

Accompanying the End of a Shared Life

Divorce recovery, attachment reorganization, and the therapist's participation

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT

"I know why I left," Leandro says. "I just keep wanting to tell her what happened today."

The therapist has been helping him remember the conditions under which he made his decision. There were repeated broken agreements, long periods of loneliness, and conversations in which his concerns became evidence that he was difficult to satisfy. The account has helped him stop treating his departure as an inexplicable failure. Now, in this fictional encounter, he is describing something the account has not resolved.

The therapist begins to ask what he hopes another conversation might accomplish. Leandro looks away. "I don't think I want another conversation about us. My father had a good day yesterday. She would have known what that meant."

There is a different loss to meet. The former partner was a witness to his family, his fears and the years in which certain events acquired their meaning. He may need distance from her conduct and still miss the person who would not have needed the story explained from the beginning. A formulation about his difficulty accepting separation would take us past what he has just made available.

The organizing question for this work is therefore a relational one: **How do we help a person inhabit a changed life while remaining able to meet the loss, the continuing bond and the responsibilities that are actually theirs?** Our answer has to remain open to the person's correction. Divorce recovery can involve mourning, protection, accountability, identity, practical reconstruction and renewed participation. The relative importance of these tasks changes from encounter to encounter.

The ending is an event within an ongoing life

It matters whether the client initiated the separation, was left, was repeatedly threatened with departure, or still does not know what the former partner intends. It matters whether the ending has brought danger, relief, homelessness, a loss of daily contact with children, release from coercion, or several of these together. A legal status tells us little about the emotional or material organization of the person's day.

We can begin with a close account of the present. Where is the person sleeping? What happens when they return from work? Who is available, and what kind of help can actually be received? Which decisions are reversible, which require qualified advice, and which cannot wait? Questions about food, income, access, care and dependable company belong inside the formulation. Otherwise psychotherapy can inadvertently ask a person to metabolize conditions that are still being imposed on them.

Sbarra's review of divorce and health describes heterogeneity and questions about selection and causation alongside associations with poorer outcomes. It supports attention to vulnerability and resources rather than a uniform prognosis. It does not establish that divorce itself explains a particular client's symptoms or that most clients will follow a particular recovery trajectory.¹¹

A person may need assessment and treatment for depression, traumatic stress, substance use, sleep disruption or another condition; educational participation is not an adequate substitute. Clinical judgment includes assessing safety and risk directly when indicated. We should also avoid making the ordinary variability of loss into a disorder. Visible composure may conceal a struggle, and visible distress need not indicate incapacity for considered action.

Language matters. "Why can't you let go?" assumes both a deficit and a destination. "What happens in the hour after contact?" gives us something to examine. "What would make this week more livable?" can be more useful than inviting a complete account of the marriage before the person has a dependable place to sleep.

A bond can remain active after the decision is clear

The ending of a partnership does not remove every function it served. It may have organized anticipation, proximity, companionship, identity and the place to which news was carried. We need to ask which function is being sought now, rather than treat every reach as the same psychological event.

Bowlby's account of affectional bonds gives a theoretical basis for understanding distress associated with unwilling separation. In this setting, it can help us hear protest, longing, anger or detachment without automatically pathologizing their persistence. It cannot establish the client's developmental history or decide whether renewed contact is wise.¹

The specificity changes the intervention. Someone seeking a practical answer may need a clearer question. Someone seeking acknowledgment of betrayal may need us to recognize the injury without making the former partner's acknowledgment a prerequisite for care. Someone missing a shared witness may need time to feel that loss before being invited to build a wider network.

Leandro's correction asks the therapist to relinquish an immediately available task. We could help him resist sending a message. We could teach attachment activation. First, though, we can say what we have understood: she knew the long history of his father's illness, and he misses that particular kind of knowing. We then check rather than assume that this is the center of the moment.

In the fictional continuation, Leandro says, "Yes. I don't want to start over with everyone." There is fatigue and sorrow here. The next invitation might be to remain with the cost of explaining, or to ask whether someone already knows enough to receive a small piece of the news. If he declines, the decline belongs in our account. Recognition does not have to produce an experiment to be clinically meaningful.

Attachment-informed work must not turn the former partner into the presumed source of regulation. For a person living with harassment or coercion, contact may be the destabilizing condition. A wider field of support, confidential planning and coordinated professional care can be essential. We should never translate a theory of connection into a duty to re-enter a harmful exchange.

The moment before the familiar response

The practical opportunity often appears before the person can offer a coherent account of it. A notification sounds; the shoulders lift; an argument is being prepared. The client may first recognize the sequence only in retrospect. We can slow the description without demanding that a past event be re-experienced in the room.

Schore's synthesis draws attention to implicit, nonverbal emotional and relational processes. Damasio's account likewise resists a disembodied view of mental life. These contributions keep us interested in timing, bodily experience, voice and relational context. They do not show that one hemisphere made this client's decision or that observing a sensation identifies its cause.^{5, 6}

Brian's six movements provide a flexible clinical scaffold here: notice the transition; regain some footing if useful; find one's own experience; make room for the other's experience without losing responsibility distinctions; become curious about what remains unknown; choose and review. In separation work, the fourth and fifth movements may occur privately or with professional support. They do not require access to the former partner, agreement with an accusation or an attempt at mutual disclosure.

We can help distinguish sensation, emotion, interpretation and impulse without insisting on a complete inventory. "Tight chest; frightened; I am about to lose everything; send the message now" is one possible account. The person may instead notice only a sudden speed in their thinking. A question such as "What did you begin needing to happen?" may reach the relevant experience more directly than a body scan.

The pause is not an inhibition drill. Its purpose is to widen access to experience and circumstances before action, where possible. There may be a time-sensitive practical need. The client may be complying with an existing arrangement. They may be afraid because a threat is credible. Naming a feeling does not downgrade the reality of the situation.

Nor should the therapist's comfort become the measure. A client may be less visibly composed when anger becomes speakable and more able to act responsibly. Another may become quieter because they are withdrawing from contact with us. We need the client's report, the interaction and the consequences. Relief, tears, steady breathing or completion of a worksheet can inform inquiry; none establishes learning on its own.

Accompaniment before the pressure to make meaning

In experiential work, the question is not only which emotion is present. It is what happens when that experience is met by someone who can remain interested, responsive and able to revise. Does the person feel less alone, more scrutinized, hurried toward sadness, or invited to display an acceptable kind of pain?

Fosha's AEDP formulation places the therapeutic relationship and the processing of emotional experience together. Its relevance here is the need for accompaniment and for attention to how a new encounter is received. This is a clinical orientation, not a basis for treating a self-guided exercise as an AEDP session or importing psychotherapy outcomes into BKL.³

There may be anger that protects a grief the person wants help approaching. There may instead be anger about a current violation that needs action. We can ask which account fits and remain willing to hear that neither does. A client who becomes irritated at our invitation to sadness may be defending against feeling, but may also be accurately resisting an interpretation that erases present injustice.

The therapeutic task includes receiving that resistance as information. "I may have moved too quickly toward loss. What did I miss about what is happening now?" can restore the client's authority without abandoning our responsibility to think. A correction should change the next intervention, not merely be welcomed ceremonially before the therapist returns to the same interpretation.

This is especially important with narrative work. Sbarra and colleagues' randomized writing study found poorer emotional outcomes in meaning-seeking participants assigned expressive writing relative to control writing. The finding is conditional, not a general prohibition of journaling, and the experimental tasks are not equivalent to responsive psychotherapy. It nevertheless challenges compulsory retelling and a universal prescription to create a coherent divorce story.⁷

We can notice whether inquiry enlarges contact with life or becomes another loop of accusation, imagined reply and self-condemnation. The distinction is functional and contextual. Repetition can be an effort to find a listener who finally understands. It can also leave the person more isolated afterward. Changing the amount, form, timing or recipient of reflection is a legitimate intervention.

Responsibility without a totalizing verdict

Divorce stories invite opposing simplifications: a villain who explains everything, or a mutual cycle in which responsibility becomes evenly distributed. Neither can replace an account of particular conduct, reported impact, power and available choices. A person may have been unkind in an argument and also experienced sustained coercion. These facts require separate consideration.

If a client caused harm, tenderness cannot become absolution. We can help them remain present to a specific action and its consequences, tolerate shame without demanding reassurance, and identify a repair that does not require renewed intimacy. Accountability can include truthful information, practical restitution, reliable parenting or respecting a request for no personal contact. Its legitimacy is not contingent on being forgiven.

If a client experienced harm, curiosity about their history should not imply that their wounds caused the other's behavior. We may examine why an arrangement was familiar or difficult to leave while retaining the distinction between constrained participation and responsibility for abuse. There are reasons a person remained that concern love, money, disability, housing, children or realistic fear. A preferred theory should not make those reasons disappear.

Observed self-compassion predicted less separation-related emotional intrusion in Sbarra, Smith and Mehl's study. This is an association rather than a treatment test. Its useful contribution is a question: can the person encounter their experience with enough dignity to examine conduct accurately, instead of using either self-attack or self-exoneration to escape it? ⁸

The same question applies to the therapist. Where do we become punitive because a client's action resembles an injury in our own life? Where do we become excessively reassuring because their remorse is difficult for us to bear? Our reaction can provide information about the field; it does not authorize a verdict.

An unfinished relationship and a changing self

Some clients wait for a last conversation that would make the past intelligible. Others have had many last conversations, each leaving the decisive question unanswered. A person can know the relationship has ended and still find that social, parental and internal boundaries remain unclear.

Boss's ambiguous-loss perspective keeps absence and presence available together and locates uncertainty within relational circumstances. It can help us accompany an ending that lacks satisfying resolution. We should not convert that perspective into an instruction that a client must tolerate preventable confusion, accept withheld information or relinquish a legitimate request.⁴

Selfhood may also have to be rediscovered in daily participation. Slotter, Gardner and Finkel found changes in self-concept following romantic breakup and an association between reduced self-concept clarity and distress. Their samples and designs do not describe all divorcing adults. They support inquiry into identity alongside inquiry into attachment, rather than treating the client's wish for direction as merely avoidance of grief.⁹

There may be an unfamiliar preference, an old pleasure that no longer fits, or a valued capacity the client fears losing with the relationship. We can distinguish a freely chosen loyalty from an arrangement maintained only to keep the previous self intact. We can also honor continuity. Being a caring stepparent, a reliable friend or a person who values commitment need not be discarded because a marriage ended.

Depth-oriented inquiry can attend to the identities that became available or unavailable in the relationship: useful one, unwanted one, betrayed one, reasonable one. These are hypotheses about experience, not roles to assign. Optional parts language may help a client speak for contradictory wishes; an elaborate internal cast is unnecessary. The question is whether they can recognize more of their range while acting in the present.

The marriages we bring into the room

Divorce may activate early lessons about loyalty, abandonment, gender, anger and who is allowed to leave. In one family, separation meant survival. In another, it meant exclusion. A child may have been recruited to comfort a parent, condemn the other parent, preserve appearances or carry news between homes. Later, a client's decision can stir these arrangements in both people in the consulting room.

We should invite the client's connections rather than announce them. "Does this feeling have a familiar quality, or is it mainly about what is happening now?" allows historical resonance without requiring it. A remembered family pattern may illuminate the present while leaving present differences intact. An absence of remembered resonance is also usable information.

Aponte and Kissil's Person of the Therapist Training model (POTT) gives this inquiry a clinical purpose. The therapist learns to recognize recurring personal struggles, become aware of their activation in the encounter, and use that awareness deliberately in relationship, assessment and intervention. Their term "signature theme" concerns a recurring vulnerability and way of relating, rather than a particular marriage or divorce. The task does not depend on having resolved every personal difficulty before becoming useful to

a client. It involves taking responsibility for how our unfinished experience enters the work.
10, 12

Our own marriage or partnership can be especially close to the surface. A client's loneliness may resemble something we have not found a way to say at home. Their wish to leave may stir our fear of being left. Their decision to stay may bring relief because it supports a hope we need for our own relationship. Even a sustaining partnership can become an unexamined standard: we may assume that a repair, conversation or shared effort that became possible for us is available to this person. Similarity can help us hear something important; it cannot tell us that we already know what their experience means.

There can be tenderness here as well as danger. A therapist who has known the quiet grief of an unrepaired breach may be able to sit with a client's loneliness without hurrying to explain it. But the same recognition may create an urge to give the client the acknowledgment the therapist has long wanted. We may become unusually certain about the absent partner, offer reassurance too quickly, or begin wishing the client would make a decision we have not permitted ourselves to consider. These are possibilities to examine, not conclusions to draw from a therapist's relationship status. Being partnered, separated, divorced or single establishes neither competence nor impairment.

Our parents' marriage, separation or successive partnerships may have taught us what commitment costs and whose pain matters. We may remember a parent who endured quietly, another who left without explanation, or two people who remained together while no longer seeming to know one another. We may also have witnessed affection, dependable repair and a relationship with room for difference. What did we learn to admire, fear, conceal or prevent? Which parent's account became the family truth? What happened to our own feelings when we were expected to understand the adults?

A childhood position can return as a professional impulse. The child who mediated may become the therapist who keeps finding another way to bring the couple together. The child who could not protect a parent may feel compelled to secure a client's departure before the client's circumstances have been understood. Someone who experienced a parent's leaving as abandonment may hear a client's relief as callousness. Someone who watched a parent disappear into duty may find it difficult to respect a client's freely chosen commitment. These illustrations are BKL clinical applications of POTT, not predictions about therapists with these histories.¹²

Countertransference, as used here, includes the therapist's emotional, bodily and relational responses to the client, shaped by both the present encounter and the therapist's history. Projection is one possible difficulty within that field: we attribute our own fears, wishes or meanings to the client or former partner and begin treating the attribution as knowledge. We may feel the client's fear accurately and also add something of our own. The question is what supports our understanding, what we have supplied, and whether we can hear an answer that unsettles it.

In Leandro's fictional encounter, for example, a therapist who has struggled to stop contacting a former partner might hear his wish to share news as a familiar failure to separate. A therapist whose parents never reconciled might instead feel hopeful about the continuing bond. Either response could narrow the listening. His statement about his father gives both therapists an opportunity to set aside the anticipated story and ask what this particular loss means to him. Recognizing the personal pull becomes useful when it changes the question we ask.

For this work, disciplined inquiry becomes concrete. Which position in this separation do I find easiest to understand? What happens in me when someone stays, leaves, longs, admits betrayal, declines forgiveness or speaks with relief? Am I trying to protect this person, a child I once was, a parent I still defend, or a preferred account of my own marriage? Whose experience becomes harder for me to hear when I feel protective? What information would make me reconsider?

We can bring the pause into our own clinical participation. Notice the tightening, urgency, irritation or wish to reassure. Find enough footing to distinguish what we feel from what we know. Identify the intervention we are about to make and ask whose need it would serve. We may then choose a more open question, acknowledge uncertainty or seek consultation. This inquiry should sharpen attention to evidence, power and actual harm; it should not make us doubt every protective concern or replace necessary action with endless self-examination.

Personal therapy, consultation, supervision and attentive review can help us identify these pulls. The aim is sufficient freedom to use resonance without requiring the client to reenact or repair our history. We may disclose something only when it serves a considered therapeutic purpose, with attention to how the client receives it. They should not have to take care of our divorce in order to receive help with theirs.

In consultation, it helps to bring the actual moment: what the client said, what happened in us, what we inferred, what we said next and how the client responded. We can examine a recurring vulnerability alongside the clinical task and consider another intervention. This is one application of POTT's purposeful use of self, rather than a requirement to reveal intimate details to the client. If personal circumstances are compromising judgment or our ability to offer care, reflection needs to lead to appropriate support and changes in the work. Insight alone does not discharge that responsibility.¹²

When our history has shaped a misattunement, repair can be plain. We acknowledge the specific intervention, invite its impact and change what we do. "I have been treating contact as the problem, and you have been trying to tell me about missing a witness to your life." Leandro does not owe the therapist reassurance that the error was understandable. The correction needs to become a different meeting.

Contact, children and the conditions of participation

Systems thinking can help us see recruitment, coalitions and the movement of distress through a family after separation. It can also be misused to recommend contact as evidence of differentiation. Bowen's framework emphasizes a considered position and the capacity to receive influence rather than reflexive accommodation or opposition. In this context, our application must remain subordinate to consent, safety, actual duties and realistic options.²

A former partner may no longer be an appropriate recipient of emotional processing while remaining someone with whom essential coordination occurs. We can help distinguish the audience and purpose of a communication: a practical arrangement, a request for acknowledgment, a legal question, a parenting concern or a wish for comfort. These may require different recipients and different forms of assistance.

Where coercive control or post-separation abuse is present, a routine mutual communication exercise is an inadequate frame. Do not use calmness as evidence of safety or symmetrical language to obscure power. Work within appropriate competence and coordinate with relevant specialist, legal or protective support. Educational suggestions do not amend orders, agreements or restrictions.

Children's needs require their own assessment. They should not become witnesses for one parent's case, couriers or primary sources of adult reassurance. Yet protecting them does not mean pretending nothing has happened or suppressing every feeling. The work is developmentally appropriate truth, dependable care and adult support that leaves children room for their own experience. Contact and parenting arrangements require attention to the particular circumstances, not a general ideal of harmony.

Adult children, former in-laws and stepfamilies also have agency. The client may grieve a bond they cannot preserve unilaterally. A direct invitation can be possible without treating a response as proof of loyalty. We can help someone express care without asking another person to resolve the marriage's meaning.

From a helpful encounter to a life that can receive it

The five BKL modules translate this clinical direction into education: present footing, the continuing reach, particular losses, ongoing contact and obligations, and renewed participation. Each contains the complete encounter-explanation-correction-experiment-result-revision cycle. The sequence is a scaffold for learning, not a timetable of recovery or a substitute for individualized treatment.

A learner might consider one ordinary message throughout the pathway, change situations, use fiction or do no writing. The pause precedes a possible response, while a brief route offers a worthwhile stopping place. Return review distinguishes helped, mixed, no noticeable difference, made things harder and did not try. An explanation can be rejected

independently of the outcome. A practical change may help even when our attachment formulation was mistaken.

The clinician's integration task is similarly specific. What did the person try? What happened to the practical concern? How did they experience support, and what made it usable or unwelcome? What needs more help, a different explanation or no further exercise? We can consolidate a small capacity without immediately requiring another challenge.

The existing articles [What Remains When We Cannot Make It Different](#), [Remaining Yourself in the Presence of Someone You Love](#), and [Becoming Yourself Without Leaving Relationship](#) offer adjacent clinical perspectives. Their questions remain useful after separation, while their language about connection must be interpreted in the person's actual circumstances.

At the end of the fictional session, Leandro has not stopped missing his former partner. The therapist has not persuaded him to reach out or refrain. Something more modest has happened: the loss he was describing has become clearer, and the therapist has allowed that clarification to change the work. They can now consider who might receive the news about his father, or simply remain for a moment with how much shared knowing has been lost.

Recovery may become visible in that kind of accuracy. A person can grieve without making sorrow their only identity, receive help without surrendering authorship, acknowledge harm without collapsing into contempt, and invest in a day whose meaning is still unfinished. Our task is to remain interested enough in the actual person that these possibilities can emerge in their own form, and that an unwelcome result can change what we offer next.

[Divorce, Separation, and Finding Your Footing Again](#)

[When the Life You Shared Comes Apart](#)

Research, clinical theory and literature make different contributions. The educational formulations and fictional examples do not establish BKL treatment effectiveness.

Bibliography

1. Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds: I. Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130(3), 201-210. [Source](#)
2. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. [Source](#)
3. AEDP Institute. (n.d.). AEDP psychotherapy. [Source](#)
4. Boss, P. (n.d.). About ambiguous loss. University of Minnesota. [Source](#)
5. Damasio, A. (2021, November 1). Opinion: Being, feeling, and knowing: Our path to consciousness. *The Scientist*. [Source](#)
6. Schore, A. (2022). Right brain-to-right brain psychotherapy: Recent scientific and clinical advances. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 21, Article 46. [Source](#)

7. Sbarra, D. A., Boals, A., Mason, A. E., Larson, G. M., & Mehl, M. R. (2013). Expressive writing can impede emotional recovery following marital separation. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 1(2), 120-134. [Source](#)
8. Sbarra, D. A., Smith, H. L., & Mehl, M. R. (2012). When leaving your ex, love yourself: Observational ratings of self-compassion predict the course of emotional recovery following marital separation. *Psychological Science*, 23(3), 261-269. [Source](#)
9. Slotter, E. B., Gardner, W. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(2), 147-160. [Source](#)
10. Aponte, H. J., & Kissil, K. (Eds.). (2016). *The person of the therapist training model: Mastering the use of self*. Routledge. [Source](#)
11. Sbarra, D. A. (2015). Divorce and health: Current trends and future directions. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 77(3), 227-236. [Source](#)
12. Aponte, H. J., & Kissil, K. (2014). "If I can grapple with this I can truly be of use in the therapy room": Using the therapist's own emotional struggles to facilitate effective therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 40(2), 152-164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12011> [Source](#)