



Seminar Year II, Fall 2019

Technique II: The Analytic Stance

Instructors: Stephen Bernstein, MD and Michael Dvorkin, EdD

“What we have come to know about the shaping of the analyst, his work ego, and analytic competence has long since required of us that we see ourselves in our work as indeed adequate at times, but liable to lapse and short-fall for many reasons. Since we know the assets and limitations we brought to our choice of career, and the forces of conflict and compromise that shaped that choice, we know we are not so different from our patients, except as our own analytic experience and training have helped us to evolve a little further in our development and adaptation through analytic ways of knowing. We realize that what we have been trained to do and molded to think both expand and constrain us, and reflect our identifications made with and against those who educated us.” McLaughlin (1991)

Note: log into your PEP Web account to access full text articles cited below

Session 1, September 19th: Transference I: Freud’s technique and the limits of technical directives

Freud, S. (1914). Observations on transference-love. *SE, XII* (pp. 157-171). [PEP Web Link](#)

Pinsky, E. (2014). The potion: Reflections on Freud’s “Observation on transference-love”. *JAPA*, 62(3), 455-474. [Pep Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to elucidate the two somewhat contradictory views of transference love introduced by Freud in his seminal paper on the subject.

In the Transference Love paper, Freud lays out two seemingly contradictory views of the treatment relationship. After taking pains to point out the illusory nature of transference love, he shifts to an emphasis on the feelings that arise in treatment. One can read these two positions as bookends that have framed subsequent debate regarding analytic technique and the treatment relationship

Session 2, September 26th: Transference II: The evolution of the concept

Bird, B. (1972). Notes on transference: Universal phenomenon and hardest part of analysis, *JAPA*, 20, 267-301. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to discuss how the concept of transference evolved in North American psychoanalysis.

The concept of transference has long been recognized as a central element in the clinical encounter. In this classic review of the topic, Bird wrestles with many of the issues that come to the fore when psychoanalysts discuss the topic. Transference vs. the “real relationship,” the role of countertransference, the elusive concept of transference neurosis, and the role of the analyst’s subjectivity. We will use this as a jumping off point to look at more contemporary views on the subject as the course progresses.

Session 3, October 3rd: Using Countertransference I: The evolution of the concept

Loewald, H. (1986). Transference-countertransference. *JAPA*, 34, 275-287. [PEP Web Link](#)

Jacobs, T.J. (1986). On countertransference enactments. *JAPA*, 34, 289-307. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to address how countertransference came to be seen as a useful source of data in psychoanalysis.

The early papers on counter-transference were an attempt to move beyond the view of counter-transference as a contamination of the analytic field. These authors came to accept their own emotional reactions and associations as valuable sources of information regarding the transference and the analyzed internalized object relations. Subsequent theorists have questioned the certainty with which they present their insights.

Session 4, October 10th: Using Countertransference II: Listening from different vantage points

Schwaber, E.A. (1992). Countertransference: The analyst’s retreat from the patient’s vantage point. *Int. J. of Psychoanalysis*, 73, 349-361. [PEP Web Link](#)

Ogden, T. (1996). Reconsidering three aspects of psychoanalytic technique. *Int. J. of Psychoanalysis*, 77, 883-899. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to discuss the contrasting approaches to analytic listening offered by Schwaber and Ogden.

How we listen to analytic process is a cornerstone of our work and may vary greatly, depending on theoretical perspective and the personhood of the analyst. In this session, we will consider two very different approaches to how we might think about the analyst’s listening. Schwaber has made important contributions to this topic, particularly around the importance of empathy and the capacity of the analyst to listen, affectively, from the patient’s vantage point. In her paper for this session, she considers the close process of several clinical situations, exploring what might cause the analyst to retreat from the patient’s experience. Ogden’s paper will offer an interesting contrast. Rather than privileging one vantage point over another, and working from an intersubjective perspective, Ogden focuses on listening for the affective dimension of aliveness and deadness as it emerges in the analytic third created by the reveries of both analyst and analyzed.

Session 5, October 24th: Caring, Coercion and The Analyst's Presence

Hoffman, I. (1986). The intimate and ironic authority of the psychoanalyst's presence. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 65, 102-136. [PEP Web Link](#)

Renik, O. (1999). Playing one's cards face up in analysis: An approach to the problem of self-disclosure. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 68(4), 521-539. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to contrast two different views of the analyst's authority in psychoanalysis.

These two contemporary authors hold similar positions on many issues that have come to define the relational position. These two papers, however, show them taking very different positions on a key issue related to the atmosphere in which the treatment is conducted. Hoffman believes we should preserve the power of illusion though he still values the "intimacy" of the relationship. Renik, by contrast, believe we should just put our ideas on the table, diminishing the mystique of the analyst in favor of a search for truth conducted by two adults in a very personal and meaningful collaboration

Optional Reading:

Kris, A. O. (1990). The analyst's stance and the method of free association. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 45, 24-41. [PEP Web Link](#)

Session 6, October 31st: Resistance: To What and By Whom

Gill, M. (1979). The analysis of the transference. *JAPA*, 27(S), 263-288. [PEP Web Link](#)

Mitrani, J. (2001). 'Taking the transference': Some technical implications in three papers by Bion. *Int. J. Psychoanalysis*, 82(6), 1085-1104. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to elucidate the factors that may contribute to the analyst's resistances to being fully engaged in treatment.

We all know that the exploration of transference is perhaps the most central part of therapeutic action. However, we also know that this is an unusually difficult and unnerving aspect of psychoanalytic work. What are some of the reasons for our difficulty and how might we think about the obstacles as well as how we use, or don't use, ourselves in this process? Coming from an interpersonal perspective, Gill's article explores reasons for our own complex resistances to transference, as well as ways that we may make transference more immediate and accessible in the here and now. Mitrani's article draws on the work of Bion to consider the analyst's role vis a vis transference, in particular, the functions of containment, reverie and transformation.

Session 7, November 7th: The analyst's unconscious participation

Aron, L. (1991). The patient's experience of the analyst's subjectivity. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 1(1), 29-51. [PEP Web Link](#)

McLaughlin, J. (1988). The analyst's insights. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 57, 370-389. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to contrast two different views of the use of the analyst's subjectivity.

Aron and McLaughlin address the issue of the analyst's subjectivity in ways that overlap but also imply different conceptualizations of the analyst's "optimal functioning." Both would agree that counter-transference is a useful source of data that can also be a hindrance at times. McLaughlin believes that self-analysis can return the analyst to place of relatively unencumbered work. Aron, by contrast, views the analyst's subjectivity as a ubiquitous and unavoidable aspect of the interactive process in treatment. This view is an elaboration of Benjamin's notion of the mother's subjectivity as the infant's window into external reality.

Session 8, November 14th: All the Same Only Different

Greenberg, J. (2015). Therapeutic action and the analyst's responsibility. *JAPA*, 63(1), 15-32. [PEP Web Link](#)

Choder-Goldman, J. (2016). A conversation with Antonino Ferro. *Psychoanalytic Perspectives*, 13(1), 129-143. [Available in the library: check the reading folder or request from library@bps.org]

Learning Objective: Participants will be able to discuss the ways that psychoanalytic theory can illuminate clinical experience or, conversely, serve as a "controlling fiction" that provides an illusion of certainty amidst the flood of clinical data. Participants will also be able to discuss how the technical stance of the analyst will change when adopting the Bionian field theory model as articulated by Ferro.

In our final meeting participants will have an opportunity to think about and discuss the pluralistic state of current theory given our growing understanding of the intersubjective nature of experience and communication.

Optional Reading:

Ferro, A. (2009). Transformations in dreaming and characters in the psychoanalytic field. *Int. J. of Psychoanalysis*, 90(2), 209-230. [PEP Web Link](#)

Foehl, J. (2010). The play's the thing: The primacy of process and the persistence of pluralism in contemporary psychoanalysis. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 46(1), 48-86. [PEP Web Link](#)