

UNITED WISDOM

Ending a relationship with respect for reality

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R29 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Ending a relationship with respect for reality

Epigraph

> *passions than manners*

Mary Wollstonecraft, *Maria; Or, The Wrongs of Woman*, author's preface, sentence fragment. The context is the purpose of the novel.

What this article is about

In a fictional story, Irina has already decided to leave, but every evening she composes another speech that will finally make Pavel agree: their relationship really is over. Her speech accounts for everything except his right to disagree. The harder she tries to be convincing, the more the ending becomes another joint project requiring both people's approval. Yet agreeing with an explanation and agreeing to continue a relationship are different things.

Respect for reality begins with several uncomfortable acknowledgments. A decision can be clear while feelings keep changing. One person can leave without mutual understanding. A shared history remains, but no longer grants the same claims on time and intimacy. Material constraints need separate attention, and danger changes the very way an ending is approached. This article considers acknowledging the end of a relationship: how to communicate it without a false promise, account for consequences, and avoid assigning the other person the correct way to feel. It offers no universal conversation script, legal procedure, or guarantee of a peaceful separation. Continuing shared responsibilities need arrangements of their own; here the first task is to see what has ended.

I. A decision need not look like complete certainty

Deciding to end a relationship and losing all doubts do not necessarily happen at the same moment. You can believe that continuing to live together is wrong for you and still be glad to hear a familiar voice. You can miss someone with whom you no longer want to build a future. If every warm feeling counts as a refutation of the decision, the test becomes endless: do I feel sufficiently empty to be entitled to leave? That standard makes separation depend on an emotional blankness nobody has promised.

In our fictional scene, Irina remembers a trip on which she and Pavel were happy. The memory is true within the story, but answers a question about the past. It does not settle whether their

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

present relationship works for her. Conversely, one painful argument does not describe the whole relationship either. The distinction is to consider the grounds for the decision in their current context: what repeats, what has changed, which possibilities have been discussed, and what remains unknown. This is reflection, rather than a test of irreversibility.

Clarity can be limited in scope. A person knows they do not want to continue living together but does not yet know where they will live next month. They have decided to end the romantic relationship but have not decided whether friendship might ever be possible. Calling these different questions one general doubt loses precision. What is unknown can remain unknown without becoming a promise of future closeness. A decision about the present does not require inventing an entire subsequent life to sound confident enough to yourself or to other people.

There is also the opposite case: someone genuinely has not decided whether to leave. Then acknowledging uncertainty is more honest than declaring a final departure to elicit the desired response. Where a conversation is possible and safe, a provisional discussion can be named as provisional. Threatening an ending to obtain a concession means something different: the partner is asked to guess where there is a decision and where there is pressure. Respect for reality calls for correspondence between what you say and what you are currently prepared to do, rather than a display of icy certainty. The next question follows: what message can convey that?

II. Communicating an ending differs from inviting an argument

An explanation can help someone understand a decision without making them its joint author. If ending the relationship has already been chosen, the conversation may concern what happens next, rather than an obligation to convince the listener that the choice is flawless. Each person will retain their own judgment. An opportunity to speak does not amount to a right to keep a relationship going until every argument has received the same assessment. This is an ethical distinction between participation and agreement; it does not determine the legal consequences of marriage, a contract, or ownership.

In the fictional scene, Irina lists ten reasons. Pavel answers the first two, demands examples for the third, and promises to fix the fourth. The conversation quietly becomes an examination of evidence. Perhaps it would be appropriate if they were still choosing a path together. But if the decision is already made, another list may suggest that refuting its points will automatically restore the old relationship. A lengthy explanation can then be less clear than a brief statement of the decision and the matters on which further contact is available.

Brevity does not in itself ensure respect. An abrupt sentence can avoid acknowledging consequences, while a carefully prepared speech can honestly name them. What matters more is the relationship between the form and the task. An explanation can acknowledge the

significance of a shared life, state the present decision, and distinguish what is settled from what remains open. It need not assess the other person's character, predict their future, or list every old grievance. If details are used only to obtain acknowledgment that you are right, notice that the task has changed again.

The other person may say that what they have heard seems unfair, sudden, or incomprehensible. That does not oblige you to enter an endless demonstration. In safe communication, you can address a specific misunderstanding without reopening a settled question. For instance, you can clarify that the romantic relationship is ending while the return of belongings will be discussed separately. Such wording remains a suggestion for a calm situation. It is no instruction to announce a decision face to face to someone whose reaction you fear, and it does not make the absence of a final conversation a moral debt.

III. Respect does not require identical accounts of the past

A mutually acknowledged history might make an ending less lonely. Sometimes people do agree about what was good, what became impossible, and why they are separating. But that agreement cannot be made a condition of a dignified departure. One sees an exhausted relationship; the other sees a temporary crisis. One remembers prolonged loneliness; the other remembers sudden rejection. The difference in perspectives may remain. It does not automatically establish bad intent on either side, but neither does it erase observable actions or harm.

Trying to obtain a single account can turn separation into a trial of the entire shared life. In our example, Pavel demands that Irina acknowledge he always tried. Irina demands that he acknowledge things were hard for her for years. These claims need not exclude one another, yet in this conversation each sounds like a condition without which the other person will not be released. Acknowledgment then ceases to be voluntary. It is extracted through repetition, argument, or witnesses, while the ending is postponed until some future agreement.

In Epictetus's *Enchiridion*, paragraph 1, translated by Elizabeth Carter, one's actions are distinguished from what one does not command. The useful question here concerns the limit of power over another person's judgment. But the Stoic text is no proof of invulnerability and does not erase real harm: its strong promises of freedom cannot become a modern guarantee. The application is limited. You can take responsibility for your message; you cannot ensure that it receives exactly the interpretation or emotional response you want.

Keeping different perspectives does not require treating every account as equally reliable. A date, payment, or agreement can sometimes be checked. An assumption about motive remains an assumption. Respect for reality includes this work: separating an available fact from the meaning assigned to it. You need not confirm an accusation you reject for the sake of

a gentle ending. Nor does your calm explanation entitle you to declare the other person healed, reconciled, or grateful. An ending can be sufficiently clear without a shared final verdict on who you were to each other.

IV. A beautiful ending is not available to everyone

The image of a dignified separation often resembles an intimate scene: two people meet calmly, acknowledge the value of the past, return belongings, and leave without anger. That scene is possible, but cannot measure someone else's maturity. People differ in resources, dependence, access to housing, support, and experiences of threats. In some circumstances, meeting in person adds danger instead of improving the ending. Before considering the eloquence of the last speech, it is necessary to ask whether the proposed contact is appropriate at all.

In her author's preface to *Maria; Or, The Wrongs of Woman*, Mary Wollstonecraft connects the novel's purpose with women's position under unequal customs and laws. This is an unfinished novel presented after the 1798 edition, not current separation statistics or a legal description of today's family. Its useful challenge is not to assume that every continued relationship represents a free choice. The author's historical critique does not establish the reader's particular circumstances or replace an assessment of what is happening now.

The British NHS identifies control, threats, and stalking as important reasons to seek support; when leaving is being considered, it advises specialist help and caution about disclosing plans. Immediate danger calls for the local emergency route, rather than a conversation that follows a literary ideal. The British page's contacts belong to its jurisdiction; local availability has not been checked here. These limits mean the article does not make a meeting, disclosure of a destination, or a joint experiment a condition of respect. Nor does it promise that communicating remotely will itself ensure safety.

Even without threats, a calm meeting may be more than someone can manage today. Then it matters to distinguish an inability to sustain the conversation from an intention to prolong uncertainty. In safe circumstances, an available channel or a limited message can be chosen without pretending to be capable of hours of discussion. But convenience for the person making the decision does not erase its consequences for the other person. Having no universal script removes the demand to perform an ideal ending; it does not remove honest attention to what your words allow someone to understand and which questions remain open. A particular form of ending lies between those extremes.

V. Care for consequences does not restore the old intimacy

After an ending has been communicated, help can easily become confused with continuing the relationship. One brings groceries; the other hears hope of a return. One answers a practical question; the other takes the answer as an invitation to talk all evening. Neither a caring act nor a limit on contact carries one obligatory meaning in every story. It can therefore help to specify the purpose of an action: which task it addresses and what further involvement it does not promise. This is not coldness by definition; sometimes it keeps help from creating another expectation.

In our fictional case, Irina is willing to help move books but is not willing to spend weekends together. If she accepts a Sunday lunch out of guilt, Pavel may believe that their previous arrangement is gradually returning. It is better to notice that contradiction before making the promise. Limited help can be offered with limits: a specific action, available time, and a clear end. The other person may reject that format, however. An offer does not become caring simply because its author finds it reasonable and generous; the possibility of declining without further punishment matters.

Some responsibilities do not disappear when feelings change: shared tasks, belongings, agreements, and care for people who depend on others. But their substance cannot be deduced from the idea of respect alone. Legal obligations depend on particular circumstances and jurisdiction; voluntary arrangements depend on what was actually agreed. Here it is enough to distinguish an ended relationship from the remaining work. Returning belongings should not become a pretext for restoring intimate access, while ending intimacy should not become a universal explanation for refusing to address any consequences of decisions or earlier promises.

Sometimes direct communication about these matters is impossible or unsafe. Choosing an available, suitable way to hand tasks over may then require specialist assistance. This article does not decide who owns belongings, who must pay, or which document is sufficient. It offers another point of orientation: a task needs a name of its own so it does not become a disguised argument about returning. Discussing a box's delivery does not necessarily require discussing the value of the whole relationship. Arranging continuing responsibilities is a separate subject; here it shows that the end of one form of connection means neither the complete disappearance of the other person nor the indefinite preservation of the old relationship.

VI. Pity can create a promise that does not exist

Another person's pain can make clear words difficult. You may want to soften them with a qualification: things are over now, but perhaps we will get back together later. Sometimes that is honest uncertainty. Sometimes it is said only because the speaker cannot bear the expression on the listener's face. The distinction matters: comfort based on an intention that does not exist passes on an expectation the other person must live with. Compassion does not require predicting a return or keeping a romantic possibility open so that both of you feel better for a few minutes.

In our story, Irina nearly offers friendship. Then she notices that she does not want to be friends; she wants to stop feeling cruel. The wish to ease another person's pain is understandable, but does not make every promise accurate. You can acknowledge that the conversation is painful without assigning a shared future. You can leave what is unknown as unknown and clearly state what has been decided. Such language may offer less comfort than a familiar promise of lasting closeness, but it does not require someone to build their life around your temporary difficulty in saying something definite.

In Romans 12:18, in the Updated World English Bible, the pursuit of peace is qualified by possibility and one's own responsibility. This is an exhortation within religious ethics, not a modern agreement on separation or grounds for mandatory contact. It allows a limited question: which actions on my part avoid adding unnecessary hostility? It cannot establish a duty to remain near a dangerous person or guarantee a peaceful response. The peaceful intention of an action and restoration of a couple remain different matters.

Honesty does not require expressing every thought in its most painful form. You can choose considerate words, omit humiliating comparisons, and avoid presenting the other person as an obstacle to your new life. But consideration differs from changing the meaning. If the decision is final for the present, it helps not to call it an ordinary break merely to soften the scene. If it is still being discussed, it helps not to present the conversation as a completed departure. The right to compassion remains alongside the right not to promise a relationship. Care becomes possible without making you responsible for the correct speed of another person's recovery.

VII. Feelings do not follow the date of the announcement

A decision and the experience of it keep different time. On the day of a clear announcement, outward life may change faster than habits: your hand reaches to send a message, an evening feels empty, a familiar place brings back an old conversation. These are hypothetical examples, not a list of inevitable symptoms. No single feeling determines whether a decision was right. Nor should the other person be required to stop grieving by a set date. Ending a relationship changes available actions and arrangements; it does not order all memories to lose their significance at once.

In David Sbarra, Hillary Smith, and Matthias Mehl's 2012 study, ratings of self-compassion in recorded accounts were associated with subsequent adjustment to marital separation. This was an observational study with incomplete repeated measurements, not a trial of a way to separate or a promise that our practice works. It cannot prescribe a uniform recovery period or prove that kindness toward oneself causally removes pain. The limited correction to self-condemnation matters here: a difficult experience should not automatically become a moral judgment on the person or their right to continue living.

The partner left behind may feel that the other's composure proves there was never love. The partner leaving may feel that the other's intense pain requires a reversal of the decision. In each case, a feeling is granted authority it does not itself possess. It can be taken seriously without becoming the only fact. A real need for support also does not mean that the former partner must provide all of it. Available help may extend beyond the couple; its particular composition and quality cannot be established by an article or secured by one correct sentence.

Respect for your own feelings does not mean endlessly watching a former partner. In a calm situation, you can notice which contact addresses a real matter and which leaves you waiting for a sign again. This is no general ban on friendship or instruction to immediately destroy all correspondence. It asks about the current cost of a specific action. If your feelings make everyday life so difficult that your own resources are insufficient, you can consider available specialist support without treating the article as a diagnosis. Ending the relationship and addressing its consequences may require different amounts of time and different people.

VIII. The past need not become a mistake

To leave, a person sometimes wants to prove that the entire relationship was pointless. Every good memory must then be explained as a delusion and every act of care as a hidden calculation. This creates a convenient but impoverished story: if nothing was real, there seems to be nothing to lose. The other extreme requires maintaining an ideal image to avoid acknowledging painful events. Respect for reality permits a complex record. The past may contain closeness and limits, generosity and hurt, shared effort and different hopes. Their coexistence does not overturn the present decision.

This is no call to distribute responsibility equally. If harm occurred, good episodes do not make it acceptable or establish a duty to forgive. Yet acknowledging harm does not always require erasing everything you truly valued. In our story, Irina can remember Pavel's support during her studies while declining to continue their present relationship. Those judgments answer different questions. Gratitude for the past is no indefinite payment through continued participation, and an ending does not make gratitude automatically false or forbidden.

Holding that complexity can be especially difficult among mutual friends. They may request a short explanation, allocate who is right, and expect an identifiable culprit. You can limit details; a shared history does not become the property of everyone who witnessed it. Privacy does not, however, require silence about safety or rejecting necessary support. Public retelling to gain acknowledgment differs from speaking to a suitable person to obtain particular help. The article sets no universal list of information that may be disclosed; circumstances, others' privacy, and real needs for protection determine the limit, rather than the beauty of a shared image.

Return to Irina's evening speech. She no longer needs an ending in which Pavel agrees with every reason, stops suffering, and confirms her goodness. What she needs is more limited: correspondence between the message and the decision, attention to whether contact is appropriate, and precision about remaining questions. He may retain another account of the past. She may retain sadness. Further work neither devalues the end of the relationship nor makes it incomplete because there was no ceremonial final moment. Respect for reality means bearing the fact that two people can end a shared future without obtaining a shared answer to everything they experienced.

IX. Subsequent actions communicate something too

A clear sentence does not remove the need to attend to your actions afterward. If someone announces an ending but keeps demanding daily reports, feeling entitled to control new acquaintances, and directing the other's weekends, old claims return through habit. The other person receives incompatible messages: the relationship no longer exists, but compliance with its rules is still expected. No single episode permits diagnosing a person or establishing their motive. Yet the contradiction between a stated decision and a particular demand can be noticed without guessing at someone's entire character.

In our fictional story, Pavel invites Irina to a familiar family celebration. She may accept or decline; that choice alone proves neither a return nor indifference. The question is what meaning is communicated and understood by those involved. If the invitation is interpreted differently, it is better not to rely on a silent agreement. Sometimes the limits of contact will need to be stated again. Sometimes people will find that a shared meeting is too ambiguous for now. Declining may then be more accurate than attending and later having to explain it as an accidental mistake.

A new decision is possible too. People may reconsider their intentions, but reconsideration needs renewed, explicit participation; it cannot be attributed to another person on the strength of a smile or practical help. Respecting an ending does not forbid a future change of mind. It means that a present agreement is not retroactively cancelled by one person's hidden hope. If a different form of connection is proposed later, it remains a proposal that can be declined. The past does not provide automatic access to the future.

The criterion for a dignified ending becomes clearer. It is not confined to one flawless conversation: people will continue making small decisions about messages, meetings, and mutual friends. A mistake can be corrected without declaring that the entire ending failed. Where safe, it may be enough to acknowledge the misunderstanding created and clarify a particular limit. The article's initial thought returns: you can work with your own participation, while the ultimate shared meaning is not entirely in your hands. Even an imperfect ending may then leave each person room for a separate life.

What this means in practice

In a calm situation, you can choose one small task: check whether a proposed formulation matches your intention. This is voluntary reflection, not preparation for a mandatory meeting. Where there are threats, control, or fear of the reaction, suitable specialist support comes first; immediate danger requires local emergency help. Do not record sensitive plans somewhere the other person might access. The exercise can be skipped, done mentally, or stopped if it merely intensifies tension without helping distinguish the questions.

First, name for yourself what has been decided. Not the entire history or an assessment of the other person, but your present form of participation: for example, you are not willing to continue living together. Then name what is unknown separately. If friendship's possibility is unclear, leave it as a question rather than a promise. Finally, identify one practical matter that actually needs further resolution. Do not try to design the whole future arrangement at once; it is enough to notice that returning belongings and continuing intimacy are different questions.

Now read the proposed message through the eyes of its recipient. The purpose is not to predict their response, but to check the expectations you create. Does a settled decision sound like an invitation to bargain? Does compassion promise a return you do not intend to offer? Does a list of reasons turn the conversation into a test of agreement? If necessary, clarify one sentence without adding ten new accusations. This check concerns your words, rather than management of the other person's feelings.

The result may be a more accurate message, a decision not to speak yet, or acknowledgment that you need help choosing an appropriate way to end the relationship. None guarantees a peaceful outcome. If a conversation takes place, its quality is not determined by an absence of tears or mutual gratitude. The modest aim is fewer false promises and a clearer distinction between the ended relationship, remaining tasks, and the other person's right to experience events in their own way. You can return to that when you want to write a speech that will finally settle everything for both of you.

Key quotation

> *partial laws and customs of society*

Mary Wollstonecraft, *Maria; Or, The Wrongs of Woman*, author's preface, sentence fragment. The author's historical object of criticism, not a description of current law.

Connections between traditions

The Stoic distinction between one's action and another's judgment ↔ an editorial limit on responsibility for a response. The resemblance concerns power alone; Epictetus's strong promises of invulnerability are not accepted as a modern guarantee.

The Christian pursuit of peace in Romans 12:18 ↔ avoiding unnecessary hostility in an ending. The religious context establishes no duty to maintain contact, return, or meet together.

Wollstonecraft's historical critique of unequal conditions ↔ attention to the material possibility of leaving. An unfinished novel does not describe current law or provide evidence about a particular reader.

Sbarra and colleagues' observational ratings of self-compassion ↔ distinguishing experience from moral self-condemnation. The study does not establish the proposed practice's effectiveness or turn a philosophical analogy into a clinical method.

Stoic independence of judgment ↔ the Christian orientation toward peace: both allow discussion of one's actions, but their foundations differ—ethical work with choice and an exhortation within faith. No single doctrine of separation is asserted.

Sources

1. Mary Wollstonecraft, *Maria; Or, The Wrongs of Woman*. Text after the 1798 edition; Gutenberg 134, updated 29 October 2024. Editorial and author's prefaces read; not the complete novel. Historical critique, not current law.

2. Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, paragraph 1. Elizabeth Carter translation; the electronic text's precise printed basis was not established. Paragraph 1 and nearby context read; philosophical support with limits on application.

3. Romans 12:14–21, Updated World English Bible. Chapter and publisher notice read. Christian ethical support, not an instruction for ending relationships.

4. Sbarra, Smith & Mehl, 2012, *When Leaving Your Ex, Love Yourself*. *Psychological Science* 23(3), 261–269, DOI 10.1177/0956797611429466. Abstract and selected method, discussion, and limitations read; no claim to full verification of every model.

5. NHS, *Domestic violence and abuse*. Reviewed 23 June 2026; selected sections and review date read. British support; linked pages and local availability not checked.

Tags

separation, ending relationships, respect, reality, clarity, decision, uncertainty, consent, participation, boundaries, intimacy, contact, safety, consequences, shared history, memory, gratitude, loss, emotional experience, self-compassion, expectations, promise, practical tasks, material constraints, dignity, autonomy, Stoicism, Christian ethics, Mary Wollstonecraft, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.