

Gil A. Katz, Ph.D.

295 Central Park West, Suite 5 • New York, NY 10024

Phone: (212) 799-5559 • Fax: (212) 666-3488 • Email: gilkat46@gmail.com

**INTERACTION IN PSYCHOANALYSIS:
TRANSFERENCE, COUNTERTRANSFERENCE, AND ENACTMENT**

G89.4585 — Fall, 2018

This seminar will explore the *enacted dimension of analytic process*, the continuously evolving second dimension of analytic treatment that exists alongside of and inextricably interwoven with the treatment's verbal content. Within the enacted dimension, a new version of the patient's early conflicts, traumas, and formative object relationships is inevitably created, without awareness or intent, in the here-and-now of the analytic engagement. Within this "play within the play," repressed or dissociated aspects of the patient's past are not just remembered, they are re-lived. As the enacted dimension becomes conscious, it forms the basis for genuine and transforming experiential insight.

Thus, "enactment" is not simply an overt event but an unconscious, dynamically meaningful process that is continuously evolving within the transference-countertransference matrix. The seminar will trace the origins of the concept of the enacted dimension in the bedrock concepts of transference, countertransference, and repetition, and its relationship to such interactional concepts as projective identification, role responsiveness, and the analytic third. The realm of "interpsychic" interaction in the analytic dyad, which underlies the enacted dimension, will be distinguished from intersubjective and interpersonal interaction, and from the concept of co-creation. The relationship of the enacted dimension to analytic technique and to the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis will be discussed. Theoretical concepts will be illustrated via clinical vignettes from the literature and from those of the instructor and class participants.

Course Learning Objectives: At the end of this course candidates will be able to: 1) Define and discuss the concept of enactment and review its historical evolution. 2) Describe and illustrate the *enacted dimension of analytic process*. 3) Distinguish Contemporary Freudian and Relational/Intersubjective perspectives on enactment. 4) Define the concept of *interpsychic* interaction and distinguish it from interpersonal and intersubjective interaction, and from the concept of co-creation. 5) Recognize the difference between enactment and analytic technique. 6) Discuss the contribution of enacted processes to the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis. 7) Illustrate the centrality of the enacted dimension in the treatment of patients with a history of trauma, abuse, and early object loss via extended clinical vignettes. 8) Demonstrate support for these ideas from current research in cognitive neuroscience.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: TRANSFERENCE, ACTING-OUT, AND REPETITION

The concepts of transference, acting-out, and repetition (the compulsion to repeat) were introduced together early in Freud's writing. Weeks 1–3 attempt to sort out the insights and the ambiguities inherent in Freud's seminal ideas about remembering and repeating in analytic process, and will trace how our understanding of the role of action in clinical process has evolved.

Learning Objective: At the end of this three-session module, candidates will be able to describe the historical evolution of the concepts of transference, acting-out, and repetition and discuss their relevance and relationship to the concept of enactment.

WEEK 1: **In the Beginning: The Talking Cure and the Problem of Action**

FREUD, S. (1905). Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria. *S.E.*, 7:7–122.
[**Read only* pp. 76–78 and 116–120*]

FREUD, S. (1912). The dynamics of transference. *S.E.*, 12:97–108.

FREUD, S. (1914). Remembering, repeating, and working through. *S.E.*, 12:147–156.

WEEK 2: **Reconceptualizing the Role of Action in Analytic Process**

BOESKY, D. (1982). Acting out: a reconsideration of the concept. *Int. J. Psycho-anal.*, 63:39–55.

LOEWALD, H. (1971). Some considerations on repetition and repetition compulsion. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 52:59–66.

BUSCH, F. (1989). The compulsion to repeat in action: A developmental perspective. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 70:535–544.

WEEK 3: **The Enacted Dimension of Transference**

Reprint
Provided

FREEDMAN, N. (1994). More on transformation: Enactments in psychoanalytic space. In *The Spectrum of Psychoanalysis: Essays in Honor of Martin Bergmann*, Eds. A. D. Richards & A. K. Richards. Madison, CT: Int. Univ. Press, pp. 93–110.

LOEWALD, H. (1975). Psychoanalysis as an art and the fantasy character of the psychoanalytic situation. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 23:277–299.

POLAND, W. (1992). Transference: “An original creation.” *Psychoanal. Q.*, 61:185–205.

KERN, J. (1987). Transference neurosis as a waking dream: Notes on a clinical enigma. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 35:337–366.

A copy of each week's readings will be emailed to class members one week in advance.

All articles (except those designated as “Reprint Provided”) are also available on PEP-WEB.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: COUNTERTRANSFERENCE

Freud introduced the concept of countertransference, but he wrote very little on the subject. In Week 4, the widening of Freud's conception, and the debate surrounding it, is explored.

Learning Objective: At the end of Week 4, candidates will be able to describe the historical evolution of the concept of countertransference, and distinguish two broad contemporary definitions of the term.

WEEK 4: Countertransference in Freud's Technique Papers

FREUD, S. (1910). Future prospects for psycho-analytic therapy. *S.E.*, 11:139–152.
[**Read only* pp. 144–145*]

FREUD, S. (1912). Recommendations to physicians practising psychoanalysis. *S.E.*, 12:111–120. [**Read only* pp. 115–116*]

FREUD, S. (1915). Observations on transference love. *S.E.*, 12:157–175. (*In particular, pp. 160 and 164.*)

The “Classical” (or “Narrow”) and the “Totalistic” (or “Broad”) Conceptions of Countertransference

HEIMANN, P. (1950). On counter-transference. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 31:81–84.

REICH, A. (1960). Further remarks on countertransference. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 41:389–395.

RACKER, H. (1957). The meanings and uses of countertransference. *Psychoanal. Q.*, 26:303–357.

III. FORERUNNERS: THE TRANSFERENCE-COUNTERTRANSFERENCE MATRIX

Object relations theories, psychoanalytic developmental theories, modern structural theory, and interpersonal theory have all tried to take formal theoretical account of the complex interactions that occur within the transference-countertransference relationship. Weeks 5 and 6 explore six concepts, from diverse theoretical perspectives, each of which deals with some aspect of the enacted dimension of clinical process.

Learning Objective: At the end of this two-session module, candidates will be able to compare and contrast six concepts that take account of unconscious interactions that occur within the transference-countertransference matrix.

WEEK 5: A. Projective Identification and Role Responsiveness

SPILLIUS, E. B. (1992). Clinical experiences of projective identification. In *New Library of Psycho-Analysis*, 14:59–73.

OGDEN, T. (1979). On projective identification. *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, 60:357–383.

SANDLER, J. (1976). Countertransference and role responsiveness. *Int. Rev. Psychoanal.*, 3:43–47.

WEEK 6: B. Countertransference Structures, the New Object Relationship, Unconsciously Negotiated Resistance, and Transformation and Resisting Transformation

TOWER, L. E. (1956). Countertransference. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 4:224–255.

LOEWALD, H. (1986). Transference–Countertransference. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 34:275–287.

BOESKY, D. (1990). The psychoanalytic process and its components. *Psychoanal. Q.*, 59:550–584. (**Read only the sections entitled: “The Locus of the Psychoanalytic Process” and “The Interactional View,” pp. 564–578.**)

Reprint
Provided

LEVENSON, E. Transformation and resisting transformation. In Katz (2014), *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Analytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 2. (**Read especially the last section on Levenson, pp. 7–8.**)

IV. ENACTMENT

Week 7 traces the emergence of the term of enactment, which has now been adopted by analysts of all theoretical schools and persuasions, and Week 8 considers the many varied, and sometimes problematic, ways the phenomenon has been conceptualized and applied clinically.

Learning Objective: At the end of this two-session module, candidates will be able to discuss the evolution of the concept of enactment as well as compare and contrast various contemporary definitions of the term and identify the usefulness of, and the problems with, each.

WEEK 7: The Emergence of a New Concept

JACOBS, T. (1986). On countertransference enactments. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 34:289–307.

MCLAUGHLIN, J. (Panel Chair) & JOHAN, M. (Reporter) (1992). Enactments in psychoanalysis. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 40:827–841.

CHUSED, J. (1991). The evocative power of enactments. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 39:615–639.

MCLAUGHLIN, J. (1991). Clinical and theoretical aspects of enactment. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 39:595–614.

WEEK 8: Uses and Misuses of the Concept

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Enactment: The emergence of a new concept. In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 3.

ROUGHTON, R. E. (1993). Useful aspects of acting out: Repetition, enactment, and actualization. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 41:443–472.

V. THE ENACTED DIMENSION OF ANALYTIC PROCESS

In all treatments, a new version of the patient's early traumas, conflicts, and formative object relationships is inevitably created and brought to life, without awareness or intent, in the here-and-now of the analytic engagement. Weeks 9–11 explore this second dimension analytic process.

Learning Objective: At the end of this three-session module, candidates will be able to define the *enacted dimension of analytic process*, recognize its presence in all treatments, and its particular centrality in the treatment of patients with a history of trauma, abuse, and early object loss.

WEEK 9: What is the Enacted Dimension?

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Where the action is: The second dimension of analytic process. In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 4.

Reprint
Provided

RENIK, O. (1991). Countertransference enactment and the psychoanalytic process. In *Psychic Structure and Psychic Change. Essays in Honor of Robert S. Wallerstein, M.D.*, 1993, ed. M. J. Horowitz, O. F. Kernberg, & E. M. Weinshel. Madison CT: Int. Univ. Press, pp. 135–158.

JACOBS, T. (1994). Nonverbal communications. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 42:741–762.

WEEK 10: Reliving Preverbal Experience in the Enacted Dimension

CASEMENT, P. (1982). Some pressures on the analyst for physical contact during the reliving of an early trauma. *Int. Rev. Psychoanal.*, 9:279–286.

CASEMENT, P. (2000). The issue of touch: A retrospective overview. *Psa. Inq.* 20:160–184. (Pages 160–171 are optional); (**Read:** the section entitled: “Further reflections on the clinical sequence under discussion,” pp. 171–184.)

WEEK 11: Reliving Trauma in the Enacted Dimension

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Dissociative identity disorder and the enacted dimension. In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 11.

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Object loss and mourning in the enacted dimension. In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 12.

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2015). Repressed ghosts and dissociated vampires in the enacted dimension of psychoanalytic treatment. *Psychoanal Q.*, 84:389-414.

VI. INTERACTION IN PSYCHOANALYSIS

All contemporary psychoanalytic schools formally address, and all practicing clinicians consider, the interactive aspects of analytic process. However, how “interaction” is defined is another matter. Week 12 focuses on the “interpsychic” realm of analytic process—the unconscious and

preconscious transference–countertransference processes that underlie the enacted dimension of analytic process—and differentiates it from the concepts of intersubjectivity and co-creation.

Learning Objective: At the end of Week 12, candidates will be able to define the concept of *interspsychic* interaction and distinguish it from interpersonal and intersubjective interaction and from the concept of co-creation.

WEEK 12: **Interpsychic Interaction**

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Interaction in psychoanalysis: Across and through the interspsychic “cat-flap.” In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 7.

SMITH, H. F. (1993). Engagements in the analytic work. *Psychoanal. Inq.*, 13:425–454.

POLAND, W. (1992). From analytic surface to analytic space. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.*, 40:381–404.

VII. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ENACTED DIMENSION TO TECHNIQUE AND TO THE THERAPEUTIC ACTION OF PSYCHOANALYSIS

The enacted dimension of analytic process occurs naturally and inevitably, without conscious awareness or intent. It is outside the domain of explicit technical interventions. Attention to these unintended, but dynamically meaningful and often elaborately developed characteristics of the treatment process furthers our understanding of the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis. Weeks 13 and 14 consider these aspects of the enacted dimension of analytic process.

Learning Objective: At the end of this two-session module, candidates will be able to distinguish Contemporary Freudian and Relational/Intersubjective perspectives on enactment, recognize the difference between enactment and analytic technique, and discuss the contribution of enacted processes to the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis.

WEEK 13: **The Enacted Dimension and Analytic Technique**

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Enactment and analytic technique: What we can learn from John Lennon and microwave ovens. In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 8.

Reprint
Provided

JACOBS, T. (1991). The interplay of enactments: their role in the analytic process. In *The Use of the Self: Countertransference and Communication in the Analytic Situation*. Madison, CT: Int. Univ. Press, Chapter 2: pp. 31–49.

WEEK 14: **What is Mutative? The Interplay of Insight and Experience**

EAGLE, M. (1993). Enactments, transference, and symptomatic cure: a case history. *Psychoanal. Dialogues*, 3:93–110.

JACOBS, T. (1993). Insight and experience: Commentary on Morris Eagle’s ‘Enactment, transference, and symptomatic cure.’ *Psychoanal. Dialogues*, 3:123–127.

CHUSED, J. (1996). The therapeutic action of psychoanalysis: Abstinence and informative experiences. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 44:1047–1071.

VIII. REVIEW AND INTEGRATION

WEEK 15: **Frequently Asked Questions**

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2014). Frequently asked questions (and answers). In *The Play within the Play: The Enacted Dimension of Psychoanalytic Process*. London: Routledge, Chapter 14.

JACOBS, T. (1997). In search of the mind of the analyst: A progress report. *J. Amer. Psychoanal. Assn.* 45:1035–1059.

At any point during the second half of the semester, we may choose to substitute/add any or all of the following sets of case presentations and discussions, as well as a clinical presentation by one or two class participants.

Clinical Case Presentations and Discussions

Reprint
Provided

ORAM, K. (2009). The case of Arthur. *Freudian Lounge Presentation: Freudian and Relational Perspectives on Enactment, NYU Postdoctoral Program, March 1, 2009*.

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2009). Discussion of Kate Oram's "The case of Arthur." *Freudian Lounge Presentation: Freudian and Relational Perspectives on Enactment, NYU Postdoctoral Program, March 1, 2009*.

DAVIES, J. M. (2004). Whose bad objects are we anyway?: Repetition and our elusive love affair with evil. *Psychoanal. Dial.*, 14:711-732.

Reprint
Provided

KATZ, G. (2009). Discussion of Jody Davies' "Whose bad objects are we anyway?: Repetition and our elusive love affair with evil." *Contemporary Psychoanalytic Orientations Seminar, NYU Postdoctoral Program, October 7, 2009*.