

Seattle Psychoanalytic Society and Institute
OVERVIEW OF MAJOR PSYCHOANALYTIC THEORIES

Year One Psychoanalytic Training

Instructors: Ken King, MD and Joanna Goodman, MSW

Guest Instructors: Ann De Lancey Ph.D., Sue Radant, Ph.D., and Peggy Crastnopol, Ph.D.

Second & Third Trimesters 2016-17: January 27, 2017 - April 28, 2017

This course is meant to introduce clinical associates to the major schools/theories that have contributed to the development of psychoanalysis. Although there are different currents in psychoanalytic thinking, there are many layers that overlap and we will attempt to expose you to the efforts towards synthesis.

The main objectives of this course are:

- 1) To give clinical associates an overview of the major psychoanalytic schools of thought. Clinical associates will be able to cite one aspect differentiating these major schools of thought.
- 2) To explore similarities and differences (overlap) between theories. Clinical associates will be able to list one or two similarities and differences among theories.
- 3) To emphasize the personal nature of psychoanalytic practice. Clinical associates will be able to identify one aspect of the personal nature of psychoanalytic practice.
- 4) To introduce clinical practices within each theoretical body of knowledge, integrating theory and practice. Clinical associates will articulate one or two clinical practices within each theoretical body of knowledge and demonstrate a practical implication for clinical practice from the knowledge or skill gained.

We will begin the course with an overview class then delve into structural theory and ego psychology for four sessions. From ego psychology, we will move to object relations (traditional and middle school) then to self psychology, relational, and finally, mentalization/attachment.

In addition to reading the articles, we encourage you think about how you already work and why you work that way. Where do authors (and your own way of thinking) diverge and converge – and how do we grapple with major differences in theory and clinical practice? We welcome your feedback throughout the seminar.

Week 1: January 27, 2017

Overview of Theory

In this class, we will introduce the main theories of psychoanalysis. Think about how you work with your patients and how your personal views regarding therapeutic change match (or don't) with what you are reading. Cite one or two ways in which your views match or diverge from the theory of change articulated in these papers.

Readings:

1. Safran, J. (2012). *Psychoanalysis and Psychoanalytic Therapies*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association. Ch. 2, pp. 23-45. [Article provided](#)
Safran offers a brief historical and updated review.
2. Pine, F. (1988). The Four Psychologies of Psychoanalysis and their place in Clinical Work. *JAPA*, 36:571-596. [PEPWeb](#)
Pine synthesizes a clinical approach listening for elements of drive, ego, object and self.

Optional:

Sandler, J. (1983). Reflections on Some Relations between Psychoanalytic Concepts and Psychoanalytic Practice. *IJP*, 645:35-45. [PEPWeb](#)

Sandler introduces some ideas about the confluence of theory and clinical practice.

Week 2: February 3, 2017

Ego Psychology and Structural Theory

Introduction

To begin these four sessions, we will approach Ego Psychology through the writing of two of its central figures, Jacob Arlow, MD (1912–2004) and Charles Brenner, MD (1913–2008). Brenner was one of the main standard bearers for American Ego Psychology for over half a century. He was past president of the American Psychoanalytic Association and past president of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. He was thought by many to be rigid in his thinking and dismissive of alternative viewpoints. He was also known as a talented thinker who introduced controversial divergences from convention, based on clinical observation. In this way, he carried forward Freud's practice of allowing oneself to be transformed through the interaction of learning and experiencing throughout life.

For this four-session overview, we will use Brenner's late book, *The Mind in Conflict*, published in 1982. This work was the culmination of the development of Brenner's thinking to that point. The chapters are structured with sufficient historical description to fast-forward us through the first 70 years of the evolution of Ego Psychology and bring us very close to its current status.

Jacob Arlow served as president of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. In perhaps his most significant theoretical contribution to psychoanalysis, Arlow explored the role of unconscious fantasy from the point of view of ego psychology. This subsumed its use in Kleinian theory, and provided a significant building block for Brenner's later development of conflict theory.

For each class we ask you all to bring in a piece of case material that confirms, disconfirms, or reminds you in some way of the ideas put forth in the chapter or article. We will do the same.

Readings:

1. Arlow, J.A., and Brenner, C. (1964). *Psychoanalytic Concepts and the Structural Theory*. New York: New York, pp. 31-42. [Article provided](#)
This chapter serves as a summary of major ego psychological concepts prior to Brenner's revisions.
2. Brenner, C. (1982). *The Mind in Conflict*. New York: New York. Ch. 3, Affects, pp. 40-54. [Article provided](#)
This chapter summarizes affect theory in Ego Psychology, including the pleasure principle, as a preliminary to discussing the role of affect in psychic conflict. The development of affect and their differentiation is both dependent on and comprises a feature of ego development.
3. *Ibid*: Ch. 4, Affects and Psychic Conflict, pp. 55-71. [Article provided](#)
Here Brenner describes psychic conflict as taking place whenever the satisfaction of a sexual or aggressive drive derivative is connected with unpleasurable emotion. The emotional result can be either in the form of depression or anxiety. Unpleasure combined with danger results in anxiety. Unpleasure combined with calamity results in depressive emotion.

Optional:

Ibid: Ch. 2, The Drives, pp. 11-39. [Article provided](#)

In this chapter, Brenner outlines the history of the drives in Ego Psychology and concludes that the drives are an aspect of brain function and that there is an important relationship between drives and ego development but that there is no inherent antagonism between either of the drives and ego. He asserts that drive energy is an analog of, rather than a form of, physical energy and that both operate within the pleasure principle.

Week 3: February 10, 2017

Ego Psychology, Continued

Defenses and Observing Ego, Sterba and Anna Freud

Anna Freud (1895 –1982) was an Austrian-British psychoanalyst. She was the sixth and last child of Sigmund Freud and Martha Bernays. Alongside Melanie Klein, she may be considered the founder of child psychoanalysis. Her work emphasized the importance of the ego, particularly exemplified in her Viennese monograph of which we will read a portion. The war gave Freud opportunity to observe the effect of deprivation of parental care on children. She set up a center for young war victims, called "The Hampstead War Nursery." Based on these observations, Anna published a series of studies with her long-time friend, Dorothy Burlingham, on the impact of stress on children. During the 1970's, she was concerned with the problems of emotionally deprived and socially disadvantaged children, and she studied deviations and delays in development. At Yale Law School, she taught seminars on crime and the family: this led to a transatlantic collaboration with Joseph Goldstein and Albert Solnit on children's needs and the law, published in three volumes as *Beyond the Best Interests of the Child* (1973), *Before the Best Interests of the Child* (1979), and *In the Best Interests of the Child* (1986).

Richard Sterba was in Sigmund Freud's first graduating psychoanalytic class in Vienna. The following paper is his most influential.

Readings:

1. Freud, A. (1936). *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*. New York: International Universities Press, pp. 25-53. [Article provided](#)
What are the major ego defense mechanisms understood early in the development of psychoanalysis? Would you add any today? Note the emphasis on the ego as both the site and the focus of psychoanalytic work.
2. Sterba, R. (1934). The Fate of the Ego in Analytic Therapy. *IJP*, 15:117-126. [PEPWeb](#)
This is a classic paper that is too seldom read anymore and yet has had a huge effect on psychoanalysis. It introduces the concept of the observing ego. You should be able to list one advantage of the clinical impact of knowing about the observing ego.

Week 4: February 17, 2017

Ego Psychology, Continued

Analysis of Defenses/Resistances: Close Process Monitoring

Paul Gray, M.D. was a training analyst in Washington, DC, who influenced a generation of psychoanalysts in paying close attention to shifts in tone, cadence and syntax and other manifestations of the play of conflict in the psychoanalytic process. In this paper, he also gives considerable practical advice.

Selma Kramer was a major Philadelphia training analyst, and supervising child analyst. In this paper, she describes "running commentary." Compare it to Gray's approach with adults.

Pray and Davison in the past chaired a discussion group at APSA meetings devoted to Gray's approach. Here Pray explicates Gray's technique and compares it to Brenner's.

At the end of this session, you should be able to employ one of the various approaches to defense analysis.

Readings:

1. Gray, P. (1993). A Brief Didactic Guide to Analysis of the Ego in Conflict. *J. Clin. Psychoanal.*, 2:325-340. [PEPWeb](#)
2. Kramer, S., and Byerly, L.J. (1978). Technique of Psychoanalysis of the Latency Child in *Child analysis and*

Therapy, Edited by J. Glenn. New York: Jason Aronson, pp. 218-226. (Optional: pp. 205-217 and 227-236.)

[Article provided](#)

3. Pray, M. (1996). Two Different Methods of Analyzing Defense in *Danger and Defense: The Technique of Close Process Attention*, Edited by M. Goldberger. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, pp. 53-75. (Optional: 76-106, particularly, p. 103.) [Article provided](#)

Optional:

1. Gray, P. (1986). On Helping Analysands Observe Intrapsychic Activity. In: Gray, P. (1994) *The Ego and Analysis of Defense*. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, pp. 65-85. [Article provided](#)
2. Busch, F. (1996). Free Association and Technique in *Danger and Defense: The Technique of Close Process Attention*, Edited by M. Goldberger. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, pp. 107-130. [Article provided](#)
3. Brenner, C. (1982). *The Mind in Conflict*. New York: New York. Ch. 7, Compromise Formation, pp. 110-120. Here Brenner explains his use of the term “compromise formation” as describing a balance between defense and drive gratification as flexible and mobile. He disagrees with Freud in that he sees compromises formed to optimize satisfaction in the face of anxiety and depressive emotions. [Article provided](#)

Week 5: February 24, 2017

Ego Psychology, Continued Transference and Superego

Readings:

1. Strachey, J. (1934). The Nature of the Therapeutic Action of Psycho-Analysis. *IJP*, 15:127-159. [PEPWeb](#)
This is another classic paper that has had great influence upon psychoanalysis ever since its publication. Notice his emphasis upon transference interpretation as the mutative factor in psychoanalysis. You should be able to list one contrasting item in Strachey’s approach to transference analysis in comparison to others. Contrast this to what you have already read. Strachey is otherwise best known for his translation of Freud’s collected works, the *Standard Edition*.
2. Davison, W.T.; Pray, M.; Bristol, C; and Welker, R. (1996). Defense Analysis and Mutative Interpretation. In *Danger and Defense: The Technique of Close Process Attention*, Edited by M. Goldberger. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, pp. 1-2, 6-15, 19-29. (Optional: 3-5, 16-18, and 30-51.) [Article provided](#)
The authors apply Gray’s approach to analysis of transference. Their copious clinical examples, many more of which are available in the optional material, primarily illustrate what Gill calls interpreting resistances to awareness of transference. You should be able to cite one reason that interpreting the resistance to the awareness of the transference is so helpful.

Optional:

1. Brenner, C. (1982). *The Mind in Conflict*, New York: New York. Ch. 8, The Superego, pp. 121-140. [Article provided](#)
In this chapter, the superego is described as “a group of compromise formations originating largely in the oedipal period.” But departs again partly departs from Freud’s comments in that rather than the “heir” of the oedipal period, Brenner sees the superego as only one of several compromise formations that result from that phase of development.
2. Gill, M.M. (1979). The Analysis of the Transference. *JAPA*, 27S:263-288. [PEPWeb](#)
3. Arlow, J.A., and Brenner, C. (1990). The Psychoanalytic Process. *Psychoanal. Q.*, 59:678-692. [PEPWeb](#)
4. Brenner, C. (2003). Is the Structural Model Still Useful? *IJP*, 84:1093-1096. [PEPWeb](#)
In this brief invited essay, published when he was 89 years old, Brenner makes what would essentially be his final comments regarding the model he had helped to build and that he had protected all of his

working life.

5. Sandler, J. (1960). On the Concept of the Superego. *PSC*, 15:128-162. [PEPWeb](#)

Week 6: March 3, 2017

British Object Relations

Summary of Early Contributors

Melanie Klein, (1882-1960) an Austrian born London psychoanalyst, was analyzed by Ferenczi and along with Anna Freud pioneered the analysis of young children. Her hypotheses of very early complicated fantasy life in infants and children contributed to what is known today as British object relations theory. Probably Kleinian theory, including its later developments influenced by Wilfred Bion, today is the majority psychoanalytic theory worldwide. At the end of this session, you should be able to articulate one or two reasons that focusing on the internal world and unconscious phantasy leads to therapeutic change. Ideally, you will be able to cite two differences in your approach to a relational approach.

Readings:

1. Bronstein, C. (2001). "Melanie Klein: beginnings" in *Kleinian Theory: A Contemporary Perspective*. London/Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers. pp. 1-16. [Article provided](#)
These are some brief notes on Melanie Klein biography. The chapter includes the early development of Klein's ideas that started with the discovery of the psychoanalytic play-technique with children, which she regarded as the equivalent to free association in the adult.
2. Daniel, P. (1992). "Child analysis and the concept of unconscious phantasy" in *Clinical Lectures on Klein and Bion*. London: Routledge. pp. 14-23. [Article provided](#)
Here the concepts of *internal world* and *unconscious phantasy* are explained. It includes a clinical vignette.
3. Bronstein, C. (2001). "What Are Internal Objects?" in *Kleinian Theory: A Contemporary Perspective*. London/Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers. pp. 108-124. [Article provided](#)
This is an explanation of the development of the concept of *internal objects* within the Kleinian theory.

Week 7: March 10, 2017

British Object Relations, Continued

Readings:

1. Segal, H. (1973). "The Paranoid-Schizoid Position" and "The Depressive Position" in *Introduction to the Work of Melanie Klein*. London: Hogarth Press. pp. 24-38 and 67-81. [Article provided](#)
This is a good summary of the concept of developmental "*positions*" according to the Kleinian theory. Segal was one of the major early followers of Klein. You should be able to cite the positions and what leads from one to another.
2. Ogden, Thomas H. (1979) On Projective Identification. *IJP*, 60:357-373. [PEPWeb](#)
This is one of the clearest explanations and descriptions of what takes place in projective identification, a major British object relations concept. Be prepared to discuss brief clinical examples and cite one reason using this idea will alter your clinical practice.
3. Joseph, Betty (1986) Transference: The Total Situation. *IJP*, 66:447-454. [PEPWeb](#)
This paper is a clear and sophisticated example of how modern Kleinians understand transference. You should be able to cite how Joseph's approach differs from Mrs. Klein's.

Introductory Comments about the Middle School:

Commenting on the book, *The Independent Mind in British Psychoanalysis*, by Eric Rayner (1991), Otto Kernberg (*) stated that the Independent group (or school) of British psychoanalysts, that was originally called the “Middle group,” emerged as a result of the controversial discussions between Melanie Klein and Anna Freud and their co-workers and followers. The main independent figures were: Jones, Sharpe, Glover, Flugel, Payne, Rickman, Strachey, Brierley, Fairbairn, Winnicott, Balint, Klauber, Khan, and Bowlby. They all focus on the importance of affects and the multiple aspects of symbolization in relation to affective communication in the psychoanalytic process. They all explore the patient's early development—the pre-oedipal stages—and also pursue the formation of psychic structure through childhood and adolescence. They are concerned with pathological character structure as it manifests itself in the psychoanalytic process and is transformed into transference developments that activate past internalized object relations in the here-and-now, and require analysis, first of all, in the here-and-now. They are particularly interested in the exploration and therapeutic utilization of transference regression. They utilize fully the exploration of countertransference reactions. They think, however, that the analyst should be spontaneous, have the ability to tolerate expressing affect, and that his or her functions include both confrontation and interpretation of defenses as well as the reaffirmation of the patient's healthy, creative qualities. They acknowledge their roots in both classical psychoanalysis as represented by Anna Freud, and the newer findings of the Kleinian approach, particularly its emphasis on internalized object relations as a guiding principle for psychic development, structure formation, and psychoanalytic technique. Above all, they share a concern for and emphasis on the nature of the psychoanalytic process as an object relationship contributed to by the personality and attitudes of the psychoanalyst as well as the personality and nature of the patient's transference regression.

Week 8: March 17, 2017

Object Relations’ Ongoing Evolution

British Middle School: Winnicott, Ogden and Bollas

Guest Instructor: Ann De Lancey, Ph.D.

In a book review on Winnicott, the writer was asked who was the most influential theoretician in his country. In a check of the references of case studies, the writer found that Winnicott was quoted more than any other psychoanalyst including Freud. In this seminar, we will focus on Winnicott with a nod to Ogden and Bollas, more current figures.

Winnicott is a beautiful, poetic writer, but sometimes cryptic and hard to understand. Ogden is also a beautiful writer and much easier to understand. To accomplish two birds with one stone, and given my predilection for cutting edge thinking, I have chosen Ogden’s 2016 article “Destruction reconceived: On Winnicott’s ‘The Use of an Object and Relating through Identifications’” for this seminar. [Article provided](#)

If you want to read Winnicott’s actual article you can find it in PEPWeb: Winnicott, D. W. (1969). The use of an object. *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 50:711-716.

When Ken asked me to do this seminar, he knew that I had been in a study group with Bollas for a number of years. I have also included a paper by Bollas on free association for your independent (not required) reading. If you do read it, included are some questions. I select this paper because it gives such a nice description of free association, which I think will help you listen to your patients. But given the time constraints, our time will be focused on Winnicott/Ogden.

I find all of these authors ahead of their times in exciting ways. We will look at how they anticipate current issues as well as respond to old conundrums.

Objectives:

At the end of this session, clinical associates will be able to:

- identify core aspects of the centrality of development in Winnicott's ideas
- state the goals of psychoanalysis according to Winnicott
 - recognize the importance of authenticity
 - trace the importance of aliveness
- assess the relative importance of theory in Winnicott's view
- cite some of Winnicott's seminal contributions
 - spontaneous gesture
 - true self and false self
 - potential space
 - object use
 - transitional objects
 - the good enough mother
 - fear of breakdown
 - the capacity to be alone
- define the difference between object relating and object usage
 - note the difference between Ogden's first reading of destruction *in fantasy* and second reading *in reality*
 - describe times you have felt as a parent or clinician times you have felt yourself destroyed. See pp. 1250-1251.
 - describe how this phenomenon occurs from infancy through life, e.g. Loewald, Waning of the Oedipus
 - describe the intermediate position between object relating and object usage. p. 1251.
 - Baby's role
 - Mother's role
 - describe the implications for the role of the analyst
- cite one way in which the knowledge or skill you have gained in this session will affect your clinical work.

Questions to keep in mind:

- Is his contribution a new paradigm?
- How does one achieve aliveness?
- What are the implications of Winnicott's theory of development for therapeutic action?
- Does he foreshadow self-psychology and relational thought?

Weeks 9 and 10: March 24 and 31, 2017

Self Psychology

Guest Instructor: Sue Radant, Ph.D. (March 24)

In this section of the course, the participants will be introduced to basic Self Psychological concepts including: self objects, empathy, fragmentation, and symptoms of self disorders. At the end of the course, you will be able to define each of these concepts and state one way that their use will affect your clinical work. We will also explore the differences between Self Psychology and other psychoanalytic theories, and how a self-psychological psychoanalysis works to treat and cure the patient. You will be able to explain one difference between self psychology and previous theories and will be able to state one reason self psychology is mutative. Self Psychology was developed by Heinz Kohut, M.D. (1913-1981), an Austrian-American psychoanalyst in Chicago. A former president of APsaA, he originally was a strong proponent of the traditional

structural approach but became convinced of the need for placing primary importance on empathy in the clinical situation. This in turn guided him to examining his patients' self states and to the hypothesis of selfobject relations.

Readings:

Week 9:

Wolf, E.S. (2002). *Treating the Self: Elements of Self Psychology*. Guilford Press: New York (Ernest Wolf, M.D. was a fellow Chicagoan colleague of Kohut and a close collaborator in the development of self psychology.)

- 1) Chapter 1: Introduction: Historical Developments, pp. 3-8
- 2) Chapter 2: General Orientation: The Inner Life of Man, pp. 9-22
- 3) Chapter 3: Basic Concepts of Self Psychology, pp. 23-49

Articles provided

Week 10:

Kohut, H. (1984). *How Does Analysis Cure?* The University of Chicago Press: Chicago. Chapter 6: The Curative Effect of Analysis: The Self Psychological Reassessment of the Therapeutic Process, pp. 80-110. [Article provided](#)

Week 11: April 7, 2017

Relational Psychoanalysis

Guest Instructor: Margaret (Peggy) Crastnopol, Ph.D.

Relational psychoanalysis is not a single theory, but a collection of theories rooted in the view that the self is fundamentally “relational by design” (Stephen Mitchell). Thus, relationships both intrapsychic and interpersonal play a primary role in the development of character, selfhood, and psychopathology. In contrast to a traditional drive model based on libidinal and aggressive impulses and their associated conflicts (a “one-person” model), relational psychoanalysis sees psychic development as underwritten by the vicissitudes of anxiety and a sense of self-worth as these play out in the relational matrix (a “two-person” model). We look at the way in which internal and external relational configurations can generate underlying psychic distress, and how they may be shifted to relieve the distress and further emotional maturation.

Our class discussion will address, and you will be able to articulate answers to, the following questions: What are the defining characteristics of relational psychoanalysis? What are the two prior strands of thinking that contribute most strongly to it? How is relational psychoanalysis both related to and distinct from other models of psychoanalysis? What does relational psychoanalysis look like in clinical practice?

Readings:

1. Mitchell, Stephen (1988) *Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA. pp. 271-306. [Article provided](#)
Stephen Mitchell, Ph.D. (1946-2000) had a brilliant way of digging into psychoanalytic theory to examine inconsistencies, commonalities and paths for future development. His book with Jay Greenberg, *Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory* (1983), became a classic textbook, providing a systematic comparison of what had long been a highly complex and often confusing set of disparate theories. *Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory* distinguished between psychoanalytic theories that emphasize biological drives such as sexuality and aggression, on the one hand, and theories that emphasize human relationships, on the other. The former were referred to as *drive/conflict theories*, and the latter were termed *relational/conflict theories*. Mitchell and Greenberg argued that drive theories and relational theories are conceptually incompatible, and psychoanalysis must therefore choose between them. After their book, the ideas of Mitchell and Greenberg diverged. Mitchell became generally acknowledged as the founder of the Relational school of psychoanalysis.

2. Aron, L. (1991) The Patient's Experience of the Analyst's Subjectivity. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 1(1):29-51. [PEPWeb](#)

Lewis Aron, Ph.D. is Director of the New York University Postdoctoral Program in Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis and was formerly President of the Division of Psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association. His 1996 volume *A Meeting of Minds: Mutuality in Psychoanalysis* and his 1999 edited volume with Stephen Mitchell, *Relational Psychoanalysis: The Emergence of a Tradition*, are considered two of the essential texts in contemporary American psychoanalysis.

Week 12: April 14, 2017

Relational Psychoanalysis, Continued

Guest Instructor: Margaret (Peggy) Crastnopol, Ph.D.

Relational psychoanalysis levels a strong critique against the idea of the neutral analyst. In this class we will focus on a key contribution of relational psychoanalysis, the notion of the bi-directional nature of transference and countertransference, and the role of the interacting subjectivities of patient and analyst. Relational clinicians operate from the assumption that the analyst brings his or her own personal motivations and experience into the clinical encounter, and these importantly shape the unfolding transference and countertransference, which in turn affect the therapeutic relationship and its power to help the patient grow.

In this class, we'll consider, and you will be able to develop coherent answers to, the following questions: How do relational theories conceptualize the influence of the analyst on the evolving transference and countertransference, the "real relationship," and the treatment's therapeutic impact in general? What roles do unarticulated experience and dissociation play in the patient's difficulty in changing (what might otherwise be called "resistance")? How can the analyst's use of him- or herself help reveal the patient's psychic obstacles and help the patient overcome these?

What is the difference between major trauma and "micro-traumas," and how might the latter, though subtler and less remarkable, affect one's psyche and character in damaging ways? What particular shapes do these smaller traumas take, and how are they played out in the analytic relationship? How can the analyst recognize, understand, and mitigate the negative impact of micro-traumatic tendencies in the patient's life and in the therapeutic relationship itself?

Readings:

1. Bromberg, P.M. (2008). Shrinking the Tsunami: Affect Regulation, Dissociation, and the Shadow of the Flood. *Contemp. Psychoanal.*, 44:329-350. [PEPWeb](#)
Philip M. Bromberg, Ph.D. is a training and supervising analyst at the William Alanson White Institute. He has written extensively concerning human mental development and the patient/therapist relationship, and has presented an interpersonal/relational point of view that emphasizes self-organization, states of consciousness, dissociation, and multiple self-states in his books: *Standing in the Spaces: Essays on Clinical Process, Trauma, and Dissociation* (1998), *Awakening the Dreamer: Clinical Journeys* (2006), and *The Shadow of the Tsunami: and the Growth of the Relational Mind* (2011).
2. Crastnopol, M. (2015). *Micro-trauma: A Psychoanalytic Understanding of Cumulative Psychic Injury*, Routledge, pp. 1-22. [Article provided](#)

Optional:

1. Stern, D.B. (1990). Courting surprise - Unbidden perceptions in clinical practice. *Contemp. Psychoanal.*, 26:452-478. [PEPWeb](#)

Week 13: April 21, 2017

Attachment and Mentalization - Important Themes in Modern Psychoanalysis

“Mentalization Treatment” derives from the work of Fonagy and Target and their collaborators and is based on a synthesis of attachment theory and psychoanalysis. Think about how your theoretical stance is linked to the development of mentalization in your patients and be able to articulate one way in which you have used, or will use, the concept of mentalization to help your patients.

Readings:

1. Fonagy, P., Target, M. (2007). The Rooting of the Mind in the Body: New Links between Attachment Theory and Psychoanalytic Thought. *JAPA*, 55:411-456. [PEPWeb](#)
Peter Fonagy (born 1952) is a Hungarian-born British psychoanalyst, Professor of Contemporary Psychoanalysis and Developmental Science and head of the department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology at University College London, Chief Executive of the Anna Freud Centre, and a training and supervising analyst in the British Psycho-Analytical Society in child and adult analysis. We have had Dr. Fonagy and his colleague, Mary Target, Ph.D., here several times to present their ground-breaking synthesis of attachment theory/research and psychoanalysis. This work has in turn developed into mentalization-based treatment, proven effective with borderline personality disorders.

Optional:

1. Holmes, J. (2006). Mentalizing from a Psychoanalytic Perspective: What’s New? In *Handbook of Mentalization-based Treatment*. Ed. J.G. Allen and Fonagy, P. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 31-49.
[Article provided](#)

Week 14: April 28, 2017

Synthesis and Review

Review of theory and connection to treatment

In this class we will review where we have been and talk about different approaches to clinical work.

Readings:

1. Akhtar, S. (2000). From Schisms Through Synthesis to Informed Oscillation: An Attempt at Integrating Some Diverse Aspects of Psychoanalytic Technique. *Psychoanal Q.*, 69:265-288. [PEPWeb](#)
2. Greenberg, J. (2001) The analyst’s participation: A new look, *JAPA*, 49:359-381 with 5 Optional commentaries: Object Relations: Casement, P.J. pp. 381-386 (5); Relational: Crastnopol, M. pp. 386-398 (3); Eclectic: Kantrowitz, J.L. pp. 398-403 (5); Classical: Michels, R. pp. 406-410 (4); Relational/Interpersonal: Pizer, B. pp. 411-417 (6); and authors response. [PEPWeb](#)

Jay Greenberg, of the William Alanson White Institute, presents a paper on the contemporary relational approaches to the nature of the analyst’s participation in the psychoanalytic process and five authors with divergent theoretical orientations respond. In what ways are these theoretical perspectives alike and in what ways are they different? With which positions do you find yourself resonating as an analyst?