution of known parts presented as sufficient care. The article prescribes no medical, legal, or urgent decision. Its conversational practice is limited to ordinary tasks. A clearer limit gives less ground for promising a loved one an outcome the family is not yet able or willing to provide.

Returning to the opening messages, everyone helping remains meaningful when it acquires particular actions. One gives money, another visits, another performs coordination, and someone accepts no participation now. These differences do not automatically become different ranks of human dignity. Neither do they disappear beneath the word family. Possible care comprises actual resources, a recipient’s voice, accepted promises, and acknowledged gaps. Equal words are not yet equal help; a precise conversation only establishes what assistance they are actually negotiating.

What this means in practice

Where circumstances suit voluntary discussion, choose one ordinary, non-urgent task for a loved one. First clarify what they want to receive and for how long. Separate fact from a family assumption. Then name different parts: payment, travel, presence, information, coordination, or checking completion. Everyone need not accept every part, nor must participation be divided equally. This remains a description of the subject, rather than allocation of a duty.

For one part, distinguish three resource states: known and offered, assumed, and still unknown. Do not record an address as free time, income as an available amount, or past help as a new promise. Where appropriate, ask one potential participant a specific question and leave them the right to answer with a limit or decline. Do not require proof of love through disclosure of an entire budget, schedule, or personal history. Preserve no answer as no answer.

After agreement, note which part was accepted, what it accomplishes, and what gap remains. Consider both the recipient’s voice and the participant’s conditions. Where an action changes, return the question to those affected without declaring new consent for them. The practice does not guarantee fair distribution, sufficient assistance, health, or safety. Under threats, coercion, urgency, or a need for specialised competence, it may be inapplicable and does not replace suitable assistance. You may decline it. Its limited result is clearer knowledge of participation actually existing today, rather than a ranking of the family.

Key quotation

> *“if you can manage”*

George Gissing, *The Odd Women*, chapter II. A fragment of the landlady Mrs Conisbee's response to the sisters' request to share a room. The condition concerns particular accommodation, does not promise comfort, and establishes no obligation to accept every available option.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Substantial difference	Limit
Aristotle and family distribution	What do we call equality?	Historical political merit differs from relatives' resources and voluntary participation.	No transfer of social hierarchy or ready formula for shares.
Gissing and the authorial scene	Is an option affordable and feasible?	Victorian women's fictional lodging differs from present assistance to a loved one.	No contemporary housing, medical, or financial recommendation.
Paul and resources	How does willingness to help relate to what exists?	Church giving concerns grace and religious community.	No rule about each relative's obligatory share.
Recording results and relationships	What was performed and what remains?	A task permits particular accounting; human worth cannot be derived from an amount.	Neither gratitude nor dissatisfaction establishes the entire state of consent.

Sources

1. George Gissing. *The Odd Women*. English Project Gutenberg no. 4313, updated 17 October 2021; Charles Aldarondo, Al Haines, Richard Tonsing. Chapter I and the selected beginning of chapter II were read, including Virginia's request and the landlady's response about a room for two sisters. The full novel was not read; PG's precise underlying print edition was not established. Open Library catalogue OL6978062M separately confirms a Macmillan edition of 1893; it is not declared the electronic text's source. Text read, catalogue record.

2. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, book V, sections 2–4, W. D. Ross's English translation at MIT's Internet Classics Archive. Selected sections on kinds of justice were read; the distinction between distribution and equality is used without adopting historical social hierarchy. The translation's precise print-edition year was not established. This is neither a family-care theory nor an empirical test of the practice. Text.

3. Paul. *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, chapter 8, KJV at BibleGateway. The whole short chapter was read; verses 11–14 are used within the context of giving, grace, and voluntary generosity. The precise print edition was not established. This is neither financial instruction nor universal allocation of family duties. Text.

Tags

care, loved ones, family, capacity, resources, money, time, distance, participation, consent, assistance, distribution, fairness, equality, promise, limits, support, organisation, information, travel, presence, responsibility, gratitude, refusal, reconsideration, agreement, Gissing, Aristotle, Paul, dignity

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh and **Maria Evilkut** are the authors of United Wisdom. We bring knowledge from different traditions into conversation with questions of everyday life, preserving differences between sources and the reader's right to make their own decision.

For feedback and further conversation: **@andrey.zarinsh** and **@ilkutki**.