

UNITED WISDOM

Farewell ritual as an action of the living

Meaning and Direction

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

P-16-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Farewell ritual as an action of the living

Epigraph

> *In the ceremonies of mourning, it is better that there be deep sorrow than a minute attention to observances.*

— Confucian Analects, III.4.3; James Legge translation

What this article is about

After their father’s death, Sasha and Vera arrange a modest farewell. Their mother wants to read a prayer, an old colleague can send a memory but cannot attend, and Vera is not ready to speak before everyone. This imagined scene shows that a shared occasion creates no single relationship to it. The living carry out the ritual: they choose its place, words, presence and treatment of memory. This neither makes the dead an incidental pretext nor reduces religious meaning to the gathering’s convenience. Antigone, selected passages of the Analects, and John’s Gospel distinguish duties to the dead, attention to ritual substance, and togetherness that leaves room for tears. Their grounds remain different. Contemporary discussion can ask which action is possible and whose it is, without promising grief’s completion. Farewell requires neither identical faith, a public account nor proof of love through expense. It can mark a particular relationship while people experience the day differently.

I. Who carries out the farewell

A farewell ritual includes particular actions: choosing a room, announcing a time, placing a photograph, preparing food, speaking, or remaining beside others quietly. People whose lives continue carry them out. They are therefore responsible for the meeting’s form and what they say to each other. Such precision does not cancel a relationship to the dead. It prevents every present decision being attributed to them as an unquestionable demand. In Sasha and Vera’s imagined family, their father can no longer answer which music he would prefer now. A preserved request can be named as a request. Without one, choosing a song remains the living people’s decision, even when made with love.

Calling this an action of the living does not mean the ritual exists exclusively for their convenience. Someone may understand it as a duty to the dead, prayer, observance of religious order, or preservation of a particular relationship. These grounds cannot be replaced in advance with a general psychological explanation. For the mother, prayer is more than suitable background for a meeting: it has its own subject and faith. Vera can acknowledge that her mother is praying rather than performing a neutral technique without sharing that subject.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Identifying who acts leaves different meanings possible. It pronounces a religious interpretation neither established nor mistaken, and makes none compulsory for everyone.

Three questions can therefore be separated: what are we doing, whose meaning do we attribute to it, and what do we expect afterwards? A time can be agreed without agreement about existence after death. Memory can be honoured without promising inward relief. A chosen form can be observed while feelings remain different. These distinctions protect the event from the excessive demand to answer everything. Sasha proposes gathering and recalling several particular episodes. This is a proposal, not a declaration that the family will finally say farewell correctly. Others can clarify it, decline individual parts, or suggest their own participation without explaining every private reason behind those choices.

II. Form organises an action, not a feeling

A form distributes small responsibilities and marks a meeting’s beginning and end. Knowing who will open the room and when a submitted text will be read spares people from guessing every detail at once. But an order of actions establishes no order of feelings. Sasha may calmly arrange the table and want solitude later. Vera may cry beforehand and remain silent during the speeches. Their love need not be measured by this. Making an action understandable to participants is one purpose of form; securing an identical inward state at an appointed minute is a different claim. The former can be agreed, whereas the latter does not follow from organising a meeting.

A repeated gesture sometimes connects people with earlier generations: a familiar prayer, established burial order or shared meal has a history nobody invented today. In accepting a form, someone may feel connected to that history, or simply think following it appropriate. This article does not establish that repetition necessarily produces connection for everyone. It may be costly, difficult, unfamiliar, or inconsistent with a participant’s beliefs. Where a family arrangement can be discussed, its meaning and limits can be clarified. A religious community’s particular rules should be learned from that community, rather than treating a general philosophical discussion as knowledge of every rite or permission to alter all of them.

A new form is possible too, such as reading a colleague’s letter from another city. It is not inauthentic merely because it lacks a long tradition. Novelty does not prove it better than an established order either. The question concerns a particular action: does it fit this occasion, what does it express, and do those whose words or belongings are used agree? Vera can suggest one photograph rather than a lengthy selection. The photograph, its context and access are then discussed, not the family’s overall readiness to let the past go. A bounded form can serve its subject without symbolically promising that the whole history of loss will change forever afterwards.

III. Antigone: burial and a disputed duty

In the selected Antigone episode, burial becomes a conflict’s subject. A guard describes the earth and libation with which Antigone honoured her brother’s body despite Creon’s prohibition. She acknowledges the deed openly and associates it with unwritten divine ordinances. Ritual is not presented merely as a way to calm down. It addresses the dead and an order she considers higher than a ruler’s command. An honest comparison preserves that ground. The ancient scene should not become an illustration of a contemporary slogan that anyone may choose any ceremony solely for convenience, without a relationship to duty, power or belief. The drama makes those competing grounds part of the action itself.

Creon and Antigone judge the dead man differently: his hostility to the city matters to one, brotherhood and required rites to the other. Their conflict shows that farewell can concern who is permitted to be mourned and how public power governs memory. This article considers that question within the dramatic passage, offering no solution to every legal or family dispute. Antigone’s readiness to die is not transferred into advice for contemporary readers. Her statement remains part of her situation and convictions. Respect for the dead is used here to infer neither a duty to endanger oneself nor a requirement to repeat an action at any cost. Historical seriousness need not become a dangerous present instruction.

For the imagined contemporary family, the transfer is limited: does someone else’s judgment of a person replace every opportunity for loved ones to have their own relationship to them? Personal farewell also requires no declaration that every act was good. Sasha remembers care; Vera remembers difficult conversations. They can join one event without agreeing on a complete moral portrait. Antigone proves neither that all memories are equal nor that every dispute now ends. She supplies a particular example connecting ritual, duty and disputed evaluation. The editorial boundary permits naming a relationship without erasing history or requiring gratitude from others whose experience may differ.

IV. Confucius: ritual substance and the limits of display

In Analects Book III, a question about what matters first in ceremonies receives an answer preferring restraint to extravagance, and deep sorrow in mourning to minute attention to observances. Nearby stands a question about humanity and rites; later comes a statement about presence at sacrifice. These passages do not abolish form. Their meaning arises within a world in which form, reverence and relationships matter. The contemporary slogan that nothing is obligatory cannot be extracted and called Confucius’s teaching. Within the selected scope, an action’s substance is compared with demonstrating correctness; the uselessness of every ceremonial order is not established. The source’s own commitments remain visible rather than being softened unnoticed.

For Sasha and Vera, this distinction permits discussing costs without measuring love by price. An expensive arrangement may appeal to the family; a simple one may suffice. Its cost alone reveals no depth of relationship. But the historical preference for sorrow cannot become a new examination in which visible tears prove more honest observance. An external observer cannot access someone else's whole experience. Refusing such a test today is this article's editorial boundary, rather than a literal proposition from the selected ancient passage. Otherwise an attempt to escape display generates another display, requiring everyone to produce convincing evidence of grief for the people around them.

The statement about presence at sacrifice deserves attention. In a particular tradition, participation contributes to an action's meaning rather than merely completing an outward sequence. Presence cannot, however, be translated without explanation into a demand to travel at any cost to every contemporary gathering. The original statement's subject must remain distinct from present conditions. The father's colleague can send a memory from another city. That is neither identical with an ancient sacrifice nor proof that all forms are equivalent. It is a different, named way for a living person to participate. Its meaning can be considered within this relationship without substituting historical grounds or assigning guilt for impossible travel.

V. Tears within a narrative of resurrection

In the selected John passage, people come to comfort Martha and Mary after their brother's death. Martha goes out to meet Jesus while Mary first remains at home; a conversation about resurrection and faith follows. When Jesus sees people weeping, the narrative describes his trouble and tears. This sequence prevents religious hope being honestly presented as a demand for absence of sorrow. It cannot be reduced to an illustration of general human response independent of faith either. Consolation and tears belong to a particular story in which claims about resurrection concern Jesus and belief in him. Both subjects are part of the chosen verses' meaning and remain in this comparison.

The contemporary comparison is limited to not treating tears as an automatic refutation of hope. It promises neither that prayer or community presence will change this loss's outcome nor identical experience among believers. Sasha can see his mother praying and crying without requiring one to be chosen as more authentic. Vera can remain outside her faith without ridiculing prayer or repeating words she is unprepared to say. A shared day confirms no theological agreement. It provides conditions for particular participation where boundaries can be agreed. The narrative supplies comparison grounds, rather than promising every ceremony the same result or making another person's faith the required solution.

The sisters' different actions within the passage require no ready judgment either. One event is encountered in different places and actions, while others come to comfort them. No

contemporary sequence of proper grief stages follows, and neither does a rule about who must leave home immediately. For the imagined family, what matters is recognising that absence of one behaviour does not make another false. Silence, speech, prayer and practical help can have different subjects. Comparing them does not make them invariably interchangeable. Someone may want presence alone, or ask for a particular action. Their request is learned through conversation rather than assigned beforehand from an ancient example.

VI. A shared day with different grounds

Before a shared farewell, people can clarify which words are genuinely shared and which belong to an individual or community. The mother wants prayer; Vera is not prepared to call it her own belief. Prayer can then be identified as the prayer of its participants rather than the whole family’s single voice. This is no universal instruction for every service: a particular religious form may have its own conditions. The discussion concerns an adaptable family gathering. Agreeing on its parts preserves different grounds. Sasha should neither infer his sister’s lack of love from her declining a text nor declare his mother indifferent because she will not replace prayer.

Some words can be spoken without a shared answer about life after death: naming a relationship, giving thanks for a particular action, identifying help offered that day. Such limited language need not be the only permitted language. Someone may speak separately from their faith if the meeting allows it without requiring everyone’s agreement. Ownership of the statement matters. Reading the colleague’s letter, Sasha identifies its writer instead of turning a private memory into a family verdict. A prayer is not presented as a verified description of every attendee’s convictions. Shared action permits different voices while none attributes to others something they did not express or choose to endorse.

Disagreement is not always fully resolved by the appointed day. Sometimes only place and sequence are agreed while words remain disputed. That does not automatically make the gathering meaningless. A statement can be limited, an unagreed episode omitted, or participation divided. But avoiding a dispute should not require a false expression of agreement. Vera can remain silent about difficult relations with her father without affirming that everything was happy. Others retain gratitude for what actually happened in their experience. Farewell becomes neither a court where every history must finally be joined nor permission to prescribe one compulsory memory on behalf of every family member, including those who have not spoken.

VII. What the living can promise

The living can promise a particular action where it is chosen and feasible: preserving a letter, passing on a photograph, caring for an object, or agreeing on help. The promise has participants, a subject and limits. It cannot be expanded into an eternal family duty without their agreement. Sasha can say he will keep several records himself. He cannot automatically promise that the children will preserve every object or that Vera will return annually on the same day. Memory requires no unlimited disposal of another person’s future. A precise promise remains serious without becoming a broad symbolic obligation nobody discussed and that may be difficult to fulfil.

The deceased’s own requests must also be distinguished accurately from assumptions. A clear wish left by the father can be discussed in terms of its content and possibilities for observance. Recalling his liking for particular music is evidence of a habit, not a demonstrated instruction for this day. An assumed wish cannot be used to end every discussion. Absence of a written request does not make every decision indifferent either. The living can draw on a known relationship while identifying what they do not know. They are responsible for their choice and can name it as theirs, rather than making the dead an infallible party unable to clarify attributed words.

Practical tasks surrounding farewell can be demanding without each expressing the whole relationship. Paying for transport, preparing food and speaking are different contributions. They can be shared with regard to resources and willingness, without creating an unspoken competition. Vera handles photographs without making a speech; Sasha welcomes visitors. Neither contribution must be pronounced deeper. Where help is needed, naming a request and conditions is better than linking refusal to lack of love. The article settles no legal or property matter. It preserves the distinction between symbolic action, a material task and the broader relationship, which cannot be reduced to one visible contribution made on one occasion.

VIII. Absence supplies no ready verdict on a relationship

Absence from a gathering has different possible reasons; an empty place on the participant list does not tell us which reason was at work. Distance, work, resource limits or a personal decision are not visible in a group picture. The colleague sends a letter; another acquaintance does not respond. The family can regret this without automatically knowing the entire depth of those relationships. This requires neither calling every absence good nor refusing to discuss a broken promise. A particular agreement has its own history. What matters is not making a general verdict from one fact, especially where circumstances are unknown and need not be disclosed publicly.

Someone who missed the gathering may later want an action of their own: reading a letter, visiting a familiar place, keeping a record, or simply remembering the person. It can matter without claiming to have fully replaced the shared day. A common ceremony and a personal farewell offer different possibilities. The first provides particular togetherness; the second a separate relationship. Sometimes they coexist, sometimes not. A second ritual cannot be imposed as a penalty for missing the first. Choosing it belongs to the living person and the meaning they actually find in it. If no special gesture is chosen, an observer still has no grounds for declaring their memory empty.

Participation in a particular form may also involve unacceptable words or relationships for some people. Discussion should not pronounce refusal illegitimate beforehand. Another way of being present can be sought, or participation limited. This is a contemporary editorial boundary, not a promise that every historical tradition permits any alteration. Honest meaning requires distinguishing its own rules from the present agreement. A private refusal need not be called rejection of every ritual or all respect. Sasha may not know every reason for Vera’s silence. Acknowledging this limit is more precise than interpreting her inward state and prescribing actions supposedly leading her to a correct farewell.

IX. After the ceremony ends

The ceremony ends in time: visitors leave, the room is vacated, belongings are packed. That ending concerns the chosen event and says nothing about an inward relationship being finished. Next day someone may want conversation, return to ordinary work, or revisit a record a month later. These examples establish no compulsory stages or deadlines. Loss does not become an unfinished assignment because thoughts of the person continue. Nor must an identical feeling be sustained constantly to prove loyalty to memory. A bounded event can take place and end while participants continue living with different decisions that need no single final formula or public confirmation of completion.

Relationships’ practical organisation may change: care must be shared, belongings considered, familiar routines reviewed. A farewell gathering can mark that the previous order no longer fully holds without doing every subsequent task. Sasha and Vera separately agree about letters and photographs. That agreement need not be pronounced a direct spiritual result of the ceremony. It concerns present actions and can be reconsidered with participants’ agreement. Preserving memory puts no eternal prohibition on changing every object. Conversely, removing something need not be represented as liberation from the past. It may have a straightforward practical subject that deserves to be named precisely without assigning an inward transformation to its owner.

No subsequent day requires finding a useful lesson in death. Someone can value a particular conversation or appreciate support without declaring loss beneficial. They can remember

difficulty and reject a proposed explanation. A shared ritual grants its organiser no authority to settle the question for everyone. The mother’s continuing prayer remains grounded in her faith. Vera’s difficult memory need not become grateful for the sake of family harmony. Different relationships can continue without one concluding interpretation. Continuing to live requires no demonstration that farewell produced growth, reconciliation, or a condition in which nobody ever asks previous questions again. An event’s meaning remains bounded by what it actually expresses.

X. A particular action within continuing life

The selected sources reveal three different aspects. Antigone connects rites with divine duty and conflict over power. Confucian passages question substance and reverence within form. John’s passage retains consolation, belief and tears in one narrative. Comparing them neither makes one doctrine of death nor presents three episodes as research into ceremonies’ effectiveness. This article separately asks about the living people’s actions, ownership of words and limits to expectation. That transfer has explicit editorial grounds and responsibility. It permits closer consideration without replacing historical convictions with a universal psychological explanation or prescribing one proper form of farewell to every reader regardless of their relationships and beliefs.

In the imagined family, the gathering includes prayer for those wishing to join, the colleague’s letter and several photographs. Vera makes no public speech. This is neither a model that must be repeated nor a report that every disagreement disappeared. Only the agreed actions and what they marked for participants can be named. Lack of relief makes no result false; feeling relief creates no obligation to extend it to others. The event retains a limited meaning: people gathered, named a relationship and gave particular words a place. They thereby established neither identical love nor the correctness of one faith nor completion of every private history involved.

A farewell ritual can be serious precisely with this boundary preserved. The living answer for their action without possessing every meaning of the deceased or one another’s future paths. They can honour, pray, remember and help without promising what the chosen form cannot guarantee. Room remains for silence, a question, a separate gesture or changed participation. This does not discount togetherness: its subject and boundaries make it more precise. Farewell can mark a particular day and relationship, then leave life open to further relationships. It requires no shared inward finale before the performed action can be honest and significant for the people who choose it.

What this means in practice

If you want to consider a farewell’s form now, begin with one modest action rather than a demand to arrange everything correctly. Name its subject: prayer, reading a letter, presence, caring for a photograph or another gesture. Then distinguish what is known about the deceased’s wishes from what remains the living people’s present choice. Uncertainty need not be filled with a confident assumption, and no whole private history must be disclosed.

Where an action involves others, clarify whose words are used, agreement and resources. Can a text be spoken in a particular author’s name rather than attributed to everyone? Is help needed, and to whom is it appropriate to offer it? Participation can be partial; silence or refusal needs no general explanation. A particular religious rite’s rules are learned from its community, not inferred from this article.

Finally, separate the event’s ending from a promised inward result. You can record what will or did take place without measuring grief’s fullness or requiring reconciliation. If discussion is unwelcome now, the practice is optional. A pause, another way to participate, or choosing no special gesture remain possible. No action here guarantees relief, loss’s completion, or agreement with someone else’s meaning.

Key quotation

> *Jesus wept.*

— John 11:35; King James Version

Connections between traditions

Question	Two textual grounds and locators	Comparison mechanism	What it does not establish
The action’s addressee	Antigone, dramatic lines 430 and 450–470: earth and libation address a brother; duty is grounded in divine ordinances. Analects III.12 connects participation in sacrifice with presence when addressing the dead and spirits.	Both grounds identify a living participant’s action without making the dead an incidental pretext. The tragedy’s divine law and Confucian practice of presence nevertheless remain different grounds.	This proves no condition of the dead after death, reduces no rite to psychological convenience, and licenses no attribution of any present wish to the deceased.
Substance and outward sequence	Analects III.3–4 relates humanity to rites and prefers sorrow to minute attention to observances. John 11:19 and 33–35 describes people coming to comfort the sisters, then retains weeping and Jesus’s tears.	The comparison distinguishes an event, its inward ground and visible conduct. It allows contemporary discussion to avoid treating an orderly sequence as a complete account of experience.	The texts offer no scale of authentic grief, establish no therapeutic efficacy, and prescribe no compulsory tears as a test of sincerity.
Different religious grounds	Antigone, lines 450–460 and 519–523: unwritten divine ordinances and Hades’ claim enter the dispute with Creon. John 11:23–27 associates resurrection with Jesus and belief in him; Martha answers from that faith.	Related attention to the dead creates no identical account of an afterlife. Each statement retains its subject; a contemporary gathering can identify who speaks from a particular conviction.	This is no single doctrine of death, confirmation of every religion through one episode, or requirement that all family participants profess one faith.

Question	Two textual grounds and locators	Comparison mechanism	What it does not establish
Presence and different actions	John 11:20 and 28–31: Martha goes out, Mary first remains home, then is called and followed by those comforting her. Analects III.12 treats personal presence at sacrifice as significant for the speaker.	Participation matters within each particular scope but is not described by one outward posture. Comparison preserves the difference between a named religious practice and contemporary ways to join a family occasion.	It makes a letter equivalent to no ancient rite, establishes no grief stages, and grants no authority to blame an absent person without knowing circumstances.
Expense and the subject of reverence	Analects III.4 prefers restraint in ceremonies to extravagance, while separately relating mourning to sorrow. Antigone, lines 425–430 honours a brother through earth and libation within a particular prohibited act.	Material aspects are visible in both passages, but the size of an expense supplies no shared mechanism for measuring a relationship. A contemporary family can discuss a budget separately from love's price.	This prescribes no inexpensive form for everyone, erases no divine duty in Antigone, and turns mourning's sorrow into no required emotional display.
Relationship and disputed evaluation	Antigone, lines 510–525: Creon stresses hostility and unequal honour; Antigone stresses brotherhood and rites. John 11:36 has observers relate tears to love for the dead, following the earlier consolation and faith.	A relationship is disputed in the first passage; a particular gesture receives observers' interpretation in the second. Comparison separates testimony about a relationship from a final portrait of the person.	It proves neither equal memories nor absence of love through absent tears. It demands no forgiveness, gratitude or single family verdict.

Primary sources

1. **Sophocles, Antigone, Richard Claverhouse Jebb translation, 1917 edition.** The primary English text. The continuous selected carrier 331–399, dramatic lines 407–525, was actually read: burial, libation, admission and disputes about divine ordinances and brotherhood. Visible opening and adjacent context were also read; translator and edition labels checked. Neither the whole tragedy, Greek original nor commentaries were read. The heroine's speech about death is not advice. Perseus did not return the chosen chunks, so the actually accessible Jebb 1917 text was adopted.

2. **Confucian Analects III.3–4 and III.12, James Legge.** The complete selected chapters and surrounding context. Humanity and rites, the answer to Lin Fang, and both statements about sacrificial presence were actually read. The title page identifies Legge and the revised second edition of 1893; the passage transcription was not collated line by line with its scan. No Chinese philological comparison or reading of the whole work is claimed.

3. **John 11:17–36, King James Version.** All twenty selected verses. The entire selected passage and KJV label were actually read: consolation, the sisters' differing actions, resurrection faith and tears. Neither the full chapter nor Greek was collated here; the narrative promises no outcome for a contemporary farewell.

Both Russian quotations are United Wisdom's own translations; English was literally checked against Legge and KJV. General international rights remain UNKNOWN despite a historical edition or carrier notice. The family scene, contemporary participation boundaries and voluntary practice are editorial; no raw source import was performed.

Tags

farewell, ritual, death, loss, memory, the living, presence, silence, prayer, faith, tears, form, substance, reverence, relationships, family, duty, participation, agreement, boundaries, Antigone, Sophocles, Confucius, John, tradition, dignity, care, remembrance, voluntary action, continuation

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.