



B P S I

boston psychoanalytic
society & institute

Fall 2019

TECHNIQUE IV

Instructors: Fran Arnold, Ph.D and Risa Weinrit, Psy.D.

Course Description and Reading List

In this course we will focus closely on the relation between theory and technique, asking several questions in the context of specific pieces of actual analytic process. How do different theoretical stances make therapeutic differences? Do different kinds of interpretations and interventions lead to similar outcomes? Different but equivalent outcomes? Different and non-equivalent outcomes? We will also try to think about the different ways that analysts can hold theories in their minds when sitting with patients, and consider some questions about ways that different theorists think about using multiple models.

For the first half of the course we will be asking these questions about a clinical presentation that appeared in *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* in 1990, together with discussions of the presenter's technique from analysts with different theoretical backgrounds. We will review the relevant distinctions among the schools of thought represented in the discussions, asking what would analysts of differing persuasions have done and what might the consequences be?

In the next three weeks we will look at some theories of technique not represented in that 1990 discussion, and discuss what it might mean to be an analyst of one persuasion or another. In our final class, we will read one paper and the introduction from a recent Panel on the Analyst's Use of Multiple Models to deepen our discussion of how our relationships to theory can affect technique.

Week 1 – September 19, 2019:

Fosshage, J.L. (1990). Clinical protocol. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 461-477. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to define Fosshage's self-psychological theory of therapeutic action, in the context of his case.

Week 2 – September 26, 2019:

Curtis, H.C. (1990). Patient as existential victim: A classical view, *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 498-508. [PEP Web Link](#)

Fosshage, J.L. (1990). The analyst's response. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 601-607, 610-612. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to identify two examples of internal conflict which a classical view sees to be misunderstood or minimized in Fosshage's case.

Week 3 – October 3, 2019:

Roth, P. and Segal, H. (1990). Discussion: A Kleinian view. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 541-549. [PEP Web Link](#)

Kohon, G. (1990). Discussion: British independent object relations view. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 10(4), 550-553. [PEP Web Link](#)

Fosshage's response, pp. 607-610, 618-619. [PEP Web Link](#)

Miller, J.P. and Miller, A.H. (1990). Reflections on commentaries. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 585-591. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to identify at least one example of internal object relations which a Kleinian view sees to be misunderstood or not seen in Fosshage's case.

Week 4 – October 10, 2019:

Mitchell, S.A. (1990). A relational view. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 10(4), 523-540. [PEP Web Link](#)

Fosshage's response, pp. 612-616. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to identify at least one moment in Fosshage's case where a Relational analyst would have acted significantly differently

Week 5– October 24, 2019:

Anderson, J.W. (2014). How D. W. Winnicott conducted psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 31(3), 375-395. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to compare what Winnicott wrote about "holding" and "interpretation" with the ways in which he actually treated a number of analytic patients.

Week 6 – October 31, 2019:

Ferro, A. (2006). Clinical implications of Bion's thought. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 87(4), 989-1003. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to define what Ferro means by "characters" in the analytic "field", and how that affects technique.

Week 7 – November 7, 2019:

Parsons, M. (2009). An independent theory of clinical technique. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 19(3), 221-236. [PEP Web Link](#)

Parsons's response to commentaries, pp. 259-266. [PEP Web Link](#)

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to identify several key elements in an "Independent" theory of analytic technique.

Week 8 – November 14, 2019:

LaFarge, L. (2017). From “either/or” to “and”. *JAPA*, 65(5), 829-844. [Available in the library: [Download](#) in the library, check the reading folder or request from library@bpsl.org]

Zimmer, R.B. (2017). The analyst’s use of multiple models in clinical work: Introduction. *JAPA*, 65(5), 819-827. [Available in the library: [Download](#) in the library, check the reading folder or request from library@bpsl.org]

OPTIONAL (perhaps of further interest): We will be presenting some ideas contrasting those of LaFarge from 2 other papers from the same panel:

Blass, R.B. (2017). Committed to a single model and open to reality. *JAPA*, 65(5), 845-858. [Available in the library: [Download](#) in the library, check the reading folder or request from library@bpsl.org]

Cooper, S.H. (2017). The analyst’s “use” of theory or theories: The play of theory. *JAPA*, 65(5), 859-882. [Available in the library: [Download](#) in the library, check the reading folder or request from library@bpsl.org]

Learning objective: Candidates will be able to discuss some different ideas about the analyst’s relation to theory in the clinical moment, and to define LaFarge’s idea about the “core personal theory”.