

UNITED WISDOM

Friends after partnership and children

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-16-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Friends after partnership and children

Epigraph

“...I do not waste my life...”.

Mary Shelley, *Lodore*, volume III, chapter I; Fanny speaking, English original.

What this article is about

You used to call in the evening and meet an hour later. Now one friend lives with a partner, another has a child, and a third still makes independent plans for the weekend. A familiar invitation becomes less straightforward. Someone expects the old spontaneity; someone else hopes their friends will understand the new circumstances without being told. A reply to a message acquires more meaning than its actual words contain: a brief refusal starts to be read as a judgment on the whole shared history.

This article concerns friendship between people whose family circumstances have changed at different times. It does not discuss a couple’s adjustment after the birth of a child or propose a correct way to organize family life. The question is different: how can a separate relationship with a friend continue when available time, the people attending a meeting, and expectations of participation change? Affection, the ability to be present, commitments already accepted, and things nobody has promised are worth distinguishing. None of these distinctions guarantees that friendship will last, but each helps identify what is actually being decided.

I. A new schedule does not explain an entire friendship

Imagine two longtime friends. One suggests dinner on Friday; the other replies that she can meet for forty minutes on Sunday. To the first friend, the answer looks like a reduction in closeness. For the second, it is the only free time she is currently willing to offer. Both accounts are possible, but so far we know only the invitation and the reply. We do not know how either person understands the friendship, whether she wants to change it, or what circumstances explain the chosen time. A decision about this meeting does not require immediate answers to all those questions.

A change in family circumstances does not automatically explain every subsequent cancellation. Responsibilities may genuinely limit time; the desire to socialize may also change. Family status or a single brief reply cannot establish the latter. Instead of assuming a hidden motive, a person can ask about an available arrangement: does the proposed day work, is there interest in finding another option, or should the invitation simply be left for now? Such a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

question has a specific subject and allows an answer that may differ from what the person inviting had hoped for.

Repeated events nevertheless matter. If someone confirms a meeting three times and cancels at the last minute each time, the other person has experienced three cancellations. They do not need to prove an absence of affection before they stop reserving an entire evening in advance. They can change how they plan: agree closer to the date, choose an activity that will happen even without the guest, or refrain from making arrangements for now. This is a response to observable conduct, rather than a verdict on someone's character as a parent or partner.

Starting a family creates no obligation for friends to ignore their own losses. The earlier closeness may have offered joy, continuity, and a chance to discuss important things. Regret about a change is not necessarily a demand to restore the previous arrangement. It can be expressed without turning it into a bill: we meet less, I miss that, and I want to understand what contact is possible now. The other person remains free to hear this and decline the proposed form of contact. Naming a loss does not automatically make compensation for it a shared obligation.

II. Affection and participation call for different questions

In section 5 of Book VIII of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle distinguishes a friendly disposition from the exercise of friendship: distance can limit shared activity without immediately removing the relationship. This is a historical philosophical distinction, rather than a contemporary relationship test. In the same section he assigns particular importance to living together and makes judgments about age and character that are not adopted here as universal standards. A question about different states can be taken from the text without transferring its whole hierarchy to people today.

A friend may continue to wish someone well while replying infrequently and hardly ever meeting. For the person receiving that friendship, goodwill and availability are also different: they can value the first and need the second. They cannot be compelled to find rare contact sufficient simply because the other person's intentions are kind. Nor can constant availability be demanded as the sole proof of affection. A discussion becomes more precise when each person describes the participation they want and are willing to accept, rather than setting a general examination for authentic friendship.

Warm feelings may remain while the shared activity that mattered to these particular people disappears. One person wants regular walks and unhurried conversation; the other currently agrees only to exchange messages. Both proposals are legitimate, and they may fail to overlap. Sometimes the relationship will continue through occasional contact; sometimes one

person will not wish to maintain it. Acknowledging that possibility removes the demand for immediate proof that the friendship is either entirely unchanged or was never real in the first place.

It can help to describe available participation within limits. Agreeing to occasional calls does not mean promising to answer at night; an invitation to a family lunch does not replace every separate meeting. A clear limit allows the other person to decide whether the offer suits them. It also leaves room for a future change that will have to be named again. This is not a universal technique for maintaining contact. It is a way to avoid presenting indefinite goodwill as a concrete agreement or promising more than a person is actually willing to do.

III. Family status does not place people on different steps

An unspoken hierarchy can easily enter the conversation: someone with children has important responsibilities, while someone without children has spare time. Their work, rest, relationships, and solitude then start to look like a reserve that other people are entitled to use. But not being a parent says nothing about availability on a particular evening. A person may have responsibilities they do not discuss, or may simply want to spend the time alone. Declining a meeting does not require them to produce an equivalent family reason or explain the details of their life.

The opposite hierarchy is also possible: a parent is treated as someone who voluntarily chose limitations and therefore has no right to speak about difficulty. That reply replaces the substance of a request with a judgment on a life path. A friend can ask for particular assistance, and the other person can agree or decline without deciding whether the requester deserves support in general. Refusal remains possible without condemning parenthood. A voluntary request does not require identical experience; it requires the other person to be able to consider it within their own circumstances.

Not every difference should be smoothed over by declaring all situations equal. Care of a child that has already been undertaken creates concrete responsibilities that cannot be cancelled merely by deciding to be free. A friend may have different commitments that likewise do not vanish on request. Equal dignity here means that each person can name their participation and its limits, rather than asserting that everyone has the same resources. A proposed arrangement should take actual constraints into account without deriving from them a permanent right for one person to manage another’s schedule.

Conversation about achievements need not revolve around a single life course either. A friend without children may want to talk about a project, a move, or an important new acquaintance; a parent may want to discuss something unrelated to their child. It is possible to take an interest in what matters to the other person while acknowledging the limits of one’s own attention.

Equal enthusiasm for every subject need not be performed. But if one life is declared meaningful in advance and another merely preparation for it, that is a separate disagreement, rather than a technical difficulty in choosing a day to meet.

IV. An invitation to a friend is not always an invitation to the whole family

Imagine a host inviting a friend to a small dinner and learning that the friend intends to bring their partner and child. Perhaps the guest list was not made clear enough. Perhaps the invited person is used to a different convention. Clarification can begin with the event itself: who is invited, what space is available, and what the meeting is intended to involve. Additional people affect the host and the other guests. Their presence needs to be agreed, even where relationships are warm and family participation seems entirely natural to someone.

A separate meeting between friends does not mean that a partner is disliked or a family rejected. A relationship between two people can have its own history, subjects of conversation, and comfortable company. The recipient is nevertheless not obliged to accept a separate invitation: childcare, suitable time, or the desire to meet in that way may be unavailable. A refusal can be received without deciding who devalued whom. Another proposal makes sense only if both people are willing to look for one, rather than as a means of obtaining the original agreement.

A shared home introduces other participants into the decision. A friend inviting guests does not have exclusive authority over the time and space of everyone who lives there. An agreed visit differs from an unexpected arrival, even if the door used to be always open. This does not give a partner ownership of another adult’s entire friendship. Use of shared space can be coordinated while independence in personal contact is retained. These questions sometimes arise at the same time, but that does not make them the same question.

A meeting that includes a child also calls for clarity about the participation envisaged. A walk together may involve frequent stops and attention to the child’s needs; a private conversation between two friends may be unavailable for now. The friend is free to decide whether that arrangement suits them. The parent is free not to promise a different one. Conditions should not be concealed merely to secure the meeting: someone would agree to one event and find themselves participating in another. Goodwill does not replace clarity about company, duration, and the limits of responsibility accepted.

V. Helping need not give someone a position in another person’s family

Helping a friend can be quite specific: deliver groceries, carry out one errand, or be present during an agreed period. Having no family of one’s own does not make a person automatically available to care for someone else’s child. Previous friendship does not establish skills, consent, or willingness to undertake that responsibility either. If childcare is involved, separate agreement and suitable conditions are needed; an article about friendship does not establish child safety rules or replace the information required for the particular situation.

Accepting a limited task and agreeing to become a regular helper are different decisions. The beginning and end of participation, contact with the parent, and what to do if circumstances change can be clarified. Important conditions should not be left as a hope that the friend will work them out anyway. Asking for help is nevertheless not itself a violation. Part of its meaning depends on the possibility of refusal. When refusal becomes an accusation of false friendship, agreement is being sought at the price of defending one’s own name.

A particular commitment already accepted deserves separate attention. If an adult has agreed to perform a task and someone else is relying on them, a subsequent change of desire does not make the original promise nonexistent. They can give timely notice of being unable to do it, discuss an available alternative, and accept no new tasks. This does not establish an eternal obligation to help. Responsibility for participation one has already accepted differs from a demand to accept the next amount of work. Confusing them obstructs both the person asking and the person setting a limit.

Assistance should not become payment for access to friendship. An errand completed does not purchase a right to personal details, permanent invitations, or influence over family decisions. The recipient need not pretend the help was insignificant either: its value can be acknowledged with thanks. A difficulty arises if the subject of an exchange was never named and a debt of closeness is later derived from participation. The new claim then needs to be discussed directly. Gratitude for a task accepted is not agreement to every condition the helper may subsequently impose.

VI. A fictional friend and the limits of someone else’s idea of benefit

In chapter I of the third volume of Mary Shelley’s *Lodore*, Fanny helps the married Ethel during Villiers’s absence. Her own learning and aspiration to an independent life also matter. The character does not exist solely as an available resource for someone else’s marriage. This is a fictional situation in a novel from 1835, rather than observation of contemporary families or proof that a particular conduct by friends always leads to a good outcome.

At the beginning of the next chapter, another detail appears: Fanny takes her own love of solitude as a guide to the other person and leaves Ethel alone for the evening. The narrator shows an assumption, rather than an agreement that has been reached. For our question, that difference matters. A person can sincerely want to give a friend needed space and be mistaken about what the friend currently wants. Certainty about one’s own good intention does not yet contain the other person’s answer, even if the proposed arrangement seems reasonable and considerate.

A contemporary imagined example is simpler: a friend stops calling a new parent to avoid disturbing them, while the parent was hoping for a brief conversation. Or someone arrives to help without an invitation when the family wants to be alone. Neither version can be declared universal. A question about desired participation can be asked without requiring a full account of domestic life. The answer may be small in scope: messages are welcome now, visits are not, and I do not want to make plans this week. That is sufficient information for the corresponding offer.

The novel’s historical ideas about male and female roles do not become rules for contemporary relationships here. What is taken from the chosen episode is a particular fictional opportunity to see a friend’s separate life and the limits of an assumption about another person’s needs. The reader need not endorse the book’s arrangement of marriage, repeat a character’s fate, or choose solitude. The useful question is this: does my action respond to a request received, to agreed conditions, or to my own image of what ought to benefit someone else?

VII. A separate relationship has limits of privacy

A friend’s partner may be interested in what was discussed at a meeting. A child may also feature in stories and photographs. Being able to talk to one person does not mean having permission to pass all the information to everyone else. This applies especially to information about third parties: they did not participate in the conversation or consent to a new use of its details. What may be retold can be clarified, or one’s own experience can be discussed without unnecessary information about others. Friendship and family closeness do not remove that distinction.

A promise to keep a secret also has a subject and limits. It should not be accepted automatically when the content is unknown and the person is not prepared in advance for every possible situation. If information involves a threat or safety, suitable assistance is needed according to the circumstances; this article establishes no universal procedure for disclosure and replaces no professional or legal rules. It is enough to notice that an appealing promise of absolute secrecy may exceed the participation a friend can responsibly accept and actually maintain.

Personal communication between adults does not require a constant account to a partner of every remark. That proposition nevertheless does not authorize deception about a specific agreement the person has accepted, or decide on a couple’s behalf whether their conditions are compatible. It is possible to discuss which coordination concerns shared time and space and which demand intrudes on independent contact. A friend outside the couple does not thereby obtain a position as judge. They can state their own conditions of participation without appointing themselves manager of someone else’s relationship or promising to conceal everything indiscriminately.

If direct contact involves threats, coercion, or control, meeting to test the friendship is not a mandatory experiment. Available safe assistance can be chosen, and suitable support sought. There is no requirement to prove danger through another confrontation. At the same time, an inconvenient invitation alone cannot establish control or violence. Both boundaries matter here: avoid attributing hidden relationships without grounds, and avoid requiring a person to risk themselves in order to follow general advice about having an honest conversation.

VIII. Shared meetings and separate meetings can coexist

Family occasions can add new shared experiences to friendship. Lunch, a trip, or a walk together may be welcome to everyone involved. These occasions are no less valuable simply because partners and children attend. The question arises when that company is made the only permitted form. One friend sometimes wants to meet separately; the other agrees only to a group arrangement. There is a real difference in conditions between them, which cannot be removed by saying that such things should not matter in a good friendship.

Different forms can be suggested without promising equal enjoyment of them. A brief conversation during a walk, an evening chosen in advance, messages without an expectation of an immediate reply, and an occasional meeting between two friends are concrete options to consider. None is a mandatory recipe. Someone may lack suitable time or the privacy they need; someone may simply find the arrangement unappealing. Refusal identifies a limit to this proposal. It does not automatically establish rejection of every possible way of communicating or demonstrate insufficient maturity.

For a small invitation, naming the time for a decision can help. If plans depend on circumstances, confirmation on a particular day can be agreed. Others are then not obliged to keep their time free indefinitely. The possibility of cancellation should also be acknowledged honestly: an event may proceed without one person or require further agreement. These are practical conditions, rather than punishment of someone with children. They allow everyone to plan their own life while recognizing both the other person’s actual constraints and the cost of waiting to themselves.

Not every relationship will survive a new allocation of time and company. Sometimes people find acceptable occasional contact; sometimes they retain goodwill without regular communication; sometimes they part. This article does not propose treating one outcome as a sign of moral victory. One’s own conduct can be considered more specifically: did I promise something unavailable, declare another person’s refusal to be hidden hostility, or agree to conditions I do not wish to accept? These questions remain applicable whether or not the relationship continues under its previous name.

IX. Expectations are easier to discuss without putting family life on trial

An imagined remark that a friend disappeared after marriage may express pain, but immediately invites an argument about blame. A future decision benefits more from an available fact and a desired subject: we have not met separately for a long time, I would like occasional conversation between the two of us, and would that contact suit you? The friend can explain circumstances, offer another option, or decline discussion. The person who asked retains the ability to decide what to do with the answer. Having a conversation does not itself create an obligation to restore the old arrangement.

A parent can likewise describe a particular expectation without using the child as a final argument. For example, they might sometimes want to meet people to whom the new schedule does not have to be explained in detail. A friend is not obliged to meet that need, but can consider it and identify their participation. There is a difference between a request to accept an available arrangement and a demand never to feel inconvenienced by it. The first can be agreed; the second assumes authority over someone else’s experience, which agreement about time does not itself provide.

An answer need not always include a complete explanation. To decline childcare or a large family celebration, a person can state their limit without listing reasons. Cancelling participation already confirmed, by contrast, may require timely notice of the change, since others are relying on it. These situations differ. Privacy does not mean that every consequence of one’s own promise vanishes. Responsibility does not mean that every refusal requires disclosure of an entire personal history and recognition that the reasons are sufficiently respectable.

If a conversation again becomes an argument about the correct family, it can be paused and its original subject revisited later, or left there. Winning a dispute about worldviews is not required in order to choose a suitable arrangement for contact. Sometimes the participants’ conditions remain incompatible even after a respectful conversation. That can be recognized without a hidden promise that the person will necessarily change their mind after the right formulation. Clarity helps reveal a difference; it gives no right to eliminate it by force and does not guarantee agreement in later decisions.

X. Friendship remains a relationship between separate lives

After partnership and children enter the picture, it is possible to see again that a friend was never merely a function of one’s own convenience. Their availability varied, their decisions had other meanings, and part of their life remained separate. New circumstances make this more visible; they do not create separateness for the first time. From this perspective, preserving friendship does not require freezing a person in their previous role. It entails considering today’s participation without declaring the whole earlier relationship a mistake or demanding proof of loyalty through rejection of new relationships.

The independence of a friend without a family is not a temporary condition that others are entitled to judge as incompleteness. They need not wait for a convenient place in family people’s schedules or accept every group arrangement to keep the relationship. They can choose their own contacts and decline participation that has become unappealing or too demanding. Such a choice does not make earlier assistance meaningless. The past can retain its value without an agreement to indefinite availability that nobody expressly accepted.

A parent’s own life is not exhausted by caring responsibilities. Recognizing this does not, however, permit particular care of a child to be cancelled or transferred to a friend without agreement. Available ways of participating can be sought while acknowledging the limits of the actual situation. If resources are scarce, this is not necessarily a mistaken attitude toward friendship. Sometimes the options really are limited. Optimism promising that everyone can find time if they want it enough is unnecessary here. What matters is distinguishing desire from availability without making the latter a moral judgment on the former.

Friendship may continue if the participants find what they can currently offer acceptable. It may also cease to continue on the former scale. In either case, the other person’s answer can be treated as the answer of an independent person: hear their limit, consider one’s own, and avoid creating obligations retrospectively. This does not remove sadness, inconvenience, or disagreement. It does allow a concrete decision: whether to meet on these conditions, accept assistance, maintain occasional contact, or seek another form, without putting a friend’s entire life on trial.

What this means in practice

One changed situation can be considered voluntarily without assessing the entire friendship. Write down an available fact: an invitation, an answer, a confirmed promise, or a cancellation. Then name your interpretation separately. If a brief refusal has become a conclusion that the whole shared history is unwanted, it can help to notice the distance between the event and that conclusion. There is no need to force yourself to accept a favorable explanation; it is enough not to declare the unknown already established.

The next question concerns what you want. Is it a meeting between the two of you, an occasional call, a family day together, help with a particular task, or acknowledgment of earlier closeness? Different wishes call for different proposals. One small subject can be chosen and its conditions named: the people involved, duration, confirmation time, and what you do not accept. The other person remains free to agree, suggest a change, or decline. Absence of a reply does not confirm an agreement either.

If specific participation has already been promised, consider it separately from future requests. A change in availability can be reported honestly, and an available response discussed, without automatically accepting the next amount of work. If there was no promise, one need not be created from family status, earlier assistance, or embarrassment. Where a threat exists, direct conversation is not a necessary step; safe contact and suitable assistance can be chosen according to the circumstances.

After the answer, your own participation can be reconsidered: accept the available arrangement, offer another, limit the wait, or refrain from planning a meeting for now. This is an authorial possibility for making distinctions, rather than treatment or a test of maturity. Its result may be clarity about incompatibility, rather than restoration of the old friendship. Someone else’s answer need not become convenient for your subsequent decision to remain independent and specific.

Key quotation

> *“I aspire to be useful…”.*

Mary Shelley, *Lodore*, volume III, chapter I; Fanny speaking, English original. In the fictional context, the wish to help sits beside a separate direction in her life; usefulness establishes no duty for a friend to serve someone else’s family continually.

Connections between traditions

Text or perspective	What it helps distinguish	Limit of transfer
Mary Shelley, *Lodore*, III, I and the beginning of II	A friend's separate life, assistance, and an assumption about another person's need	A novel from 1835; neither a contemporary family study nor a mandatory model of women's roles
Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII, 5	Disposition and shared activity in friendship	A historical philosophical standard; its judgments about age and requirement of living together are not adopted here
Authorial consideration of everyday invitations	Available time, agreed company, an accepted task, and a new request	Imagined examples; no proof of hidden motives or guarantee that friendship will last

These perspectives do not form a single teaching about family life. They help ask different questions of one event while keeping a fictional episode, historical philosophy, and an independent contemporary decision distinct.

Sources

1. Mary Shelley. *Lodore*, volume III. London: Richard Bentley, 1835; Project Gutenberg 64557, transcription by Laura Natal Rodrigues from a HathiTrust copy. Edition information, the whole of chapter I, and the beginning of chapter II, lines 116–148 of the current web text, were read. Two short remarks by Fanny herself from chapter I and a particular detail at the beginning of II are used; embedded epigraphs and other authors' words are not quoted. Reading of all three volumes is not claimed. For the quotation budget, the entire novel is one work.

2. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book VIII. W. D. Ross English translation, Internet Classics Archive; the particular print edition of the translation has not been established. The whole of section 5, lines 69–75 of the accessible web text, was read. A limited authorial paraphrase of the distinction between disposition and activity is used; this source is not quoted directly. Historical judgments are not presented as contemporary empirical findings.

Availability on these platforms does not itself establish permission for every jurisdiction or every element of an edition. Particular versions, attribution, and the limits of reading are retained here; complete original source texts are neither imported into the library nor embedded.

Tags

friendship, adult relationships, family, partnership, parenthood, time, invitations, closeness, independence, reciprocity, availability, care, assistance, agreements, responsibility, personal boundaries, privacy, children, shared meetings, separate meetings, expectations, refusal, gratitude, Mary Shelley, Lodore, Aristotle, philosophy, literature, differences, voluntary participation

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 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.