CONFERENCE NOTES · 2007

No Relating Cure without Embodiment: Notes

By Michael Soth

Notes for a presentation arguing that the relational turn in psychotherapy — however necessary and valuable — remains incomplete without a full engagement with embodiment. The claim that 'it's the relationship that matters' is true but insufficient: what kind of relating? And is verbal relating, however warm and genuine, sufficient to reach the somatic substrate where the wound lives?

KEY THEMES

— The relational claim and its somatic limit

— Embodiment as the ground of genuine relating

— Why verbal relationship alone cannot reach the wound

— The therapist's embodied aliveness as therapeutic instrument

— Integrating relational and somatic traditions fully

The Relational Claim

The claim that 'it's the relationship that matters' has become something close to consensus across the psychotherapy field. This represents a genuine and important shift from earlier beliefs that cure comes primarily through the correct application of technique or the achievement of insight. But the claim requires more careful examination than it usually receives.

What kind of relationship is curative? Is any warm, empathic relationship therapeutic, provided it is genuine? Or is there something more specific — something which requires the relationship to engage with the full embodied complexity of the client's wounding, rather than simply providing a warm verbal encounter?

The relational turn, taken seriously, leads not away from embodiment but directly towards it. If the wound is relational in origin — and it is — then the relationship which heals must be able to engage with the wound at the level at which it lives, which is primarily the pre-verbal, somatic, implicit level of experience.

No Relating Cure without Embodiment

The subtitle of these notes makes a specific claim: that relating cannot be curative without embodiment. By 'embodiment' I mean not body-oriented technique but the quality of the therapist's own bodily presence — their aliveness, their genuine somatic responsiveness to the client, their willingness to be moved and affected at the bodily level.

A purely verbal relationship, however warm and empathic, cannot reach the level at which the wound is stored. The wounding which brings clients to therapy happened largely before language, or in the non-verbal dimensions of early relationship. It is held in the body — in postural patterns, breathing patterns, muscle tensions, autonomic nervous system responses that were laid down long before the cognitive mind developed.

The therapist's embodied presence — the quality of their own bodymind aliveness in the room — is not an optional extra or a supplement to the real relational work. It is the ground on which genuine relating becomes possible. Without it, the relationship may be warm and containing at the verbal-cognitive level while remaining unable to reach the level where transformation actually happens.

Integrating the Two Traditions

The task, therefore, is not to choose between the relational tradition and the somatic tradition, but to integrate them at the deepest level — not eclectically (adding somatic techniques to relational practice) but integrally (allowing each tradition to question and enrich the other's fundamental assumptions).

From the relational tradition, the somatic tradition learns that the therapist's embodied presence cannot be understood independently of the relational field in which it operates — that somatic attunement is always already a relational act, not a neutral observation of the client's body-state.

From the somatic tradition, the relational tradition learns that genuine relating requires embodied aliveness, not just verbal warmth — that the quality of contact between two people is registered primarily at the somatic level, and that a therapist who is not genuinely alive in their own body cannot offer the kind of contact that heals.

This integration is the work of an integral-relational body psychotherapy: not a synthesis that flattens the tension between the two traditions, but a living practice that holds them in productive relationship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Soth, M. (2005) Relating as cure. Unpublished conference paper

— Soth, M. (2005) Embodied countertransference. In N. Totton (ed.) New Dimensions in Body Psychotherapy. OUP

— Soth, M. (2006) How the wound enters the consulting room. Therapy Today

— Mitchell, S. (1988) Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis. Cambridge MA: Harvard

— Totton, N. (2003) Body Psychotherapy: An Introduction. Buckingham: OUP

Published at soth.co.uk · © 2007 Michael Soth · All rights reserved