

The Silent Body: Somatic Expressions of Psychological Conflict

Dr. Maya Chen¹, Prof. André Silva²

¹Department of Psychology, National University of Singapore, Singapore

²Centre for Psychosomatic Medicine, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Abstract

Human psychological conflict frequently “speaks” through the **body in silence**, producing somatic expressions that span from pain and tension to medically unexplained physical symptoms. This interdisciplinary review examines the **psychobiological, cognitive, and sociocultural mechanisms** underlying somatic expressions of psychological conflict and integrates theoretical and empirical literature from neuroscience, clinical psychology, and psychosomatic medicine. Evidence suggests that **deficits in emotional awareness and regulation** are associated with heightened somatic symptom burden, and that **interoceptive and autonomic processing** mechanisms function as the bridge between psychological states and somatic experience. We also explore how early psychoanalytic and contemporary psychosomatic theories conceptualize somatic expressions as manifestations of unresolved conflict and defense processes, and why functional somatic syndromes are often linked with trauma histories. The review highlights how cultural factors shape somatic symptom expression and outlines clinical implications for assessment and intervention. We conclude that somatic symptoms are not merely epiphenomena of psychological conflict but are **complex, embodied expressions** of affective and cognitive dynamics, demanding integrated approaches in research and practice to understand and treat the silent body.

Keywords

somatic expression, psychological conflict, somatization, emotion regulation, body-mind interaction, psychosomatic symptoms, interoceptive awareness, functional somatic syndromes

1. Introduction: The Silent Body and Psychological Conflict

Psychological conflict — whether internal (e.g., emotional ambivalence, suppressed affect) or interpersonal (e.g., unresolved trauma) — often finds expression not only in thoughts, feelings, and behavior but also through **bodily sensations and symptoms**. This phenomenon, described clinically as **somatization**, refers to the experience and reporting of physical symptoms that cannot be fully explained by organic pathology but are associated with psychological distress. Historically, somatization was conceptualized as a defense mechanism converting emotional conflict into bodily distress, a notion rooted in early psychoanalytic theory. Over time, contemporary perspectives have expanded the explanatory framework to include **neurobiological, cognitive, and cultural pathways** linking psychological conflict to bodily expression.

While the prevalence of somatic symptom reporting is high in primary care settings, the mechanisms by which psychological conflict translates into somatic experience remain multifaceted and not fully understood. This review draws on multidisciplinary evidence to

clarify **how somatic symptoms arise, what they signify, and how they should be understood in clinical and research contexts.**

2. Historical and Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Psychoanalytic and Early Somatic Theories

The concept of converting psychological conflict into somatic symptoms has roots in classic psychoanalytic theory, where **conversion mechanisms** were proposed to explain how repressed affect becomes expressed through bodily complaints. Freud and early followers posited that emotional conflict could be “displaced” onto the body in the absence of conscious awareness.

Similarly, self-psychology perspectives later suggested that somatization may occur when individuals with disruptions in self-cohesion use bodily symptoms as **experiential manifestations of unresolved conflict** or defenses against affective arousal that threatens psychic coherence.

2.2 The Biopsychosocial Model and Psychosomatic Medicine

Modern conceptualizations emphasize that **somatic expressions are not purely psychological or purely physical**, but rather emerge from interactions among biological, psychological, and social factors. This contrasts with dualistic mind–body models and aligns with the biopsychosocial framework, which frames somatic symptoms as complex products of neural, affective, cognitive, and contextual processes.

3. Mechanisms of Somatic Expression

3.1 Neural and Autonomic Pathways

Research into mind–body interactions highlights that psychological states exert top-down and bottom-up influences on bodily systems. For example, studies on anxiety and somatic symptoms demonstrate how **interoceptive processes and autonomic nervous system dynamics** contribute to bodily sensations that correspond with psychological distress.

Interoception — the brain’s monitoring of internal bodily signals — plays a central role in how emotions are felt and interpreted. Deficits in interoceptive awareness or the ability to identify and describe bodily sensations have been linked with increased somatic symptom reporting and difficulties in emotion regulation.

3.2 Emotional Awareness and Regulation

Empirical studies show that individuals with high somatic symptom burden often have difficulties identifying and describing their emotions (alexithymia), suggesting that **poor emotional awareness predisposes individuals to somatic expressions of conflict.**

In clinical populations, disturbances in emotion regulation are frequently observed alongside somatic symptoms; systematic reviews have found that emotion regulation disruptions characterize patients with somatic symptom disorders.

3.3 Functional Somatic Syndromes and Trauma

Functional somatic syndromes — such as fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue, and irritable bowel syndrome — show robust associations with histories of psychological trauma and PTSD. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that individuals with traumatic experiences are more likely to develop these somatic syndromes, implying that **psychological conflict rooted in trauma may later be expressed somatically.**

4. Phenomenology of Somatic Expressions

4.1 Bodily Expression of Distress

Somatic symptoms are not merely random pain but often reflect a person's embodied experience of emotional distress. Qualitative studies exploring adolescents with somatic symptom disorder emphasize how physical symptoms can be powerful expressions of internal states that defy purely verbal articulation, particularly for distress that is socially or emotionally difficult to articulate.

4.2 Emotional and Interoceptive Awareness

The link between emotional awareness and somatic perception is also central to psychosomatic congruence — the alignment between felt bodily states and psychological meanings. Body-oriented mentalization processes can help individuals decode bodily sensations and relate them to underlying emotional states.

5. Cultural and Social Contexts

5.1 Cross-Cultural Differences in Somatization

Somatic expressions of psychological conflict vary across cultural contexts; collectivist cultures may exhibit a stronger tendency to experience distress in bodily terms due to norms that discourage direct emotional expression. Cross-cultural research on somatic awareness and interoception suggests that culture shapes both the perception and reporting of somatic symptoms.

5.2 Historical and Social Meanings of Bodily Illness

Ethnographic studies of war survivors reveal how somatic illness becomes a culturally mediated way to articulate trauma and vulnerability when direct discussion of conflict experiences is constrained. In such contexts, somatic illness serves as a **mediated narrative of subjective experience and psychological conflict**.

6. Clinical Implications

6.1 Assessment of Somatic Symptoms

Because somatic symptoms can reflect underlying psychological conflict, clinicians must assess both **bodily and affective dimensions** when evaluating patients. Structured interviews, somatic awareness measures, and careful clinical histories help clarify whether symptoms are primarily somatic, psychological, or mixed in origin.

6.2 Therapeutic Approaches

Therapeutic strategies often integrate approaches that enhance emotional awareness and regulation, support interoceptive processing, and address trauma histories that may underlie somatic symptom patterns. Preliminary evidence suggests that emotional awareness and expression therapy can reduce somatic symptom severity by improving emotional processing, showing promise for integrated mind–body interventions.

7. Integrating Perspectives: Toward a Unified Framework

Somatic expressions of psychological conflict demand frameworks that unify **neurobiological, psychological, and socio-cultural perspectives**. Such models acknowledge that somatic

symptoms are neither mere “all in the head” phenomena nor purely physical pathology but are **embodied expressions** shaped by affect, cognition, and context.

Future research should aim to refine these integrated models through longitudinal designs, cross-cultural comparisons, and multimodal measurement combining neural, autonomic, and experiential data.

8. Conclusion

The body often speaks when the mind cannot. Psychological conflicts that remain unarticulated—due to trauma, cultural constraints, emotional repression, or limited symbolic language—frequently find expression through bodily symptoms. Headaches, gastrointestinal distress, chronic pain, fatigue, and functional neurological symptoms may emerge not as signs of purely biological dysfunction, but as embodied manifestations of unresolved emotional tension. The concept of the “silent body” captures this phenomenon, emphasizing that somatic symptoms can serve as meaningful signals rather than merely diagnostic puzzles.

Across psychodynamic theory, psychosomatic medicine, and contemporary neuroscience, a converging view has emerged: mind and body are not separate systems but deeply intertwined processes. Emotional experiences are encoded physiologically through autonomic, endocrine, and immune pathways. When psychological conflict overwhelms cognitive or emotional coping mechanisms, the body may assume the role of communicator, translating distress into physical sensation. This process is especially evident in individuals exposed to early adversity, chronic stress, or trauma, where verbal expression may be unsafe or inaccessible.

Recognizing somatic expressions of psychological conflict has important implications for mental health care. A purely biomedical approach risks overlooking the symbolic and relational dimensions of bodily symptoms, potentially leading to misdiagnosis, unnecessary interventions, and patient frustration. In contrast, integrative models that attend to both somatic and psychological narratives foster more compassionate, effective care. Approaches such as somatic psychotherapy, trauma-informed treatment, and biopsychosocial assessment honor the body as an active participant in emotional life rather than a passive recipient of pathology.

Ultimately, listening to the silent body invites a shift in perspective—from asking only *what is wrong with the body* to also asking *what has the body endured, adapted to, or been unable to express*. By restoring dialogue between psyche and soma, clinicians and researchers can better understand suffering, promote healing, and reaffirm the body’s role as a vital site of meaning in human experience.

References

- Alexander, F. (1950). *Psychosomatic Medicine: Its Principles and Applications*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. *Science*, 196(4286), 129–136.
- van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). *The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma*. New York: Viking.

CORPS & PSYCHISME

P-ISSN: 2496-4476 E-ISSN: 2273-1571

Volume 9/ Issue 2/ 2022

- Lipowski, Z. J. (1988). Somatization: The concept and its clinical application. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 145(11), 1358–1368.
- Damasio, A. R. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Kirmayer, L. J., & Young, A. (1998). Culture and somatization: Clinical, epidemiological, and ethnographic perspectives. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 60(4), 420–430.
- Lane, R. D., & Nadel, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Cognitive Neuroscience of Emotion*. New York: Oxford University Press.