African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
ISSN: 2689-5129
Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026 (pp. 13-27)
www.abjournals.org

WHY TRAUMA DOES NOT RESPOND TO TALK THERAPY: A SYMBOLIC–SOMATIC ACCOUNT OF CHANGE

Gary Ow

Swinburne University of Technology.

Email: garyow77@yahoo.com

Cite this article:

Gary Ow (2026), Why Trauma Does Not Respond to Talk Therapy: A Symbolic–Somatic Account of Change. African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research 9(2), 13-27. DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

Manuscript History

Received: 15 Jan 2026

Accepted: 20 Feb 2026

Published: 9 Mar 2026

ABSTRACT: *Despite its centrality in clinical practice, talk-based psychotherapy frequently proves insufficient for resolving trauma. This paper advances a* ***symbolic–somatic account*** *explaining why trauma often does not respond to verbal processing alone. Drawing on contemporary trauma theory, narrative psychology, and embodied cognition, the paper argues that traumatic experience is encoded not as propositional narrative but as a configuration of somatic states, affective charge, and pre-verbal symbolic meaning. To formalize the recovery process, the paper outlines a four-stage mechanism of change: symbolic engagement, affective shift, meaning transformation, and identity commitment. Crucially, this model is situated within a cross-cultural framework, integrating insights from African ritual healing traditions—such as rhythmic entrainment, communal witnessing, and initiatory rites—which anticipate modern neurobiological findings on memory reconsolidation and autonomic regulation. By reframing trauma as a symbolic–somatic system rather than a purely narrative problem, the paper clarifies the conditions under which language can once again become therapeutically effective. Ethical implications regarding sovereign authorship, pacing, and the client's right to delay processing are discussed.*

KEYWORDS: Symbolic–Somatic Change, Trauma Mechanisms, African Ritual Healing, Embodied Identity Reorganization, Collective Trauma Repair.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
ISSN: 2689-5129
Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026 (pp. 13-27)

www.abjournals.org

INTRODUCTION

Trauma is widely recognized as resistant to purely verbal forms of psychotherapy, yet the reasons for this resistance are often described in diffuse or metaphorical terms. Clients may gain insight, articulate coherent narratives, or intellectually understand their histories, while core symptoms—hyperarousal, dissociation, affective flooding, somatic distress, or identity fragmentation—remain largely unchanged. This persistent gap between understanding and transformation has prompted a growing body of work emphasizing embodiment, affect regulation, and non-verbal processes in trauma treatment (van der Kolk, 2014a). However, what remains undertheorized is *why* talk therapy fails so reliably in trauma cases and under what conditions language can once again become therapeutically effective. This paper argues that the central limitation of talk therapy lies not in language per se, but in a category error about how traumatic experience is encoded and maintained. Trauma is not primarily stored as autobiographical narrative or propositional belief; it is organized as a symbolic–somatic configuration comprising bodily states, affective charge, pre-reflective meaning, and implicit identity commitments. When therapy addresses trauma exclusively at the level of verbal articulation, it often produces narrative coherence without somatic recalibration, leaving the underlying system intact. As Winnicott (1960a) observed in early relational development, meaning emerges only within conditions of sufficient holding; without containment, interpretation becomes intrusive rather than integrative.

Building on this premise, the present paper situates trauma within a symbolic–somatic framework of change. Drawing on ritual theory (Turner, 1969a), psychoanalytic accounts of pre-verbal experience (Winnicott, 1960b), and contemporary trauma research (van der Kolk, 2014b), it proposes that therapeutic transformation requires symbolic engagement that directly interfaces with embodied regulation. Language functions not as an explanatory endpoint but as an *operator*—a symbolic instrument capable of reorganizing affect only when embedded in procedures that modulate intensity, pacing, and bodily state. This position is consistent with emerging work on symbolic tools and ritualized intervention in psychotherapy. Prior research has demonstrated that symbolic projection, mythic structuring, and somatic-symbolic protocols can facilitate recursive emotional processing where direct verbal inquiry fails (Ow, 2024; Ow, 2025a; Ow, 2025b). In high-acuity and adolescent contexts, symbolic interfaces such as projected figures, ritualized pathways, and non-discursive enactments allow clients to engage traumatic material without overwhelming affect or premature narrative foreclosure (Ow, 2025c). These approaches resonate with broader qualitative and ethnographic accounts of taboo, edgework, and embodied meaning-making, where transformation occurs through staged symbolic encounters rather than explicit explanation (Newmahr, 2011; Murray, 2017; Rambo Ronai, 1995). Importantly, trauma frequently involves domains that resist direct narration—sexuality, shame, power, dependency, and violation—domains that are culturally taboo and affectively charged. Research on sexual fantasy and taboo meaning-making suggests that symbolic framing enables engagement with these intensities in ways that propositional language cannot sustain (Moran & Stockwell, 2013; Richardson, 2021). Ritualized and symbolic forms create a buffer zone in which affect can move without collapsing the subject's sense of agency, a process Turner (1969b) described as liminality: a suspended space where structure is temporarily loosened to permit reorganization.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
ISSN: 2689-5129
Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026 (pp. 13-27)
www.abjournals.org

Within this context, talk therapy may fail not because clients are resistant, avoidant, or insufficiently reflective, but because it demands narrative integration before the symbolic–somatic system has regained regulatory capacity. Premature insistence on meaning-making can inadvertently reinforce dissociation, compliance, or intellectualization, producing what appears to be therapeutic progress without corresponding change. This problem is particularly evident in trauma survivors who can recount their histories fluently while remaining affectively unaltered—a phenomenon frequently misinterpreted as "treatment resistance."
The present paper extends a model of therapeutic change grounded in sovereign authorship and symbolic regulation (Ow, 2025d). Rather than assuming that processing must be continuous or exhaustive, this framework emphasizes containment, timing, and the client's right to delay engagement. Trauma resolution is reframed as a staged process in which symbolic engagement catalyzes affective shift, enabling meaning transformation and, ultimately, durable identity commitment. Talk becomes effective only when it follows—not precedes—somatic stabilization and symbolic reconfiguration.
By articulating a symbolic–somatic account of trauma, this paper clarifies both the limits of talk therapy and the specific conditions under which language can once again function as a tool of change rather than a surface gloss. In doing so, it contributes to ongoing efforts to bridge narrative, embodied, and ritual approaches to psychotherapy, offering a mechanistic explanation for why trauma so often resists words—and how it may finally begin to respond.

METHODOLOGY

Conceptual–Theoretical Design

This paper employs a theory-building and integrative analytic methodology rather than an experimental or outcome-comparison design. The aim is not to test a single intervention but to articulate a coherent *mechanism of change* explaining why trauma frequently does not respond to talk-based psychotherapy and under what conditions symbolic and somatic processes enable durable transformation. This approach is appropriate where the clinical phenomenon is widely observed, empirically documented, yet insufficiently theorized at the mechanistic level. The methodology integrates four complementary strands:

1. Clinical–theoretical synthesis
2. Symbolic–somatic process modeling
3. Comparative framework analysis
4. Reflexive validation through prior peer-reviewed work

Together, these strands allow for the construction of a falsifiable, internally coherent account of therapeutic change grounded in existing literature and clinical plausibility.
Clinical–Theoretical Synthesis
The primary method involves a structured synthesis of established trauma theory, psychoanalytic developmental models, ritual theory, and contemporary symbolic psychotherapy research. Rather than aggregating findings quantitatively, the analysis identifies points of convergence across domains where verbal processing alone is known to fail—

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

particularly in cases involving high affective load, dissociation, shame, taboo material, and pre-verbal memory.

Key conceptual inputs include:

- Somatic encoding of trauma and limits of narrative recall
- Pre-symbolic and transitional phenomena in early relational experience
- Ritualized containment and liminality as mechanisms of reorganization
- Symbolic mediation of taboo, intensity, and affective charge

These bodies of work are treated not as competing explanations but as describing different layers of the same symbolic–somatic system.

Symbolic–Somatic Process Modeling

Building on this synthesis, the paper develops a process model specifying how change occurs when symbolic engagement interfaces with embodied regulation. This model is articulated as a four-stage mechanism:

1. **Symbolic Engagement** – indirect or mediated access to traumatic material via symbolic forms (e.g., projection, metaphor, ritualized structure)
2. **Affective Shift** – measurable changes in somatic state, arousal, or affective organization
3. **Meaning Transformation** – reorganization of implicit meaning rather than propositional reinterpretation
4. **Identity Commitment** – stabilization of new meaning through choice, stance, or authorship

Each stage is analytically distinct but recursively linked, allowing the model to account for both progress and therapeutic stall. The model is evaluated for internal coherence, explanatory scope, and consistency with known clinical phenomena (e.g., insight without change, symptom persistence despite narrative clarity).

Comparative Framework Analysis

To clarify the specific limits of talk therapy, the paper conducts an implicit comparative analysis between:

- Purely verbal, insight-oriented, or cognitive-narrative approaches
- Symbolic–somatic approaches employing ritual, projection, or embodied mediation

Rather than positioning one modality as superior, the analysis examines **where in the change sequence each approach operates** and where mismatches occur. Talk therapy is shown to function effectively at later stages of the process (meaning transformation and identity

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

consolidation) but unreliably at earlier stages involving affect regulation and symbolic containment.

This comparative analysis avoids straw-man representations by grounding claims in widely acknowledged clinical observations and established theoretical limits.

Reflexive Validation and Prior Empirical Grounding

The model presented is further validated through reflexive integration with prior peer-reviewed frameworks developed by the author, including symbolic projection protocols, somatic-symbolic tools, and identity re-authoring architectures previously applied in adolescent, high-acuity, and transpersonal contexts. These prior works provide:

- Demonstrated clinical feasibility of symbolic mediation
- Repeated observation of affective change preceding verbal insight
- Independent peer review across multiple journals and populations

While no new empirical data are introduced in this paper, the methodology adheres to standards of **theoretical validity**: convergence with existing evidence, mechanistic plausibility, and applicability across clinical contexts.

Ethical and Epistemic Considerations

Finally, the methodology explicitly incorporates ethical restraint as a methodological constraint. The model rejects assumptions that therapeutic progress requires continuous disclosure, exhaustive processing, or immediate narrative integration. The client's right to pacing, delay, and non-engagement is treated as a methodological boundary condition rather than a clinical obstacle. This stance ensures that the proposed mechanism remains compatible with trauma-informed ethics, avoids coercive interpretation, and preserves client sovereignty in meaning-making.

Summary

In sum, this methodology combines integrative theory synthesis, symbolic–somatic process modeling, and comparative analysis to produce a coherent account of why trauma often does not respond to talk therapy. By prioritizing mechanistic clarity over procedural prescription, the approach offers a foundation for future empirical testing, protocol development, and clinical application without overextending its claims beyond what the evidence can support.

Symbolic–Somatic Mechanisms of Therapeutic Change

This section presents the explanatory outcomes of the symbolic–somatic analysis. Rather than reporting empirical results, it specifies the mechanisms by which trauma resists verbal processing and the conditions under which therapeutic change becomes possible. The claims advanced here are grounded in convergent observations across trauma research, psychoanalytic theory, ritual studies, and symbolic psychotherapy.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
ISSN: 2689-5129
Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026 (pp. 13-27)

www.abjournals.org

Insight without Change in Trauma

A widely documented phenomenon in trauma treatment is the coexistence of high narrative insight with limited symptomatic or affective change. Clients may articulate detailed accounts of traumatic events, demonstrate reflective understanding of their origins, and endorse adaptive interpretations, while continuing to exhibit hyperarousal, dissociation, or somatic distress (van der Kolk, 2014). This pattern has been noted across psychodynamic, narrative, and trauma-focused contexts and is often described clinically as "knowing but not feeling."

From a symbolic–somatic perspective, this phenomenon reflects the dissociation between explicit narrative representation and implicit bodily encoding. Trauma is not primarily stored as autobiographical memory but as patterns of physiological activation, affective readiness, and pre-verbal meaning that operate independently of conscious insight (van der Kolk, 2014). As a result, verbal understanding can increase narrative coherence without altering the embodied systems that maintain threat perception and defensive response.

Winnicott's (1960c) developmental account of early experience supports this distinction: meaning emerges only when experience is held within sufficient containment. Where containment is absent, interpretation does not integrate experience but risks reproducing intrusion. Insight without change is therefore not paradoxical within a symbolic–somatic model; it is an expected outcome of addressing trauma at the wrong level of organization.

Repetition, Coherence, and the Intensification of Distress

The limits of talk therapy become particularly evident in cases where repeated verbal recounting of traumatic material increases narrative coherence while intensifying distress. Trauma survivors may become more fluent, organized, and articulate in their accounts, even as affective symptoms worsen or remain unchanged (van der Kolk, 2014). This effect can be understood as repeated somatic reactivation without regulatory resolution. When verbal exposure occurs in the absence of adequate affect modulation or symbolic containment, narrative recall functions as a trigger rather than an integrative process. Rather than transforming meaning, language re-elicits the original physiological and affective states associated with threat.

Qualitative accounts of trauma, taboo, and embodied memory similarly document that direct narration can amplify shame, arousal, or dissociation when symbolic distance is insufficient (Rambo Ronai, 1995; Murray, 2017). These findings challenge the assumption that verbalization is inherently therapeutic and instead point to the necessity of intermediate regulatory mechanisms.

Symbolic Mediation and Affective Regulation

Symbolic mediation provides such a mechanism. Ritualized forms, projected figures, metaphorical structures, and transitional symbolic objects allow traumatic material to be engaged indirectly, reducing affective overload while maintaining experiential contact. Turner's (1969) account of ritual and liminality describes how symbolic structure creates a bounded space in which intense material can be reorganized without collapsing existing identity structures.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

In clinical contexts, symbolic tools function as regulatory interfaces between somatic intensity and reflective meaning. By displacing traumatic material from autobiographical immediacy into symbolic representation, affect can move without overwhelming the subject's regulatory capacity. This mechanism has been demonstrated in symbolic projection protocols and somatic–symbolic tools used in both adolescent and high-acuity therapeutic settings (Ow, 2024; Ow, 2025a; Ow, 2025b).

Crucially, symbolic mediation does not bypass affect; it modulates it. Rather than suppressing intensity, symbols scaffold engagement so that affective charge can be reorganized rather than merely endured.

Affective Shift as a Precondition for Meaning Transformation

Across trauma and symbolic psychotherapy literature, durable change is consistently preceded by shifts in embodied state rather than by insight alone (van der Kolk, 2014c; Ow, 2025a). When somatic load decreases—evidenced by reduced hyperarousal, increased affect tolerance, or restored playfulness—the range of meanings available to the client expands. Meaning transformation at this stage differs from cognitive reframing. Rather than replacing beliefs, it involves a reorganization of implicit meanings encoded in bodily response, such as expectations of danger, powerlessness, or compliance. Once affective charge shifts, verbal articulation often follows spontaneously, functioning as a description of an already altered experiential field rather than a mechanism of change.

This sequencing aligns with psychoanalytic accounts of transitional phenomena, in which symbolic play precedes reflective understanding (Winnicott, 1960d), and with ethnographic analyses showing that embodied and ritualized engagement often precedes narrative reinterpretation (Newmahr, 2011; Turner, 1969c).

Identity Commitment and the Stabilization of Change

Following affective and symbolic reorganization, therapeutic change stabilizes through identity commitment—the adoption of a new stance, role, or self-position that is no longer undermined by somatic threat responses. This process corresponds to what has been described as sovereign authorship: the capacity to choose meaning and orientation without immediate physiological override (Ow, 2025c).

Commitments made prior to somatic regulation tend to collapse under stress, appearing clinically as relapse or non-compliance. When made after affective shift, however, they demonstrate durability across contexts. Language regains therapeutic efficacy at this stage, supporting integration, articulation, and interpersonal communication of the new identity position.

Boundary Conditions for Talk Therapy

Within the symbolic–somatic framework, talk therapy is neither rejected nor privileged. Its effectiveness depends on specific boundary conditions. Verbal interventions are most effective when somatic load has been reduced, symbolic mediation has facilitated affective movement, and the client retains agency over pacing and disclosure (van der Kolk, 2014d; Ow, 2024). Absent these conditions, talk risks reinforcing dissociation, intellectualization, or compliance rather than promoting integration. The failure of talk therapy in trauma thus reflects a mismatch

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

between intervention modality and system state, not a deficiency in client capacity or motivation.

SUMMARY

The symbolic–somatic analysis clarifies why trauma frequently resists talk therapy and why symbolic, ritualized, and embodied interventions succeed where verbal processing alone fails. Therapeutic change unfolds through a staged process: symbolic mediation enables affective shift; affective shift permits meaning transformation, and meaning transformation stabilizes through identity commitment. Language becomes effective only when this sequence is respected.

ANALYSIS

The symbolic–somatic account advanced in this paper does not emerge in isolation. Rather, it aligns with a converging set of contemporary literatures that, taken together, clarify why trauma frequently resists purely verbal intervention and why symbolic mediation plays a central role in durable change. These convergences can be organized across five domains: image-first depth psychology, embodied archetypal cognition, narrative identity as recovery ecology, ritual as mechanism, and sovereignty or authorship as an ethics of interpretation. Read together, these lines of work support the claim that symbolic–somatic engagement is not an aesthetic preference but a mechanistically coherent response to how meaning and selfhood stabilize under conditions of affective load.

Image-First Depth Psychology and Clinical Anti-Reductionism

A recurring theme in James Hillman's depth psychology is that the psyche is not exhausted by explanation (Hillman, 1975). Images are not merely coded messages awaiting interpretation; they are primary phenomena that must be encountered on their own terms. Hillman's insistence on "sticking to the image" functions as an explicit resistance to reductive explanatory habits that translate imaginal material too quickly into causal or diagnostic language. Recent scholarship connecting Hillman's work to phenomenology sharpens this position into a methodological stance: therapeutic engagement should privilege disciplined attention to imaginal presentation over premature interpretive closure. Meaning is not extracted from images; it unfolds through sustained contact with them. Within this view, symbolic material is not a detour from psychological work but its central medium.
This orientation supports the present paper's argument that therapeutic change cannot be reliably produced through explanation alone. When trauma is approached primarily through interpretation, the imaginal field is subordinated to cognition, often at the expense of affective regulation. An image-first stance, by contrast, preserves symbolic material as a site of active engagement, allowing it to function as a stabilizing intermediary between bodily state and reflective meaning.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research
ISSN: 2689-5129
Volume 9, Issue 2, 2026 (pp. 13-27)
www.abjournals.org

Embodied Archetypal Cognition and the Symbolic–Somatic Bridge

One longstanding critique of archetypal language is that it is literary, metaphorical, or culturally imposed rather than psychologically grounded. Contemporary work in embodied cognition directly addresses this concern. Goodwyn's argument that archetypal images function as innate embodied metaphors reframes archetypes as biologically anchored mappings between bodily experience and symbolic form, rather than as abstract narrative motifs.

From this perspective, symbols matter not because they are evocative, but because they are *body-readable*. They participate in the same representational substrate as sensation, affect, and action readiness. This provides a mechanistic explanation for why symbolic engagement can reorganize felt sense in ways that verbal reinterpretation often cannot.
The implications for trauma work are significant. If traumatic meaning is encoded at the level of embodied metaphor and affective readiness, then interventions limited to verbal narrative will necessarily operate downstream of the problem. Symbolic mediation, by contrast, interfaces directly with the bodily systems through which threat, safety, and agency are experienced.

Narrative Identity as Authorship Ecology

Research on narrative identity has increasingly moved beyond the idea of storytelling as an individual cognitive achievement toward a more ecological understanding of authorship. Narrative identity has been conceptualized as both a vulnerability and a resource in mental illness and recovery, shaped through social co-authoring, cultural master narratives, and relational context (Thomsen, Cowan, & McAdams, 2021).
Within this frame, psychological distress is not simply a matter of having a maladaptive story, but of being caught within narrative systems that constrain authorship. Recovery is less about editing the storyline and more about deciding who is authorized to play the character. In practical terms, this means choosing one's inner "video-game skin": the symbolic or archetypal operator through which experience is interpreted and action becomes possible. This shift aligns with clinical observations that trauma survivors often struggle less with narrative absence than with narrative capture—by symptoms, by institutional language, or by the expectations of others.
The symbolic–somatic approach articulated in this paper addresses this problem indirectly but effectively. By delaying premature narrative consolidation and prioritizing affective regulation and symbolic engagement, it preserves the conditions for authorship to be reclaimed later. Narrative revision becomes possible only once the organism is no longer organized around threat.

Ritual as Mechanism, Not Ornament

Ritual has long been acknowledged as meaningful, but recent work has returned to ritual as a *mechanism* rather than a symbolic ornament. Warran's integration of interaction ritual theory with social identity approaches to health treats ritual participation as a generator of identity coherence and well-being, not merely a container for shared meaning.
This shift is directly relevant to trauma treatment. Structured symbolic sequences—preparation, activation, liminal engagement, and closure—provide containment architectures that regulate intensity, pace participation, and support integration. Ritualized structure does not add meaning to therapeutic work; it delivers meaning in a form that can be tolerated and

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

stabilized.
Within the symbolic–somatic framework, ritual functions as a delivery system for affective and identity change. It stages experience in ways that make engagement voluntary rather than overwhelming, thereby reducing the risk that therapeutic intensity reproduces traumatic dynamics.

Sovereignty and the Ethics of Interpretation

A final convergence appears in contemporary discussions of sovereignty as an ethical principle of interpretation. In adjacent fields such as AI ethics, the concept of affective sovereignty has been proposed to describe the subject's right to interpret their own emotional states rather than having meaning imposed externally.

Although emerging outside psychotherapy, this language clarifies a central ethical tension in trauma treatment. Survivors are often vulnerable not only to the memory of past events, but to ongoing interpretive capture—by institutions, diagnostic frameworks, relational pressures, or therapeutic agendas. When therapy demands disclosure or meaning-making before the client has regained regulatory capacity, it risks repeating this violation.
The symbolic–somatic stance advanced here reframes pacing, containment delay, and non-engagement not as avoidance, but as ethical safeguards. Protecting interpretive jurisdiction becomes a clinical priority. Meaning is not extracted from the client; it is allowed to emerge when bodily and affective conditions permit.

Integrative Implications

Across these five domains, a consistent pattern emerges: durable psychological change depends on respecting the symbolic–somatic conditions under which meaning can be safely reorganized. Image-first engagement, embodied symbolism, narrative ecology, ritual containment, and interpretive sovereignty converge on a single conclusion. Language becomes therapeutic not by force of explanation, but by timing—when affect has shifted, symbols have done their regulatory work, and authorship can be exercised without threat.
This convergence strengthens the central claim of the paper: trauma does not fail to respond to talk therapy because words are ineffective, but because words are often introduced before the system is ready to receive them.

Symbolic–Somatic Change Beyond Western Clinical Paradigms

The Symbolic–Somatic model aligns not only with contemporary trauma science but also with longstanding African ritual traditions that privilege embodied, communal, and symbolic transformation over purely discursive processing. While Western psychotherapy has historically foregrounded verbal reflection as the primary vehicle of change, many African healing systems situate transformation within rhythmic embodiment, collective witnessing, ancestral invocation, and initiatory restructuring of identity. These traditions illuminate a broader ecology of change in which meaning is enacted, not merely interpreted.

African ritual healing practices frequently employ communal drumming, call-and-response song, dance, and trance states as regulatory technologies. Rhythmic entrainment fosters physiological synchrony and co-regulation within the group, reinforcing belonging and safety. Contemporary research in embodied cognition suggests that interpersonal synchrony

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

influences therapeutic alliance and outcome (Mende & Schmidt, 2021). Such findings resonate strongly with communal ritual forms in which coordinated movement and shared rhythm recalibrate autonomic states before narrative meaning is revisited. Ancestor invocation and initiation rites similarly enact symbolic reorganization. Initiation ceremonies mark identity transitions—child to adult, wounded to restored, outsider to integrated member—through structured symbolic death and rebirth. These rites reorganize social identity at both the intrapsychic and communal levels. African spiritual healing traditions, including ancestral reverence and plant-mediated rituals such as Iboga ceremonies in certain Central African contexts, emphasize embodied ordeal, guided visionary encounter, and communal reintegration as mechanisms of repair (Mthethwa & Bhagwan, 2025). Rather than privileging insight alone, these practices sequence affective activation, somatic intensity, symbolic confrontation, and communal witnessing—precisely the pattern predicted by memory reconsolidation models, which hold that emotional activation followed by corrective experience is necessary for durable change (Ecker & Vaz, 2022). From a cultural neuroscience perspective, symbolic forms are not culturally neutral carriers of universal cognition; they are neurocognitively embedded in sociocultural learning histories (Han, 2015). Ritual symbols activate culturally shaped affective and identity networks. The Symbolic–Somatic account therefore does not treat symbolism as abstract metaphor but as a culturally situated compression node that binds autobiographical memory, affect, moral positioning, and action tendencies. When enacted within a culturally resonant ritual context, symbolic activation may reorganize survival circuitry more efficiently than abstract reframing alone.

Decolonial psychology further challenges the assumption that Western talk therapy represents a universal standard of psychological care (Adams et al., 2015). Psychological suffering is embedded in historical, political, and communal conditions. Accordingly, healing cannot be reduced to private cognitive restructuring detached from collective experience. African oral traditions exemplify identity regulation through narrative performance: proverbs, praise poetry, communal storytelling, and mythic recitation function as living archives of meaning that scaffold moral identity and communal continuity. Story is not merely expressive; it is constitutive. The act of telling and retelling within a witnessing community reorganizes selfhood in relation to lineage, land, and obligation.

Collective trauma repair in many African contexts similarly centers communal witnessing. Public testimony, ritual lamentation, cleansing rites, and reconciliation ceremonies externalize suffering into shared symbolic space. The group does not passively observe; it metabolizes the event. This aligns with reconsolidation theory: traumatic memory requires activation within a safe relational field before it can be updated (Ecker & Vaz, 2022). The ritual container supplies that field. In this sense, African healing traditions anticipate contemporary trauma science by centuries, operationalizing mechanisms of affective activation, embodied regulation, symbolic restructuring, and communal validation without reliance on purely discursive explanation. The Symbolic–Somatic model therefore positions itself not as a Western innovation but as a cross-cultural articulation of convergent mechanisms. It recognizes ritual, rhythm, ordeal, and collective narration as legitimate technologies of identity reorganization. By integrating embodied cognition (Mende & Schmidt, 2021), cultural neuroscience (Han, 2015), decolonial critique (Adams et al., 2015), African ritual scholarship (Mthethwa & Bhagwan, 2025), and reconsolidation research (Ecker & Vaz, 2022), the model situates trauma repair within a

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

broader social science framework that honors both contemporary empirical inquiry and longstanding communal wisdom.

Social Implications: Schools, Post-Conflict Settings, and Community Repair

Extending the Symbolic–Somatic framework beyond the clinic has direct implications for educational and post-conflict environments. In schools, particularly in contexts marked by historical inequities or communal trauma, interventions that incorporate rhythmic regulation (e.g., structured group movement, music), symbolic role-reversal exercises, and collective storytelling circles may offer more effective regulation and identity stabilization than purely cognitive behavioral instruction. Embodied, communal practices create relational safety before academic or behavioral demands are imposed.

In post-conflict settings, trauma is rarely individual. Collective witnessing rituals, public narrative reconstruction, and symbolic acts of reconciliation can facilitate shared meaning-making and restore social cohesion. Community-level enactments of grief and repair may update collective memory networks in ways that isolated talk-based interventions cannot achieve. Similarly, in community repair contexts—urban violence, displacement, intergenerational marginalization—symbolic ceremonies and culturally grounded practices can restore moral narrative continuity and social belonging.

By recognizing that transformation is simultaneously somatic, symbolic, and communal, the model invites collaboration between clinicians, educators, spiritual leaders, and community organizers. Trauma repair becomes not only a psychological task but a sociocultural one—requiring embodied participation, narrative re-authoring, and shared symbolic containers that extend beyond the therapy room.

DISCUSSION

This paper explains why trauma often does not improve with talk therapy alone. Instead of blaming clients for being resistant, avoidant, or lacking insight, the paper shows that the problem is a mismatch. Talk therapy works mainly with words and stories, but trauma is often stored deeper than language. It is held in the body, in emotions, and in early symbolic experience that existed before clear words were available. When therapy works only at the level of talking, lasting change is less likely.

This view helps explain several common problems seen in trauma therapy. First, many clients understand their trauma very well but still feel stuck. They can explain what happened and why it affected them, yet their symptoms remain. Second, repeated talking about traumatic events can sometimes make distress worse instead of better. This often happens when there is not enough emotional safety or regulation. Once trauma is understood as a body-based and symbolic process, these outcomes are no longer surprising.

The paper does not argue that language is useless in therapy. Instead, it explains *when* talking works best. Talk therapy becomes effective after emotional intensity has lowered and the body feels safer. When symbolic or non-verbal work helps calm the nervous system first, words can then support understanding, connection, and integration. If talking starts too early, it can increase dissociation, emotional shutdown, or overthinking.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

There are also important ethical points. The symbolic–somatic approach highlights pacing, safety, and the right to wait. It challenges the idea that healing always requires constant talking or full disclosure. For trauma survivors, being pushed to speak before they feel ready can repeat feelings of loss of control. Ethical therapy protects a person's right to decide *when*, *how*, and *whether* meaning is expressed.

Finally, this paper places symbolic and ritual-like methods within a practical framework. Symbols, guided imagery, and structured therapeutic sequences are not decorative extras. They are tools that help manage emotional intensity and make change possible. This perspective encourages closer links between trauma therapy, narrative psychology, and ritual studies, with a focus on *how* change happens rather than which therapy label is used.

LIMITATIONS

This paper has several limitations. First, it is a theoretical paper. It brings together existing research and clinical observations but does not present new data. Future studies are needed to test the proposed ideas in clinical settings and across different groups of clients. Second, the symbolic–somatic approach may feel unfamiliar to therapists trained mainly in verbal or cognitive methods. Ideas such as symbolic engagement, ritual structure, and emotional pacing require careful learning. This paper does not provide step-by-step techniques or training guidelines, which limits how directly it can be applied in practice. Third, symbolic and body-based work can be risky if done without proper care. If therapists are not well-trained, such methods can increase emotional intensity rather than reduce it. The approach described here assumes careful pacing, informed consent, and strong professional judgment, which may not always be present.

Finally, this paper does not explore cultural differences in depth. Symbols and rituals are shaped by culture, and what feels safe or meaningful can vary widely. More research is needed to understand how symbolic–somatic approaches work across different cultural and social settings.

CONCLUSION

Trauma is often described as difficult to treat because clients do not respond well to talk therapy. This paper offers a different explanation. Trauma resists words because it is not mainly stored as a story. It lives in the body, in emotions, and in deep symbolic patterns that words alone cannot reach.

By outlining a symbolic–somatic model of change, the paper shows why talking by itself often fails and why symbolic and embodied approaches can succeed. Change happens in stages. Symbolic engagement helps shift emotional states. Once emotions settle, meaning can change. When meaning changes, identity can stabilize. Words work best after these steps, not before them.

The message is both practical and ethical. Good trauma therapy is not just about what is said but about timing and safety. Allowing people to move at their own pace and choose when to

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

speak is not avoidance—it is respect for agency. This approach does not reject talk therapy. Instead, it places language where it belongs: as a way to support and strengthen change that has already begun.

Together, these ideas encourage a shift away from explanation-first models of therapy and toward approaches that respect the body, symbolism, and the conditions needed for real change to take hold.

REFERENCES

Adams, G., Dobles, I., Gómez, L. H., Kurtiş, T., & Molina, L. E. (2015). Decolonizing psychological science: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*(1), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.564

Ecker, B., & Vaz, A. (2022). Memory reconsolidation and the crisis of mechanism in psychotherapy. *New Ideas in Psychology, 66*, 100945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2022.100945

Goodwyn, E. (2024). *The human body is the collective unconscious: Archetypal images as innate embodied metaphors*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.38099.96948
(Preprint / conceptual paper grounded in embodied cognition and archetypal metaphor theory.)

Han, S. (2015). Understanding cultural differences in human behavior: A cultural neuroscience approach. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 3*, 68–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.01.013

Hillman, J. (1975). *Re-visioning psychology*. Harper & Row.

Hillman, J. (1983). *Archetypal psychology: A brief account*. Spring Publications.

Hillman, J. (1989). *The myth of analysis: Three essays in archetypal psychology*. Northwestern University Press.

McAdams, D. P. (2013). *The redemptive self: Stories Americans live by* (Revised and expanded ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mende, M. A., & Schmidt, H. (2021). Psychotherapy in the framework of embodied cognition—Does interpersonal synchrony influence therapy success? *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12*, 562490. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.562490

Moran, D., & Stockwell, F. M. J. (2013). A relational frame theory account of the emergence of sexual fantasy. *The Behavior Analyst*, 36(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03392305

Murray, F. (2017). Researching the taboo: Reflections on an ethno-autobiography. *Qualitative Research*, 17(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794116655792

Mthethwa, N., & Bhagwan, R. (2025). A Journey into African Spirituality: An Exploration of Its Key Values, Traditions, and Healing Methodologies. *Religions, 16*(10), 1300. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16101300

Newmahr, S. (2011). Chaos, order, and collaboration: Toward a feminist conceptualization of edgework. *Symbolic Interaction*, 34(3), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2011.34.3.349

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38

Ow, G. (2024). Re-authoring identity through the psyche-myth architecture: A structured framework for transpersonal psychotherapy. *Journal of Contemporary Approaches in Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 2(2), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.57017/jcapp.v2.i2.05

Ow, G. (2025). Inner architecture and narrative re-authorship: A contemporary psychotherapeutic approach for high-acuity clients. *Journal of Contemporary Approaches in Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 3(3), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.57017/jcapp.v3.i3.01

Ow, G. (2025). The symbol does the work: Deploying somatic-symbolic tools for emotional recursion in therapy. *Human Arenas*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-025-00527-5

Ow, G. (2025). Symbolic projection tools in adolescent counselling: The Animal Gate and Desert Path protocols. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.51317/jhss.v4i1.747

Ow, G. (2025). Sovereign authorship: A model of meaning-making, stance selection, and affect regulation. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.51317/jhss.v4i1.870

Ow, G. (2025). Precanonical symbolic rituals and the erotic archive: Mapping the roots of mythic selfhood through evocative autoethnography. *Ife PsychologIA*, 33(2).

Rambo Ronai, C. (1995). Multiple reflections of child sex abuse: An argument for a layered account. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 23(4), 395–426. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124195023004001

Rambo Ronai, C. (1996). My mother is mentally retarded. In C. Ellis & A. P. Bochner (Eds.), *Composing ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing* (pp. 109–131). AltaMira Press.

Richardson, J. W. (2021). Silence, shame, and disrupting heteronormative ethics in sexualities research: Autoethnographic reflections of a queer researcher. *Sexualities*, 24(1–2), 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460719892650

Thomsen, D. K., Cowan, T., & McAdams, D. P. (2025). Narrative identity, mental illness, and personal recovery. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 104, Article 104508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2025.104508

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Aldine.

van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. Viking.

Warran, L. (2025). Ritual, social identity, and health: Integrating interaction ritual theory with social identity approaches. *Frontiers in Social Psychology*, 16, Article 1477404. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsps.2025.1477404

Winnicott, D. W. (1960). The theory of the parent–infant relationship. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 41, 585–595.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJSSHR-I6PQDB38