

A Presence That Helps Without Taking Over

Undoing aloneness in the space between us

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT

Therapist companion to BKL's Co-Regulation pathway · 18 October 2026

Imagine a client beginning to cry, then looking quickly toward the therapist. A smile appears. “I’m sorry. I don’t know why I’m getting so emotional.” Before there has been much room for the feeling, the client is already helping the room recover from it.

We might reassure them that tears are welcome. That may help. We might also notice the relational work taking place inside the apology. Is the client concerned that we are uncomfortable? Do they expect us to become worried, impatient, or overwhelmed? Are they trying to remain someone who is easy to care for?

Fosha’s phrase **undoing aloneness** gives this moment a place in the clinical imagination. In AEDP, the therapeutic relationship offers accompaniment for experiences that have felt unbearable or unavailable alone. The person is invited to discover what it is like to encounter feeling with an emotionally engaged other. [1] Sometimes the discovery begins very quietly: I can let you see this without having to take care of what seeing it does to you.

Fosha describes “an affect-facilitating, emotionally engaged, validating and explicitly affirming therapeutic stance” (p. 5). [1]

Rumi begins the *Masnavi* with the lament of a reed separated from its reed-bed, seeking a listener capable of hearing its sorrow. In Jawid Mojaddedi’s translation, the opening movement gives separation a voice before offering a solution. [2] Its spiritual world is that of a Persian Muslim Sufi poet. I hear in it an invitation relevant to our clinical work: before explaining a person’s distress, can we hear what it is like to be the one carrying it?

Rumi opens, “Now listen to this reed-flute’s deep lament” (Jawid Mojaddedi, Trans., opening line). [2]

Science can help us examine how relationships influence emotional experience. Spiritual and literary writing can deepen our attention to its meaning. They contribute different kinds of understanding. Neither relieves us of the responsibility to find out what this particular person experiences with us.

What changes when someone joins us?

Co-regulation is sometimes described as one settled nervous system calming another. That image can obscure the relationship. A soothing intervention may be received as pressure. Quiet company may help someone remain present while their sorrow becomes more visible. A clear limit may make care more trustworthy than an offer of unlimited availability.

Arican-Dinc and Gable's 2026 review of dyadic emotion regulation brings affective science and relationship research into conversation. Their framework includes processes that improve or worsen feeling and recognizes effects on the relationship itself. What people are trying to accomplish, how they respond to one another, and the surrounding relationship matter. [3]

Coan, Schaefer, and Davidson's earlier experiment offers a specific illustration of social context influencing responses to threat. Sixteen married women underwent threat of electric shock while holding a spouse's hand, a stranger's hand, or no hand. Spousal handholding was associated with reduced threat-related neural responses, with effects varying by marital quality. [4] This small laboratory study is not a prescription for touch in psychotherapy. It helps us ask how the identity and reliability of the person beside us change an encounter.

For this article, co-regulation means responsive relational support that helps a person remain in contact with experience, available choices, and the world around them. Helpful influence may include comfort, renewed energy, clearer anger, or the courage to act. We need more than apparent calm to judge its value.

The burden of having to manage both people

Some clients are extraordinarily attentive to the person across from them. They notice a shift in expression, a glance at the clock, or a question that arrives with more concern than usual. This sensitivity may be a capacity they value. It may also involve exhausting work: deciding what can be shown without disturbing the relationship.

Bowlby's secure-base perspective helps us ask what a person expects when distress and need become visible. Will there be welcome, intrusion, dismissal, or withdrawal? Dependable availability can support exploration; uncertainty about the response can organize attention around preserving connection. [5] These are questions about possible histories and present relationships, not conclusions we can draw from a client's careful smile.

A person may become clear and analytical just as grief begins emerging. They may soften an objection before we have had a chance to receive it. They may assure us that we have been helpful while leaving unsure whether they were understood. The adaptation deserves respect. It may have allowed connection to continue under conditions in which unedited feeling carried a cost.

We can inadvertently recruit that adaptation. If we become visibly relieved when the client stops crying, they may learn something about the feelings we find easier to accompany. If we respond defensively to criticism, they may become more agreeable. The therapy may look harmonious while the client continues doing the familiar work of keeping both people comfortable.

Nouwen's writing on hospitality offers a counterweight. He imagines a spacious welcome in which the guest has freedom to discover and express a life of their own. The host does not quietly make belonging conditional on becoming like the host. [6] Translated into clinical practice, this asks whether our care leaves room for the client's language, pace, disagreement, and privacy.

Nouwen writes, "Hospitality is not to change people, but to offer them space where change can take place." [6]

We might gently ask about an apology without deciding what it means. "You seemed concerned about how I was doing when you began to cry. Is that close?" The answer could correct us entirely. Perhaps the client dislikes crying in any setting; perhaps the question itself feels intrusive. Undoing aloneness requires that our interest remain answerable to the person receiving it.

Understanding someone, and letting them feel understood

We can have an accurate formulation while the client remains lonely inside the experience. Knowing that a person fears abandonment does not tell us how to meet the small recoil that occurs when we offer care. The explanation becomes useful partly through the quality of the encounter it makes possible.

Whyte's prose reflection on friendship places witness at the heart of companionship: the privilege of seeing another life and allowing oneself to be seen. [7] Therapy has a different structure and responsibility from friendship, yet this reflection asks something of us. Can the client experience being known without becoming a project whose improvement is the price of our continued interest?

In Whyte's words, "the ultimate touchstone is witness, the privilege of having been seen by someone." [7]

Schore's account of implicit relational communication directs attention to how this knowing is conveyed. Facial expression, tone, gesture, timing, and the changing affective connection carry meaning alongside words. [8] Our stated empathy may arrive with urgency. Our silence may offer room, or leave someone guessing whether we have gone away. We need the client's account to know which.

Consider a fictional encounter. Sam describes feeling overwhelmed by a parent's illness and says, "Everyone keeps telling me how strong I am." The therapist offers a practical plan. Sam nods, but becomes less expressive. On checking, the therapist learns that Sam already has a plan. "I wanted someone to know I'm frightened."

A different response might begin there. The therapist acknowledges having moved toward organization before understanding what Sam wanted to share. They ask whether company with the fear would help. Sam says yes, then asks that there be fewer questions. That preference becomes part of the support. The therapist can remain interested without requiring a continuous explanation of what Sam feels.

O'Donohue's *Anam Cara* places friendship and belonging within a spiritual understanding of human life. In his interview with Krista Tippett, he also resists reducing a person's identity to the story they can tell about themselves. [9] That offers a useful restraint for clinicians: our formulation may illuminate a life without containing it. Some experience needs room before it becomes articulate.

Feeling understood may therefore involve a response that arrives softly enough to be received, an accurate practical action, or the relief of not having to produce more words. It may also involve a correction accepted without defensiveness. The person discovers that their account has consequences for how we respond.

The therapist's willingness to be affected

There is a difference between hearing about sorrow and allowing another person's sorrow to matter to us. The latter can stir tenderness, anger, helplessness, grief, or recognition. Our emotional life enters the work even when we would prefer to remain entirely composed.

Jung's discussion of psychotherapy describes a personal encounter within a professional frame, one in which both people exert influence. He connects that participation with the clinician's responsibility for self-examination. [10] We need not adopt his whole framework to recognize the problem with an ideal of therapeutic invulnerability: what we cannot acknowledge in ourselves can still organize the treatment.

The question is how to remain available while retaining judgment. Tears in our own eyes may sometimes communicate recognition; at another moment they may leave the client worrying about us. An impulse to disclose may arise from care, identification, discomfort, or the wish to be seen as understanding. Its meaning and usefulness require reflection. Being moved does not oblige us to make our response the subject of the session.

Nouwen's *The Wounded Healer* offers a spiritual account of service rooted in awareness of our shared vulnerability. [11] Its relevance here is the possibility of approaching suffering with less distance and less superiority. Suffering itself does not confer clinical competence. Our wounds become a responsibility to understand, especially where they create a need for the client to reassure, admire, protect, or heal us.

Siegel's *The Mindful Therapist* similarly brings the clinician's awareness and response flexibility into view. [12] We can notice that a client's despair has awakened our urgency without making the urgency their task. We may need an unforced breath, a little more contact with the room, or a simpler question. Sometimes we need to acknowledge that we have lost the thread and return together.

Schwartz offers another vocabulary for the same moment of self-examination. In his writing on the therapist's Self-led presence, protective reactions in the clinician can interfere with listening and repair. [13] A part that needs to rescue, persuade, or make progress may deserve understanding while we decide how to act. That inner work need not become an IFS exercise for the client.

The capacity to accompany is sustained beyond the room: through consultation, supervision, our own therapy or experiential work, rest, relationships, and realistic limits on what we carry. A therapist who can receive support has more opportunities to examine what happens when care reaches a place they would rather manage alone.

Why receiving can be difficult

Sam becomes tearful when the therapist stays interested without adding another task. Then embarrassment appears. “You must think I’m falling apart.” The therapist does not know whether this expectation comes from earlier relationships, present pressures, or something about their own response. There is room to find out.

Care can expose the very need a person has worked hard to conceal. It can bring grief about what was missing, suspicion about what will be owed, or fear that a welcome will disappear once dependence becomes visible. The client may appreciate the offer and want to retreat from it. That ambivalence can be part of receiving.

A Hafez lyric in Dick Davis’s *Faces of Love* remembers intimate conversation and companionship, then encounters separation and the limits of explanation. [14] Its tenderness includes fragility. Read alongside clinical work, it helps resist the fantasy that a meaningful connection makes loss irrelevant. Sometimes being met makes earlier loneliness more available to feeling.

Hafez writes, “But when our efforts fail, and hearts / Are weak” (Dick Davis, Trans.; slash marks the line break). [14]

The therapist can accompany that grief without using it as proof that an intervention worked. Sam might feel sadness, gratitude, skepticism, or irritation at being noticed so closely. The question is what is actually occurring. Fosha’s attention to the experience of receiving care keeps the relationship available for exploration rather than treating an empathic gesture as a completed task. [1]

We can ask what helped, what did not, and whether anything needs to change. A client who requests more distance has given us usable information. They should not have to become visibly soothed to make our care worthwhile. Nor should every hesitation be interpreted as a defense against receiving something we have already decided is good.

Company that leaves room for a self

Winnicott’s developmental formulation of the capacity to be alone offers a valuable paradox: supported experience in another’s presence can help a person become more able to inhabit their own life. [15] The clinical question is whether our company offers room to exist without continual performance, explanation, or attention to us.

Rilke approaches a related tension in his letter of 14 May 1904: closeness can preserve and honor the distinct inner lives of two people. [16] His image is an invitation to think about relationship,

not a psychotherapy mechanism. In the room, it asks whether connection can include a boundary and whether a difference can remain without threatening the whole encounter.

Rilke imagines “two solitudes protecting and bordering on, and greeting each other” (A. S. Kline, Trans.). [16]

Sam may want the therapist nearby emotionally while looking away. They may want a direct answer rather than more exploration. They may be ready to think practically after being heard. These preferences can change within a session. Attunement involves following those changes without requiring the client to adopt a preferred style of intimacy.

Therapy is mutual in influence and unequal in professional responsibility. Clients do not owe us companionship, reciprocal disclosure, or emotional care. Predictable boundaries around time, contact, confidentiality, and availability can make the relationship more reliable. Undoing aloneness does not require becoming the person’s entire support system.

Welwood’s concern about spiritual bypassing belongs here as well. An ideal of self-sufficiency, nonattachment, or inner wholeness can be used to move past ordinary needs for dependable people. [17] A client may become more able to be alone and also more able to ask for company. Receiving care and developing agency can strengthen one another.

Repair: when our help does not help

We will sometimes offer reassurance when recognition was needed, remain silent when a response mattered, or ask a question that feels like pressure. A relationship that has room for repair can make these misses discussable. The therapist’s intention is part of the account; the client’s experience must be able to alter it.

In Sam’s fictional encounter, the first practical plan missed the wish to share fear. The repair begins with a precise acknowledgment: the therapist moved toward organizing before learning what Sam needed. There is no demand that Sam call the mistake harmless or quickly restore the therapist’s confidence. They can decide together whether a different response helps.

Shir and Tishby’s 2024 study examined rupture and repair from both sides of 90 therapy dyads, using two analytic subsamples. Agreement about repair was associated with clients’ ratings of session helpfulness; therapist recognition of rupture alone was insufficient, particularly where rupture intensity was high. [18] These observational findings support asking about the client’s experience of repair rather than assuming that naming a miss has resolved it. They do not establish a universal repair formula.

Prenn and Fosha’s supervision writing makes feedback and moment-to-moment tracking part of learning the relational work. [19] A client’s quick agreement may be worth checking, with care, rather than celebrated automatically. They may be satisfied; they may also be protecting us from disappointment. Both possibilities need room.

Repair can become a lived discovery: I can tell you that you missed me, and you remain interested. You can take responsibility without collapsing or explaining me away. We can

disagree about part of the meaning while addressing what you actually did. Such encounters may matter deeply, though their effect must be learned from the person rather than presumed.

When something helpful is received

If Sam reports feeling less alone, we can give that experience a moment. What made the difference? Was it being heard without instructions, permission to ask for fewer questions, or learning that a correction could be welcomed? We can be specific enough that the experience becomes recognizable beyond this particular session.

Fosha and Thoma describe metatherapeutic processing as exploring the experience of helpful change itself. Their clinical account considers the feelings that may accompany it and how the person can receive what has occurred. [20] The invitation is to attend to a real experience, without requiring gratitude, relief, or a narrative of transformation.

Sam remains frightened about the parent's illness. There is also a little less effort spent hiding the fear. This distinction matters. The relationship has not altered the medical uncertainty. It has offered a different way of being with that uncertainty for a time. The next question is whether that experience is useful and what else Sam needs.

Bringing the pathway back into the room

The [Co-Regulation pathway](#) gives clients opportunities to explore these questions in ordinary relationships. Its companion, [You Can Help Me Without Taking Charge of Me](#), describes care with room for both people's needs and choices. The therapist can help the client make sense of what actually happened when they tried it.

Establish consent and a workable setting begins with whether support can be chosen. A client may discover that declining is harder than asking. Another may find that a short, clearly bounded exchange makes receiving more possible. We can ask whether the limit was respected, including when the exercise took place with us.

Ask for the support you mean makes a wish more legible. It may also reveal grief about having to explain something the client hoped would be noticed. We can honor that longing while helping distinguish a negotiable request from a demand that another person guarantee an emotional result. The other person's actual availability matters.

Offer understanding before intervention invites a tentative account and correction. The learning may be how different it feels when someone checks what was heard before advising. It may also be discovering that the proposed response did not help. There is clinical value in understanding the mismatch accurately.

Receive support and guide the fit gives the recipient an active voice. They can accept company, change the distance, ask for practical assistance, or stop. If receiving repeatedly feels uncomfortable, the inquiry includes the giver's conduct, the relationship's history, cultural and sensory preferences, and present conditions. It cannot be settled by labeling the client resistant.

Repair mismatches and share responsibility brings learning into repeated conduct. Did a pause include a dependable return? Was a preference remembered? Did an apology lead to a change? Clients choose what to share from the exercises. Their report can open a conversation; it cannot establish the quality or safety of a relationship.

Online learning cannot provide the responsive human presence described here. It can offer language, rehearsal, and opportunities to notice. A useful experiment might be asking a trusted person for a short period of listening, predicting what will happen, then reviewing the actual response. If the person is dismissive or coercive, the conclusion may concern that relationship and the need for other support. More skillful asking cannot make every relationship dependable.

Science, spirituality, and the ordinary work of care

There is a temptation to use neuroscience to certify what poetry makes us feel, or spiritual language to give clinical work a promise it cannot keep. The more useful conversation allows each tradition its contribution. Research asks what can be observed, compared, and challenged. Clinical theory organizes attention and judgment. Poetry and spiritual writing make room for longing, mystery, and the meaning of being accompanied.

The person need not share the therapist's beliefs. Nouwen's Christian hospitality, Rumi's Sufi longing, O'Donohue's Celtic spiritual imagination, and Rilke's reflections on solitude are distinct voices. They can deepen the clinician's receptivity while remaining invitations the client is free to leave aside.

I want the article's spiritual thread to remain close to the ordinary: someone does not turn away when feeling appears; a wish can be spoken without humiliation; a limit is respected; a missed encounter can be revisited. There can be profound meaning in those events without needing to describe them as transcendent.

In [Enough Steadiness to Feel](#), the question is how regulation supports contact and choice. Here it becomes relational: can another person join us without taking over the experience? Can their company help us remain ourselves, including when what we feel is unfinished?

Perhaps undoing aloneness begins when a client no longer has to hurry us away from their pain. We have enough room to be touched by it, enough judgment to remain responsible, and enough humility to learn how our presence lands. The feeling may remain. The person may have more company in meeting it, and more freedom about what comes next.

References and further reading

1. Fosha, D. (2021). Introduction: AEDP after 20 years. In D. Fosha (Ed.), *Undoing Aloneness and the Transformation of Suffering Into Flourishing: AEDP 2.0*. American Psychological Association. [Source](#). Clinical framework for accompaniment, dyadic regulation, and receiving; not evidence of BKL efficacy.
2. Rumi, J. (2004). *The Masnavi: Book One* (J. Mojaddedi, Trans.). Oxford University Press. Opening reed-song, especially lines 1-18; translation compared at [Source](#). Sufi poetry of separation and listening; brief opening-line quotation follows Mojaddedi's translation. No clinical mechanism claim.
3. Arican-Dinc, B., & Gable, S. L. (2026; online 2025). Dyadic emotion regulation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 77, 365-391. [Source](#). Contemporary review/framework joining affective and relationship science.
4. Coan, J. A., Schaefer, H. S., & Davidson, R. J. (2006). Lending a hand: Social regulation of the neural response to threat. *Psychological Science*, 17(12), 1032-1039. [Source](#). Small experimental study; no inference that touch is indicated in therapy.
5. Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*. Routledge. [Source](#). Developmental/clinical account of availability, exploration, and attachment expectations.
6. Nouwen, H. J. M. "Creating a Spacious Place." Original passage reproduced by the Henri Nouwen Society, 14 January 2026. [Source](#). Hospitality and freedom; posting date is not the date the passage was written.
7. Whyte, D. "Friendship," in *Consolations*. Author-hosted excerpt: [Source](#). Witness and accompaniment; a literary lens, not a definition of the professional treatment relationship.
8. Schore, A. N. (2022). Right brain-to-right brain psychotherapy: Recent scientific and clinical advances. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 21, 46. [Source](#). Theoretical synthesis of implicit relational communication and affect regulation.
9. O'Donohue, J. *Anam Cara*, estate description at [Source](#); and "The Inner Landscape of Beauty," interview with Krista Tippett, *On Being*, [Source](#). Spiritual/philosophical perspectives on friendship, belonging, and identity beyond biography.
10. Jung, C. G. (1966). *The Practice of Psychotherapy* (Collected Works, Vol. 16, 2nd ed.; R. F. C. Hull, Trans.), especially paragraphs 163-166. Princeton University Press. Edition/contents locator: [Source](#). Original passage inspected in the reproduced volume; mutual influence and the clinician's self-examination, paraphrased without quotation.
11. Nouwen, H. J. M. *The Wounded Healer*. Henri Nouwen Society book account: [Source](#). Pastoral theology of service and shared vulnerability; clinical responsibilities stated here are the article's application.
12. Siegel, D. J. (2010). *The Mindful Therapist: A Clinician's Guide to Mindsight and Neural Integration*. W. W. Norton. [Source](#). Broad frame for therapist awareness, presence, and response flexibility.
13. Schwartz, R. C. *The Larger Self*. IFS Institute. [Source](#). Therapist protective responses, personal work, presence, and repair; model-based clinical essay.
14. Hafez. Lyric on remembered companionship, reproduced in the publisher's excerpt In D. Davis (Trans.), *Faces of Love: Hafez and the Poets of Shiraz* (Penguin Classics, 2013). Publisher excerpt: [Source](#). Specific translated poem on companionship, separation, and the limits of explanation; Hafiz is an alternative spelling. No unattributed modern internet verse is used.

15. Winnicott, D. W. (1958). The capacity to be alone. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 39, 416-420. Reprinted in *The Collected Works of D. W. Winnicott*, Vol. 5 (2016), pp. 241-248. [Source](#). Developmental formulation, not a claim that adult therapy repeats infant care literally.
16. Rilke, R. M. Letter to Franz Xaver Kappus, 14 May 1904. In *Letters to a Young Poet* (first collected 1929). A. S. Kline translation (2021): [Source](#). Closeness preserving distinct inner lives; brief direct quotation follows A. S. Kline's translation of the letter of 14 May 1904.
17. Welwood, J. (2011). Human nature, Buddha nature. Interview by Tina Fossella. *Tricycle*, Spring 2011. [Source](#). Spiritual bypassing and respect for human relational needs.
18. Shir, R., & Tishby, O. (2024). Should we feel the same? Mutual recognition and congruence between therapist and client regarding ruptures and repairs. *Psychotherapy*, 61(3), 222-233. [Source](#). Observational dyadic process study; associations with session helpfulness do not establish causation.
19. Prenn, N. C. N., & Fosha, D. (2017). *Supervision Essentials for Accelerated Experiential Dynamic Psychotherapy*. American Psychological Association. Chapter 2 excerpt: [Source](#). Permission, tracking, feedback, and supervision; December 2016 release, 2017 copyright.
20. Fosha, D., & Thoma, N. C. (2020). Metatherapeutic processing supports the emergence of flourishing in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 57(3), 323-339. [Source](#). Clinical/theoretical account with illustrative cases; informs inquiry into helpful experience.