

NEDOVRŠENO PISMO – NEDOVRŠENI OSVRT NA RAD: KONTRATRANSFER I REVERIE U GRUPNOJ ANALIZI

/ AN UNFINISHED LETTER – AN UNFINISHED COMMENT ON AN ARTICLE: COUNTERTRANSFERENCE AND REVERIE IN GROUP ANALYSIS

Zdenka Brumen Budanko

neuropshijatrica, edukatorica iz psihoanalitičke psihoterapije i grupne analize, članica HDPP i IGA.

neuropsychiatrist, educator in psychoanalytic psychotherapy and group analysis, member of HDPP and IGA.

Poštovana profesorice Moro – draga
Ljiljana,

prorađujući u sebi ideju da napišem osvrt na rad: „Kontratransfer i *reverie* u grupnoj analizi (1) iskristalizirala mi se potreba za jednim pismom. Odlučivši ipak da napišem osvrt, a i dobila sam takav „zadatak“, ispalo je nedovršeno pismo – nedovršeni osvrt. Potaknuta ovim radom ali i cijelim prošlim brojem našega časopisa, pomišljam na formiranje jedne „studijske“ grupe koja bi promišljala recepciju „novih paradigmi“ psihoanalize kod nas - a i sama bih rado tome dala prilog i povrh ovoga osvrta. Mišljeno je to, zašto ne, i u okviru potrage za *common ground* ‘relacijske psihoanalize’, premda mislim da većina nas vjeruje da psihoanaliza ima svoj čvrsti *common ground*. Koloplet je pojmovna, termina te njihovih značenja, kao što su ‘relacijska psihoanaliza’, i njezine sastavnice ‘intersubjektivna psihoana-

Dear professor Moro – dear Ljiljana,

while thinking about the idea of writing a comment on the article “Countertransference and *reverie* in group analysis” (1), I felt the need to write a letter. Having then decided to write a comment instead, which was also my “task”, the letter was left unfinished – and so was the comment. Motivated by this article, but also by the entire last issue of our journal, I have been thinking about forming a “study” group that would consider the reception of “new paradigms” of psychoanalysis in our country – which I would gladly contribute to, along with writing this comment. This was conceived, and why not, within the frame of the search for a common ground of “relational psychoanalysis”, although I think that most of us believe that psychoanalysis has a firm common ground. There is a web of concepts, terms, and their meanings, such as “relational psychoanalysis” and its components, “intersubjective psycho-

liza' ali i „intersubjektivna self psihologija“, koje ipak nisu istoznačnice za sve autore, dok za druge to mogu biti /Pohlmann, 2013/ (2). Intersubjektivističku perspektivu, izlučenu iz filozofske tradicije fenomenologije i Gestalt-psihologije, W. Pohlmann ne vidi kao teoriju, nego kao „metateoriju“, kojom proces koji se odvija u dotično vrijeme, kao svoj pravi subjekt ispostavlja „intersubjektivno polje“, s njegovim imanentnim strukturama“ (prema Orange et al., 2001). On dalje kaže: „To ukazuje na nužnost teorije kako bi se razumjelo što se i kako odvija u psihičkim procesima, koji su uvijek već „više“ i „drukčije“ nego unutar njih zahvaćene osobe“ (2). Tu se nazire pojam trećeg, s kojim ogdenovski „analitički treći“ kao noviji, nije istoznačan. Kao što ni izraz intersubjektivnost (u njegovu 'samorazumljivom', ali i u specifičnijem značenju unutar humanističko-filozofskih disciplina), nije uvijek istoznačan. Posebno u dvije sastavnice psihoanalize: u većini istraživanja dojenačkog razdoblja i s njima povezanim konceptima, te u onim njezinim usmjerenjima koji, uvažavajući „relacijsko“ i „intersubjektivno“, ne odustaju od temeljnog predmeta 'klasične psihoanalize' i njezina pojmovnika.

Pismo ne ću završiti, nego ću za njegov djelomični nastavak koristiti mogućnost *intermedijarnog prostora* koja mi se ukazala „zadatkom“ da napišem osvrt. Vjerujem da će neka od pitanja

analysis“ and “intersubjective self psychology“, which are not synonyms for all authors, while others consider them as such /Pohlmann, 2013/ (2). The intersubjective perspective, extracted from the philosophical tradition of phenomenology and Gestalt psychology, is not considered a theory by W. Pohlmann, but as a “metatheory“, according to which a process taking place at a certain time establishes “the intersubjective field“ as its real subject, “along with its immanent structures“ (Orange et al., 2001). He continues to say the following: “This indicates the necessity for a theory in order to understand what takes place, and how it does so, in psychological processes, which are always already “more“ and “different“ than the people caught within them“ (2). This reveals the concept of the third, with which Ogden's “analytic third“, which is newer, is not synonymous. In the same way, the expression of intersubjectivity (in its 'self-explanatory' meaning, but also in the more specific meaning within humanist and philosophical disciplines) is not always synonymous. Especially in two segments of psychoanalysis: in most studies of the infant period and related concepts, and in those of its approaches which, while taking into consideration the “relational“ and the “intersubjective“, do not abandon the basic subject of 'classic psychoanalysis' and its range of terms.

I will not finish the letter, but use as its partial continuation the possibility of *intermediary space*, which presented



koje sam željela podijeliti kroz pismo, biti vidljiva iz osvrta. Stoga zahvala autoru Anti Biliću, koji je svojim radom (1) važan dio tih pitanja, potaknuo. Izlaskom prošloga broja časopisa, pod uredničkom palicom poštovane gošće-urednice Mirjane L. Pernar, naše drage Lenči (3), isto je tako temom (supervizija) i „podtemom“ („intersubjektivistička psihoanaliza“), naznačen dobar dio pitanja iz „pisma“. Radovi u tom broju ukazuju na neke razine odgovora na pitanja koja sam htjela postaviti. Tim više, što smo bili u mogućnosti ponovo, nakon preduga razdoblja tišine, čuti glas i inozemnih autora. Ovdje spominjem, jer mi je i osobno važno, a ne smije biti samo osobno, opasku R. S. Balmera, koji uz pohvale „zanimljivu i inovativnu radu /.../“ napominje: „Nedostatak je što rad obuhvaća samo anglofone doprinose temi jer se rasprava o tome aktivno vodi i u Francuskoj i u Njemačkoj“ (4).

Nastavljam s nekoliko implicitnih pojmova kojima bi se, mislim, trebalo baviti u transpersonalnom (ali i u transsubjektivnom) settingu. *Self-disclosure* /u smislu kako ga prikazuje jedan od autora u prošleme broju *Psihoterapije* (5)/. Potom *reverie*: Bionov pojam iz ranih šezdesetih, već poprilično transformiran pridanim mu značenjima, ovisno i o specifičnom kontekstu radova u kojima se koristi. Bion definira: „Termin *reverie* može se primijeniti na koji bilo *sadržani /contained/*. Ovdje ga shvaćam ogra-

itself through the “task” of writing the comment. I believe that some of the questions I wished to share in the letter will be noticeable in the comment. Therefore, I wish to thank the author, Ante Bilić, whose article (1) motivated an important part of those questions. The publication of the last issue of the journal, under the editorial supervision of the guest-editor, Mirjana L. Pernar, our dear Lenči (3), and its topic (supervision) and “sub-topic” (“intersubjective psychoanalysis”) indicated a large part of the questions I wanted to propose. Moreover, after a long period of silence, we once more had the opportunity to hear the voices of foreign authors. Since it is important for me personally, but also in general, here I stress the comment by R. S. Balmer, who while complimenting “the interesting and innovating article /.../”, notes the following: “One shortcoming is that the article encompasses only anglophone contributions to the topic because discussions about it are actively taking place in France and Germany as well” (4). I continue with a few implicit terms which, I believe, we should consider in transpersonal (but also in trans-subjective) setting. *Self-disclosure* /as presented by one of the authors in the last issue of *Psychotherapy*/ (5). Also, *reverie*: Bion’s term from the early sixties, already significantly transformed by added meanings, depending on the specific context of articles in which it is used. Bion defines it as follows: “The term *reverie* can be applied to any *contained*. Here I consider it limited to the *contained* with the footprint of love or hate. Limited

ničenim na *sadržani* s otiskom ljubavi ili mržnje. U tom smislu ograničeno, sanjarenje /*reverie*/ je stanje duha (uma) receptivno za sve objekte koji pristižu od objekta ljubavi; drukčije rečeno, od uma sposobnog prihvatiti projektivne identifikacije dojenčeta, koje su s njegove strane shvaćene kao dobre ili loše. Ukratko, *reverie* je faktor *funkcije alfa* majke" /str.54; prev. s franc. ZBB/ (6). Zatim, *analitički treći* (Ogden : nesvjesna intersubjektivna konstrukcija kojoj pridonose pacijent i psihoanalitičar, asimetrično (7). *Treći* (možda ipak *treće*?) rezultat je nesvjesnih transformacijskih procesa u intersubjektivnim poljima susreta (7). Tragajući za razumijevanjem psihoanalitičkog procesa, u svom radu s pacijenticom koju vidi u 'borderline-konstelaciji', pri tome 'borderline' shvaćeno ne kao organizacija osobnosti, nego „kao obrambena i prienosna struktura“ (prema Juliji Kristevoj 1983., i J. Steineru 1993) koja se događa u svrhu izbjegavanja psihotične krize“, autor Rolf-Peter Warsitz govori o *intersubjektivnosti* i o *'trećosti'* (8). Intersubjektivnost prikazuje kao istraživačku psihoanalitičku metodu, koja se koristi iskustvom „premjeravanja“ u prostoru govorenja i tumačenja, kao varijablama a ne konstantama te metode i procesa. Proces započinje prvi (pacijent) upitom na drugoga, koji, pretpostavljeno, *zna* (analitičar). S idejom G. Pankowa, da razdvojeni (šireći se) prostor rađa vri-

to that sense, daydreaming /*reverie*/ is a state of the spirit (the mind) receptive to all objects that arrive from the object of love; in other words, from a mind able to accept projective identifications of an infant, who in its turn considers them good or bad. In short, *reverie* is a factor of the mother's *alpha function* /p. 54; trans. from French ZBB/ (6)." *The analytic third* (Ogden: unconscious intersubjective construct contributed to by the patient and the psychoanalyst asymmetrically (7). *The third* is a result of unconscious transformational processes in the intersubjective fields of encounter (7).

Searching for the understanding of the psychoanalytic process, in his work with a patient he considers to be in a 'borderline-constellation', while understanding 'borderline' not as an organization of personality, but as a "defensive and transmission structure (according to Julia Kristeva 1983 and J. Steiner 1993) that occurs with the aim of avoiding a psychotic crisis", Rolf-Peter Warsitz discusses *intersubjectivity* and *'thirdness'* (8). He presents intersubjectivity as a psychoanalytic research method used in the experience of "remeasurement" in the space of speaking and interpreting as variables and not as constants of this method and process. The process is initiated by the first one (the patient) asking the second one, who it is assumed *knows* the answer (the analyst). Using the idea of G. Pankow that divided (widening) space generates time, and "borrowing" Julia Kristeva's terms from Greek mythology and philos-



jeme, i od Julije Kristeve „posuđujući“ stare grčke mitološke i filozofske termine, između ostalih i Platonove, traga za s(t)jecištem kronološkog i aionalnog vremena (koje se ponovo rađa u smislu Aiona; ciklično). Riječ je o *kairosu*, ‘posrećenom’ intersubjektivnim trenutkom susreta, o povlaštenom trenutku tumačenja. Autor (8) prikazuje pacijenticu, koja, u svojem najranijem vremenu razvoja, nije doživjela *reverie* majke usmjeren na sebe. Suprotno, odvijao se vjerojatno onaj scenarij, koji opisuje Bion, 1963 (9), kada se *reverie* usmjera-va od djeteta prema majci. Ishod može biti u malignom obliku ponavljane projektivne identifikacije, sve do potpunog psihičkog i tjelesnog iscrpljenja. Majka, kao u nekim grčkim mitovima, odbija projekciju, ne može drukčije. U njezinom omamljenom umu (izrodila je i šestero djece), izgleda da se „nastanio“ pacijentičin, ili „možda majčin vlastiti“, otac. „Imaginarni“ je to otac po Kristevoj, s kojim se primarna identifikacija u dijadnom vremenu (maternalnom prostoru, *korī*) izbjegava (otklanja). Za „njim“ se, kao za objektom fantazije, traga (za „gostoljubivosti“ majčinskog prostora, u smislu „unutarnjeg fantazijskog aktiviteta“ majke i u njemu „skrivenog“ imaginarnog oca; to je način na koji je kreirano intersubjektivno dijadno polje ove pacijentice). Pacijentica će ga nalaziti u svom pozivu, opet ga gubiti, i, nakon psihotičnog sloma, ponovo tražiti

ophy, among which are Plato’s terms, he searches for the intersection of chronological and aionic time (which is born again in the sense of Aion; cyclically). This is *kairos*, the ‘felicitous’ intersubjective moment of encounter, the privileged moment of interpretation. The author (8) shows the patient, who, in the earliest time of her development, did not experience the *reverie* of the mother directed at her. Quite the opposite, it is likely that the scenario that Bion, 1963 (9) describes took place, wherein the *reverie* is directed by the child at the mother. The outcome can be a malignant form of repetitive projective identification until total psychological and physical exhaustion. As in some Greek myths, the mother rejects projection, and can do nothing else. It seems that the patient’s or “the mother’s own” father seems to have established himself in her dazed mind (she has given birth to six children). According to Kristeva, this is an “imaginary” father, with whom the primary identification in dyadic time (maternal space, *korī*) is avoided (eliminated). “He” is searched for as an object of fantasy (the “hospitality” of maternal space, in the sense of “fantastic inner activity” of the mother and the imaginary father “hidden” within it; that is the way the intersubjective dyadic field of this patient is created). The patient will find him in her calling, lose him again, and following a psychotic breakdown, search for him again in psychoanalysis. Watzslitz stresses the difference between the “imaginary father” and Lacan’s “symbolic law” (“the name of the father”), the denial

u psihoanalizi. Warsitz, ističući razliku između „imaginarnog oca“ i Lacanova „simboličnog zakona“ („ime oca“), poricanje kojega čini „strukturni princip psihoze“, povezuje tu razliku upravo s mogućnošću stvaranja „borderline pozicije“ za narcistično-depresivne (‘melanholične’) pacijente. Pri tom stratificira (u osloncu i na Greenov „rad negativnog“ i „tercijarni proces“) stvaranje ‘trećosti’ (to znači i u smislu „razdvajanja prostora“: „rađanja vremena“, i u smislu Platonove *trećosti*) : prvo odvajanje je u kategoriji kore (majčinskog prostora) gdje je *treće* viđeno kao međutjelesnost susreta; uvlačenje oca u triangulaciju je druga kategorija odvajanja, odvajanje od simbiotične tjelesnosti s majkom; i simbol falusa (oca) kao *treće* odvajanje, koje omogućuje nastanak *trećosti*. Nakon dugotrajnog skupljanja makar i malih znakova intersubjektivnosti po analitičkom polju, od strane pacijentičinog analitičara, pa premda i s prijetećim „usputnim“ gubitcima, u procesu prorade (uz pomoć slutnji i nagovještaja, pa i „himera“ intersubjektivnosti; ali ipak i „suzvučja slobodne asocijacije i jednakojerno lebdeće pažnje“), kada analitičar nađe u sebi mogućnost da „fungira kao imaginarni otac i ujedno kao dio majke“, dolazi kroz to do „lomljenja“ okamenjene prostornosti, i trenutka križanja kronološkog i cikličnog vremena, mogućega momenta tumačenja. Za pacijenticu, obnavljanje ranije uspješne

of which makes the “structural principle of psychosis”, and connects this difference with the possibility of creating a “borderline position” for narcissist-depressed (‘melancholic’) patients. He stratifies (while employing Green’s “the work of the negative” and “tertiary process”) the creation of ‘thirdness’ (which also means in the sense of “space separation”: “the birth of time”, and in the sense of Plato’s *thirdness*): the first separation is in the category of kora (maternal space), where the *third* is seen as the interbody encounter; the inclusion of the father in the triangulation is the second category of separation, the separation from symbiotic physicality with the mother; and the symbol of the phallus (the father) as the third separation, which enables the creation of *thirdness*. After a lengthy collection of even the smallest signs of intersubjectivity in the analytic field by the patient’s analyst, even with threatening “incidental” losses, the process of working through (with the aid of conjectures and hints, and even the “chimera” of intersubjectivity; but also with the “harmony of free association and equally drifting attention”), when the analyst finds in themselves the possibility to “function as the imaginary father and also as part of the mother”, this leads to the “breaking” of petrified spatiality and the moment of the crossing of chronological and cyclical time, the possible moment of interpretation. For the patient, the restoration of the successful earlier artistic activity. Told briefly here, but a long and arduous process. Heavily traumatized war veter-



umjetničke aktivnosti. Kratka priča ovdje; kroki dugog i teškoga procesa.

U sličnoj se „priči“, međutim, mogu za-teći i teško traumatizirani ratni veterani. Za razumijevanje intersubjektivnog /transsubjektivnog/ procesa, kada se priprema mogućnost pojave *trećega*, koja se ipak ne može planirati, transformacije pojma vremena ne bi smjele biti zaobidene (u suvremenim radovima sve se više obnavlja važnost i značenje zanemarivanoga Freudova pojma *Nachtraeglichkeit*, s učitavanjem u njega i novih spoznaja o pojmu vremena). Pojmovi transfera i kontratransfera su uvijek prisutni, pa se i u analitičkom polju grupe uvijek iznova kreiraju i rekreiraju njihovi međusobni odnosi. „Misliti transsubjektivnost“, može se na neki način naći gotovo u svim osvrtima na rad gošće-urednice prošloga broja *Psihoterapije*. „Da, bolje je, ples crvene i crne čipke“, kao da čujem autoričin glas kako nježno i zamišljeno, ali odlučno (je li to strast?), odgovara (3). /Ne citiram, učitavam./ Rad *Kontratransfer i reverie u grupnoj analizi* (1), nesumnjivo potiče studioznu raspravu.

NEDOVRŠENI OSVRT NA RAD: KONTRATRANSFER I REVERIE U GRUPNOJ ANALIZI

Osvrt je koncipiran samo kao početni prilog, vezan uz navedeni rad (1). Za

ans may also find themselves in a similar “story”. For the understanding of the intersubjective /trans-subjective/ process, wherein there is preparation for the possibility of the appearance of the *third*, which cannot be planned, the transformations of time should not be avoided (contemporary articles increasingly revive the importance and significance of Freud’s neglected term *Nachtraeglichkeit*, while reading into it new insights regarding time). The terms of transference and countertransference are always present, and in the analytical field of the group their mutual relations are always created and recreated anew. “Thinking trans-subjectivity” can be found in some form in almost all comments on the article of the guest-editor of the last issue of *Psychotherapy*. “Yes, it’s better, the dance of red and black lace,” as if I can hear the author’s voice as it gently and contemplatively, but also firmly (is that passion?) replies (3). /I am not quoting, I am reading into./

The article *Countertransference and reverie in group analysis* (1) undoubtedly encourages a studious discussion.

AN UNFINISHED COMMENT ON THE ARTICLE COUNTERTRANSFERENCE AND REVERIE IN GROUP ANALYSIS

The comment was conceived only as an initial contribution connected with the aforementioned article (1). The precise

precizniji oblik naziva, nije se uvijek jednako precizno brinulo, ali jeste o biti rečenoga. Slažem se s autorom da su „oslobođenje“ kontratransfera od „freudovske stege“, doprinosima Ferenczija, Balinta, Paule Heimann te ostalih uvodno u radu citiranih autora, imali važan utjecaj na razvoj suvremene psihoanalize, i iz nje izvedenih psihoterapija, pa i na supervizijske procese. U radu je izrazito naglašen povoljni utjecaj supervizije na prepoznavanje, razumijevanje i promjene u autorovom kontratransferu. Naglašen je i negativni utjecaj tzv. institucijskog kontratransfera na rad u grupi, a s tim u vezi autor u upućuje i na to da „**Foulkes o kontratransferu govori i kao „role-response“ – uloga koja korespondira sa pacijentovim projektivnim identifikacijama, /.../**“. Pa, vezano uz empatiju s pacijentom u grupi ili s grupom kao cjelinom, još i ovo: „**Nikad ne može biti distanciran u terapijskom procesu. Istodobno mora biti dovoljno slobodan od osobnih problema, da se ne utopi u emocionalnom vrtlogu svojih pacijenata.**“

Autor se referira i na Biona i Ezriela s aspekta prirode regresije u grupi, „usisava“ grupne voditelje u određene uloge, te kaže: „Bion smatra da se u grupnom psihoterapijskom tretmanu sve interpretacije moraju zasnivati na emocionalnim reakcijama analitičara. Uvjeren je da te reakcije potječu iz

form of the title did not always receive a lot of attention, but the essence of the content did. I agree with the author's claim that the “release” of countertransference from “Freudian shackles”, the contributions of Ferenczi, Balinto, Paula Heimann, and other authors quoted in the introduction had an important influence on the development of contemporary psychoanalysis and its derived psychotherapies, and even on the processes of supervision. The article emphasizes the beneficial influence of supervision on the recognition, understanding, and changes in the author's countertransference. The emphasis is also on the negative influence of the so called institutional countertransference on the work in a group, and in connection with this the author states that “**Foulkes also refers to countertransference as a “role-response” – the role which corresponds to the patient's projective identification, /.../**”. So, in connection with empathy with a patient in a group, and the group as a whole, he also says: “**He can never be distant in the therapeutic process. At the same time, he must be freed enough from personal problems in order not to drown in the emotional whirl of his patients.**”

The author also refers to Bion and Ezriel from the aspect of the nature of regression in a group, “draws” group therapists into certain roles”, and says: “Bion thinks that in group psychotherapeutic treatment all interpretations must be based on the analyst's emotional reactions. He is convinced that these reactions stem



činjenice da je analitičar u grupi prijemnik projektivnih identifikacija i da taj mehanizam igra vrlo značajnu ulogu u grupi“. „I dalje: „Projicirani sadržaj je predmet „sanjarenja“ i prorade osjećaja,/..../“

U tom kontekstu komentirala bih da je Bionov rad, vezano uz emocionalnost, kako se ona općenito percipira, ponešto drukčije „prirode“. Njegova je intencija u ranoj fazi promišljanja (šezdesete prošloga stoljeća) usmjerena više prema „strukтури“ emocija s aspekta njihova odnosa s misaonim procesima (6)), što je pokušao i matematički prikazati pomoću mreže (The grid) u radu iz 1963.(9) U tom pravcu je doraden i smisao termina *reverie*, s aspekta „raspršenih elemenata beta“, i položaja u kojem se tada može zateći psihoterapeut kao „container koji traži svoj container“ (pogl. devet; str. 37-47, posebice završni odlomci). Nužnost posjedovanja kapaciteta za *reverie* nije dakle mišljena u uobičajenom smislu ljubavi, povezanosti i ugone u kakvom intersubjektivnom odnosu, nego kao urođeni majčin kapacitet da dijete po porodu izvuče iz realne opasnosti psihičkog i fizičkog umiranja, zbog nesposobnosti da samostalno preživi. Razvoj mišljenja po Bionu je isto tako (biološka) nužnost, jer *'misli'* ('proto-misli') koje naviru zajedno s gladi moraju se *misлити*, otuda izraz „aparatus za *misljenje* misli“. To je slično kao što se

from the fact that, in a group, the analyst is a receiver of projective identification and that this mechanism plays a very important role in the group.“. He continues to say: “The projected content is the subject of “reverie” and processing emotions,/..../“

In this context, I would like to say that Bion's work, connected with emotionality, as it is generally perceived, is of a somewhat different “nature”. Its intention in the early stage of thinking (the sixties of the twentieth century) is directed more at the “structure” of emotions from the aspect of their relationship with the thinking processes (6), which he attempted to show mathematically using the grid in an article from 1963 (9). The meaning of the term *reverie* was completed in this direction, from the aspect of “dispersed beta elements” and the position in which the psychotherapist may then find themselves as a “container seeking their own container” (chapter 9; p. 37-47, especially the final passages). The necessity for possessing the capacity for *reverie* is therefore not considered in the usual sense of love, connection, and pleasure in some intersubjective relationship, but as an inherent capacity of the mother to take the child out of real danger of psychological and physical dying after birth, due to its inability to survive independently. The development of thinking is, according to Bion, also a (biological) necessity, because *'thoughts'* ('proto-thoughts') that come with hunger must be *thought*, and that is where the term ‘the machine for

jelo mora jesti da bi se preživjelo; jedno dolazi izvana, drugo iznutra, ali je i jedno i drugo biološki osigurano putem majčinog *reverie*. „Aparat za *mišljenje*“ će se tek postupno formirati. Majku se mora moći prije toga dozvati, i to je stanje vezano najprije uz „protomisli“. Majka ima „urođeni“ kapacitet za *reverie*, kako bi „čula“ dijete koje ju, nemušto i u „stravi bez imena“, doziva. Zato je to, po Sandleru „način na koji se iskazuje ljubav a ne ljubav sama“ (7). I stoga, *reverie* tako koncipiran, prikladno je nadopuniti pojmom *dreaming* (7), kada su uvjeti za to dani. Emocionalnost u svome negativnom obliku ('H' i 'minus K'), konstrukti su s kojima su snažno povezani i neki aspekti grupe. Prema Bionovom ranijem konceptu „osnovnih pretpostavki“, u slučaju grupe u ovom radu, prevladavajuća pretpostavka je „borba-bijeg“ iz koje grupa teško izlazi (10).

Na „analitički treći“ ću pokušati ukazati na primjeru sekvenci iz samoga rada. U radu nas se upućuje na upotrebu tog pojma kod Thomasa Ogdena, u smislu pojave novoga subjekta u psihoanalitičkom intersubjektivnom polju. Je li to doživljajni izričaj, rezultanta sanjarenja i sanjanja, možda i „nova supstanca“ koja nastaje u prostoru intersubjektivnoga, nova vrijednost, ali i „ono“ 'heisenberški neodređeno', rezultat potrage za sceničnim prikazom, oblik koji izranja u snu? Je li to možda Bionovo 'O'? Na

thinking thoughts' comes from. This is similar to the fact that *food* must be *eaten* in order to survive; one comes from outside, the other from within, but both are biologically ensured through the mother's *reverie*. "The *thinking* machine" will gradually form. The mother must be able to be summoned before then, and this state is connected first with "proto-thoughts". The mother has an "inherent" capacity for *reverie* in order to "hear" the child that is calling to her clumsily and in a "nameless panic". That is why Sandler considers it "a way to express love, and not love in itself" (7). Thus, it is appropriate to supplement this conception of *reverie* with the concept of *dreaming* (7) when the conditions for that exist. Emotionality in its negative form ('H' and 'minus K') are constructs with which certain aspects of the group are closely connected. According to Bion's earlier concept of "basic assumptions", in the case of the group in this article, the dominant assumption is the "fight-flight", which the group leaves with difficulty (10).

I will attempt to indicate the "analytic third" on the example of sequences from the article itself. The article notes the use of the term in Thomas Ogden, in the sense of the appearance of a new subject in the psychoanalytic intersubjective field. Is that an expression of experience, a result of daydreaming and dreaming, perhaps a "new substance" created in the space of the intersubjective, a new value, but also Heisenberg's uncertain "it", the result of a search for a scenic display,



tom je mjestu sigurnije se obratiti teoriji, u kojoj tražimo „argument“ za korištenje pojma „analitičkog trećeg“. To treba ostaviti ipak priložima za *imaginiranu* „studioznu raspravu“, nadam se ne u tako dalekoj budućnosti. Ovdje samo još ističem da je pojam *trećega* kao i pojam intersubjektivnosti, starijega podrijetla od danas najčešće korištenih njegovih varijanti. U tom smislu dobro će biti spomenuti kontroverzu započetu na internetu radom J. Whitebooka „koji se odnosio na „međusobno priznavanje i rad negativnog“, a na koji je odgovorio A. Honneth (2001) radom „Facete predsocijalnog selfa“. Slijedio je odgovor J. Whitebooka (2003) radom kojim postavlja granice za „intersubjective turn“ u psihoanalizi. Glavni naglasak je na obrani Freudova jezgrenog sadržaja od „nove alijanse intersubjektivističkih društvenih teoretičara“ i „istraživača maloga djeteta“. Postulira egzistenciju bilo koje vrste pred-refleksivnog znanja, i opovrgava izjednačavanje selfa s refleksivnim selfom (11). Uključenjem u debatu H.-J. Buscha (2003) vidimo intersubjektivitet kao „borbu i priznavanje ne-intersubjektivnog“. Za Honnetha, po Buschu, „priznanje uključuje borbu“, za Whitebooka, „borba i priznanje se isključuju“, a Busch (12) zauzima treću poziciju: „Borba za priznavanje uvijek je samo jedna strana realnosti oko intersubjektiviteta; intersubjektivitet je uvijek jednako i borba protiv priznavanja“.

the form that emerges in a dream? Is it Bion's 'O'? At this point it is more useful to refer to theory, in which we search for an "argument" for the use of the term "the analytic third". This should be left to articles on the *imagined* "studious discussion", hopefully in a not so distant future. Here, I merely point out that the concept of *the third*, as well as the concept of intersubjectivity, is of older origin than its variants that are today more commonly used. In that sense, we should mention the Internet controversy started by J. Whitebook's article, which referred to the "mutual recognition and work of the negative", and to which A. Honneth (2001) responded with an article titled "Facets of presocial self". J. Whitebook (2003) responded with an article that sets the boundaries for the "intersubjective turn" in psychoanalysis. The main emphasis is on the defense of Freud's core content from the "new alliance of intersubjective social critics" and "young child researchers". In this article, the existence of any type of pre-reflexive knowledge is postulated and the equation of self with the reflexive self is refuted (11). When H.-J. Busch (2003) joins the debate, we see intersubjectivity as a "struggle and recognition of the non-intersubjective". For Honneth, according to Busch, "the recognition includes struggle", and for Whitebook, "struggle and recognition are mutually exclusive", while Busch (12) takes up the third position: "The struggle for recognition is always also a struggle against recognition". We find these moments of '*recognition-struggle*' in the article (1). We

Ove momente 'priznanja-borbe' nalazimo u radu (1). Dobro je još pripomenuti da Busch (12) promišlja i razlike između „interakcijskih formi“ koje često trpe od „viška“, „preteka“, „prebačaja“ iskazanoga, i intersubjektivnosti, koja raspolaze „mogućnošću simboliziranja u komunikacijskoj razmjeni“. Svi spomenuti autori sva ova pitanja razmatraju višeslojno, uključujući i stajališta većega broja drugih autora. I Whitebook i Busch, svaki na svoj način, ustraju u tome da za čovjeka postoji jedna izlazna biološka točka, koja čovjekovom tjelesnošću utječe i na njegove intersubjektivne razvoje. U ovu debatu kasnije pozvan je i Warsitz (8).

Vlastite refleksije na klinički prikaz po sekvencama seansi, i uz komentare terapeuta.

Sekvenca 1 (Primjer 1.; 49. seansa)

Grupa se bavi izostajanjem sa seansi nakon ulaska dvije nove članice (N. i T.), neodgovornošću bivših prijateljica (I.), distanciranjem od njih i vlastita oca, kritizira se uzimanje onoga što nekome pripada, prijevaru; distanca i prema članovima grupe. U interakciji su zapravo samo I. i S., te terapeut. S. pohađa i jednu drugu grupu (neki oblik paralelnog procesa?), u kojoj se dobro osjeća, a i stječe nova prijateljstva. Terapeut, nadovezujući se na S. iznosi usporedbu sa starom maslinom koja

should also mention that Busch (12) also considers the differences between “interactional forms” that often suffer from the “excess”, “overflow”, “transfer” of the said, and intersubjectivity, which has at its disposal “the ability to symbolize in the communicational exchange”. All the aforementioned authors consider these questions on several levels, including the positions of numerous other authors. Both Whitebook and Busch, each in their own way, insist on the idea that for man there is one biological exit point, which, through man’s physicality, affects his intersubjective developments. Warsitz (8) was later also invited to join the debate.

Personal reflections on the clinical presentation according to the sequences of the sessions, along with the therapist's comments.

Sequence 1 (Example 1; 49th session)

The group is discussing absences from the sessions after two new members joined (N. and T.), the irresponsibility of former friends (I.), distancing from them and one's own father, criticizing taking something that belongs to someone else, deception; distance towards group members. The interaction actually includes only I. and S., and the therapist. S. is also a member of other groups (a form of parallel process?), in which they feel good, and are also making new friends. The therapist, continuing from what S. said, talks about a comparison to an old



se rezanjem grana pomlađuje. Iza toga prigovara zbog neredovitosti članova, i nedonošenja uputnica. Slijede opravdavanja članova „realitetom“.

Refleksije uz komentar terapeuta: Nije teško složiti se s većim dijelom terapeuta komentara na dinamiku zbiivanja u ovoj sekvenci. Izdvajam: „**Moj narcizam se nije mogao nositi sa osjećajem odbačenosti, nekompetentnosti i osjećajem krivnje.**“

Komentari: „kao maslina kojoj treba odrezati stare grane (stare članove) da bi se pomladila...“ „Nema potrebe da osjećate krivnju. Ovdje smo zbog različitih potreba i možete odustati u bilo kojem trenutku, ali iza ovih realnih potreba ponekad se kriju i neke druge potrebe.“

„primjer su moje agresije i ambivalencije“. Interakcije koje su prikazane raspršene su u grupnom matriksu čiju bazičnu građu naziremo: grupa traži oslonac za obnovu kohezije koja je ranije izgleda već bila razvijena. S. svojom asocijacijom na drugu grupu, čini se da priziva drugi grupni prostor/matriks/ stvaranjem novih odnosa. Terapeut „odgovara“ (inter)subjektivno, metaforom masline. Je li to mogao biti *reverie* na S.-inu potrebu za odnosima: okupiti grupu snagom metaforičnosti masline, tisućljetnog obnavljanja i opstanka života? „Odgovora“ na tu te-

olive tree that is rejuvenated by cutting off its branches. Following that, they complain about the irregular attendance of the members, and the failure to bring in doctor's referrals. What follows are the member's excuses based on "reality".

Reflections along with the therapist's comments: It is not difficult to agree with most of the therapist's comments on the dynamics of the events in this sequence. I single out the following: **“My narcissism could not cope with the feelings of being rejected, incompetent and guilty.**“

Comments: “just like an olive tree that only needs its old branches (old members) to be cut off to rejuvenate”, *There is no need to feel guilty. We are here for different reasons and you can give up any time, but sometimes some other reasons are hiding behind these real reasons.*“

„are an example of my aggression and ambivalence“.

The presented interactions are dispersed in a group matrix whose basic structure we perceive: the group is searching for support to rebuild the cohesion that seems to have been developed earlier. With their association with the other group, S. seems to invoke the other group space /matrix/ by the creation of new relationships. The therapist “responds” (inter)subjectively, through the metaphor of the olive tree. Could that have been a *reverie* to S’s need for relationships: to pull the group together using the power of the metaphoric olive tree,

rapeutovu asocijaciju nema. Šteta za metaforu; mogla je oživjeti komunikaciju i nagovijestiti neku promjenu u grupnom matriksu. Ali je možda terapeut bio i nestrpljiv da čeka mogućnost razvoja asocijacije u grupi. Vraća se naime odmah na početak seanse s dosta oštrom konfrontacijom.. Kao da je „rezanje grana“ u njemu u dubljem sloju pobudilo (projektivno identifikacijski?) zastrašujuću sliku *rezanja*. Premda, maslinari - s užitkom obnavljajćeg posla - režu starim maslinama grane, čuvajući ih tako od propadanja. Šteta što je terapeutov pokušaj poticanja intersubjektivne (pa i transsubjektivne) komunikacije propao; susret „promašen“, a osjećaji krivnje i agresija u grupi rasli.

Ovdje bih istaknula onu razliku koju neki autori ne smatraju važnom, ali joj drugi pridaju bitno značenje. Interaktivno ne znači isto što i intersubjektivno. Transpersonalno nije isto što i transsubjektivno. Višestruki razlozi za kontroverze pa i konfuziju svakako su već time dani.

Sekvenca 2 (dio Primjera 1., 49. seansa)

N. se brani od prigovora terapeuta prebacujući „krivnju“ na muža koji ne čuva djecu.. V. dvaput nije došao jer je „morao ići na more“, „mora preživjeti.“. Objašnjava svoje razloge nedolazaka na seanse još i nestankom paničnih

the thousand-year-old renewal and survival of life? There is no “response” to the therapist’s association. That’s a shame; the metaphor could have revived communication and suggested a change in the group matrix. However, perhaps the therapist was too impatient to wait for the association to potentially develop in the group. They return to the beginning of the séance though a very firm confrontation. As if the “cutting of the branches” awoke in his deeper layer (in the form of projection and identification?) the frightening image of *cutting*. However, olive tree farmers enjoy their work when they cut off branches from old olive trees, thus saving them from rotting. It is a shame that the therapist’s attempt to encourage intersubjective (and even trans-subjective) communication failed; the meeting was a failure, and the feelings of guilt and aggression grew within the group.

Here I would like to stress the difference that some authors disregard, while others consider very important. Interactive does not mean the same as intersubjective. Transpersonal is not the same as trans-subjective. Multiple reasons for the controversies, and even confusion, are thus already provided.

Sequence 2 (part of Example 1; 49th session)

N. is defending from the therapist’s complaints, transferring “guilt” to their husband, who is not looking after their children. V. has been absent twice because



ataka. Nema više potrebu dobivati pomoć iz grupe. Ipak, prema I. koja se zbog njegove najave izlaska iz grupe žesti („Hoćeš reći da nas više ne trebaš?“), postupa obećavajuće. Prema terapeutu izazovno: „Osim ako me doktor ne isključi?“ Refleksije uz isječak iz seanse i uz komentar terapeuta:

Terapeut još skreće pozornost na promjenu dinamike u grupi: intenziviraju se rivalitetni i neprijateljski osjećaji, ponovno otvara pitanje povjerenja u grupu i terapeuta; raste frustracija i zato jer „**zbog manje prostora u grupi i taj prostor moraju djeliti**“. Time nam skreće pozornost i na važnost dinamike grupnoanalitičkog polja: ono „po sebi“ utječe na promjene koje u njemu nastaju, i obrnuto. Teorijski, promjene u analitičkom polju mogu se razumjeti kao *treće*, uvijek „više“ i „veće“ od sastavnih dijelova (subjekata koji u njemu participiraju). Terapeut upoznaje čitatelja i s momentima koji u primjerima iz seansi nisu izravno vidljivi i za čitatelja dolaze „izvana, izvan funkcioniranja grupnoanalitičkog polja“: „tamo i tada“, ali i to je način upoznavanja s grupom. Terapeut u komentaru povezuje situaciju koja utječe na „**Vlatkov fragilni self**“ sa stanjem koje on sam proživljava u svojoj radnoj grupi, „**koja nema senzibiliteta za psihoterapijski rad, osjećao neshvaćen, profesionalno impotentan i odbačen**“. U njemu to potiče pojavu „odigrao ulogu“: „Nisam

he had to “go to the coast”; he “has to survive”. He uses the lack of panic attacks to explain his reasons for being absent from sessions. He has no need for the group’s help. However, according to I., who is angered by his proposal to leave the group (“**What are you trying to say, that you don’t need us anymore?**”), his actions are promising. He challenges the therapist: “**Unless the doctor blocks me out?**” Reflections along the clip from the session and the therapist’s comments:

The therapist also points out the change in the group dynamic: rivalries and hostilities are intensified, the question of confidence in the group and the therapist is reopened; frustration is also growing because of “**less space in the group, which has to be shared**”. Thus, the therapist directs our attention to the importance of the dynamics of the field of group analysis: in itself it affects the changes that occur in it, and vice versa. Theoretically, the changes in the analytic field can be understood as *the third*, always “more” and “bigger” than the composite parts (subjects that participate in it). The therapist also acquaints the reader with moments from examples from the sessions that are not directly observable and come to the reader “from without, outside of the functioning of the field of group analysis”: “there and then”, but that is also a way of understanding the group. The therapist connects the situation that affects “**Vlatko’s fragile self**” with the condition that he is living through in his work group, “**which has**

ništa vrijedio u grupi. Moj narcizam se nije mogao nositi sa osjećajem odbačenosti, nekompetentnosti i osjećajem krivnje.“

Moja prva refleksija uz sekvencu: teško, teško, teško. Hoće li prestati taj „rad negativnog“? /Green, 1993, cit. po Whitebooku (11) Pa potražim opet Greena (13), odmičem se od grupe, ali ne daleko. Prisjetim se „zadatka“: u potrazi smo za mogućnosti da se u ovoj grupi razvio intersubjektivni proces, i izronio „analitički treći“. (To bi moglo biti sjajno za **‘ono teško’**, ali je u teškom često nedostižno.) Green ne pruža baš puno nade (11), pa krenem „sama“: *Posvojio si je, dakle, pacijent (jedan davni) pritisnut čežnjom za ravnicom, napuštenom zbog sile terora - jednu maslinu. Oko nje uredio si je minijaturni vrt. Sve je u toj svojoj maslini mogao naći od onoga što mu je trebalo da živi: i mit, i vjerovanje, i znanost kojoj je težio. I zavolio je maslinu, postao vješt u rezanju grana. Čežnje mogu potaknuti transformacije. Mogućnost self-refleksivnog jedan je od zadanih uvjeta za razvoj intersubjektivnosti. Estetski doživljaj susreta s drugim – drugi. Računa se i estetika negativnog. Kada zadani uvjeti ne postoje, zbog pacijentove problematike ili nekih nepovoljnih faktora u i oko terapijskog prostora, transformaciju u analitičkim psihoterapijama teško je razvijati. Nije nemoguće. Psihoanaliza je – činilo mi se tako dok*

no sensibility for psychotherapy” (“institutional countertransference”). This creates within him the appearance of “played the role”: “I was not worth anything in the group. My narcissism could not cope with the feelings of being rejected, incompetent and guilty”.

My first reflection on the sequence: difficult, difficult, difficult. Will this “work of the negative” ever stop? /Green, 1993, qtd. in Whitebook (11). Again, I search for Green (13), I get away from the group, but not too far away. I remember the “task”: we are searching for the possibility that this group developed an intersubjective process, and that the “analytic third” emerged. (This could be wonderful for **‘that difficult thing’**, but the difficult often contains the unachievable.) Green does not offer much hope (11), so I start “alone”: *A patient (from long ago), motivated by a longing for the plains, which was abandoned due to the force of terror, took ownership of one olive tree. Around it he planted a miniature garden. In the olive tree he could find everything he needed for life: a myth, a belief, a science he gravitated towards. He came to love the olive tree, and became adept at cutting branches.* Desires can encourage transformations. The possibility of self-reflection is one of the preconditions for the development of intersubjectivity. The aesthetic experience of meeting someone else – the other. The aesthetics of negative also counts. When the conditions are missing, due to the patient’s problems or some unfavorable factors in or around



je moja refleksija trajala – uvijek jedan isti proces koji se može odvijati pod različitim imenima, pa i različitim putevima, samo ako i oni vode pravcima i s(t)jecištima koji su zadani zakonitostima uma (to je duboko znao Freud). Nisu dostatne svjesne namjere imenitelja različitih usmjerenja; najveći među njima vodili su i danas vode računa o tim zakonitostima. I otuda smo mi kojima su analitičke terapije životni pozivi – zahvaljući Ferencziju, Melanie Klein, i Bionu, i Winnicottu – a njegovim se potencijalnim prostorima i danas krećemo, psihoanalitičkim ili široko kulturnim – kao i nizu ostalih 'odmetnika', još uvijek baštinici Freudove misli.

Sekvenca 3 (Primjer 2. /49. Seansa/)

N. nastavlja seansu pričom o svojoj mami koja pravi razliku među djecom. Njoj uvijek prigovara, dok sestre hvatli. Slijedi „scena“ s mlađom sestrom, čiju kćer obožava.. „Vidjela sam mlađu sestru, čiju kćer obožavam, prije neki dan u trgovini. I zovem je na mobitel da se vidimo, a ona mi laže i govori da je u drugoj trgovini. Smrzla sam se. Ja ne mogu podnijeti laganje. Možeš mi reći ovo ili ono, ali mi nemoj lagati. Prije neki dan mi je kćer priznala kako je baki ukrala 200 kuna u prvom razredu osnovne škole i ne znam što da radim s tim? Ne znam da li bi je udarila ili

the space of therapy, transformations in analytic psychotherapies are difficult to develop. But not impossible. *Psychoanalysis is – that is how it seemed to me while my reflection lasted – always an identical process that can take place under different names, even on different paths, but only if they lead in directions and to crossroads assigned by the laws of the mind (which Freud knew very well).* Conscious intentions by people who gave their names to various approaches are not enough; the greatest among them took these laws into account, and still do so. That is where we come from, we whose life calling is analytic therapy – thanks to Ferenczi, Melanie Klein, Bion, and Winnicott – and even today we still move within his potential spaces, whether psychoanalytic or cultural – like other 'outlaws', are still heirs of Freud's thought.

Sequence 3 (Example 2/49th séance/)

N. continues the session with a story about her mother, who treats her children differently. She always criticizes her, and praises her sisters. There follows a "scene" with a younger sister: "I saw my younger sister, whose daughter I adore, the other day in the store. And I called her on her cell phone to meet her and she lied to me and said she was in another store. I froze. I cannot tolerate lying. .../ "A few days ago, my daughter admitted that she had stolen 200 kuna from her grandmother in the first grade of elementary school. I do not know whether to hit

kaznila.“ *Hvali svoje blizance koji se znaju zaigrati, a (njihova) sestra im voli napakostiti i „stalno je ljuta“.*

Vlastiti doživljaj i promišljanje o grupnom procesu: Ovu sam sekvencu izdvojila zbog figure „Smrzla sam se“. Kao da grupnim prostorom cirkuliraju ‘loši’ introjekti, i, miješajući se s realitetnim objektima nastavljaju svoje agresivne živote. Majčinski prostor, *kora*, davno je zamrznut (okamenjen), i sada je na N. „red“ da se smrzne. Je li o tome govorila N. zapravo? Prizivajući imaginarnog oca, koji je odsutan /usp. Warsitz (8)/. Terapeut? Ispravno je primijetio: „**Kao da pravite razliku između djece.**“ *Nije li to ipak mimo figure „smrzla sam se“.* Konfrontacija po sebi uvijek je bar malo agresivna – bilo bi važno znati kakvom je intonacijom, pa i gestikom terapeutovom - upućena. Međutim, ne bi li više „intersubjektivno“ bilo reći – a u razvijenijom prostoru grupe, i u više „posrećenom“ vremenu križanja subjektivnih, intersubjektivnih i transsubjektivnih momenata u grupi - vjerojatno bi izronilo nešto poput „Smrzavam se dok te slušam“, ili što slično. Mogao je takvo što reći bilo tko u grupi. Potaknuti kakvu slutnju o nečemu teškom kroz što je morao prolaziti N.-in self dok se formirao. O nečemu smještenom dublje, a što je povezano i s njezinim sadašnjim odnosima sa svijetom u kakvom je živjela i živi. Nije nedostajalo interakcija,

her or punish her.“ *She praises her twins, who can get playful, while (their) sister likes to hurt them and is “always angry”.*

My own experience and thoughts on the group process:

I have singled out this sequence because of the expression “I froze.” It is as if ‘bad’ introjects are circulating in the group space and, while mixing with real objects, continuing their aggressive lives. The maternal space, *kora*, was frozen (petrified) some time ago, and now it is N.’s “turn” to be frozen. Is this what N. was actually talking about? By summoning the imaginary father, who is absent /cf. Warsitz (8)/. The therapist? He correctly noticed: “**Seems like you don’t treat your children equally.**” Isn’t this contradictory with the expression “I froze”? Confrontation is in itself always at least somewhat aggressive – it would be useful to know what the therapist’s intonation and gestures were like. However, would it not be more “intersubjective” to say – and in a more developed space of the group, and in a more “felicitous” time of the crossing of subjective, intersubjective, and trans-subjective moments in the group – it is likely that something like “I’m frozen while listening to you” would crop up, or something like that. Anyone in the group could have said something like that. And encourage the conjecture of something difficult that N.’s self must have been going through while being formed. Of something located deeper and connected with her present relations with the world in which she has lived and is still



ali mi se čini, da su s aspekta intersubjektivnosti, uglavnom bile „ispražnjene“. Možda osiromašene i nalik na *maternalni prostor* u razvojno vrijeme N.-inog selfa, *pred-refleksivnog selfa i vremena*. Možda, otuda, njezini neveliki kapaciteti za self-refleksiju, i refleksiju Drugoga i drugih. Ipak, donijela je san. Iz svojih kontratransfernih razloga terapeut je možda propustio zapaziti slutnje, makar i sitne tragove N.-ine potrebe za intersubjektivnosti, imanentne čovjeku i grupi. Da je mogao, ne bi vjerojatno morao ponavljati konfrontacije. I, manje se plašeći za grupu, možda ne bi nesvjesno sudjelovao u kasnijem fenomenu *žrtvenog jarca* (članica T.).

Sekvenca 4. (Primjer 3. /49. seansa) Vrtlog života – asocijacije na grupni san

U nastavku *iste* seanse N. iznosi: „Sanjala sam neobičan san. U snu mi starija kćer ide autobusom u Split. Ne razumijem što će u Splitu? U sljedećem trenutku, vidim dijete u vrtlogu kako se guši. Strašno, što to znači? Neobično je to, što sam svega nekoliko puta bila u Splitu. Odakle taj put u Split?“ Šutnja. Terapeut pita grupu: „Sjećate li se filma Vrtlog života?“ Šutnja? (kraj seanse)

Komentar terapeuta na svoju asocijaciju na N.-in san, važna je za našu

living. There was no lack of interactions, but it seems to me that, from the aspect of intersubjectivity, they were mostly “emptied.” Perhaps impoverished and like the *maternal space* at the time when N’s self was developing, a *pre-reflexive self and time*. Perhaps that is the source of her small capacity for self-reflection and for the reflection regarding the Other and others. However, she brought her dream. Due to their reasons related to countertransference, it is possible that the therapist failed to notice the conjectures, perhaps even small traces of N’s need for intersubjectivity, which is immanent to man and group. If he could have, he probably would not have had to repeat the confrontations. And, being less afraid for the group, perhaps he would not have unconsciously taken part in the later phenomenon of the *scape goat* (member T.).

Sequence 4 (Example 3/49th session) Life’s Whirlpool – associations with a group dream

As the *same* session continues, N. says the following: “*I had an unusual dream. In my dream, my older daughter was travelling to Split by bus. I do not understand why she is going to Split. The next moment I see a child drowning in a whirlpool* (in Croatian: vrtlog). *Awful, what does that mean? What is strange is that I have only been in Split a few times. Where does this trip to Split come from?*” Silence. The therapist asks the group: “**Do you remember the film Life’s Whirlpool?**” Silence? (End of the session.)

potragu za *trećim*. Za one koji film nisu gledali – a među njima sam – koristan sažetak. Moja sažeta inačica: Glavni lik filma, L., najprije površinski prilagođen na okruženje u kojem živi, doživljava transformaciju koja otvara put prema njegovom pravom selfu. Manifestira se, međutim, time da svojoj ženi i susjedu ratnom veteranu, „baci u lice“ svoju „istinu“ o njima. Povrijeđeni susjed ga ubije. Terapeut je pokušao pružiti pomoć grupi i ponudio je svoju asocijaciju, ali grupa je odgovorila šutnjom. Terapeut kaže: „**Nakon seanse, prisjećajući se filma nalazio sam niz suptilnih analogija. U filmu se, baš kao i u grupi, ispod naizgled mirnog i uobičajenog obiteljskog života, kriju vrlo intezivni osjećaji i odnosi. Iako isprva nisam pronalazio vezu, intuitivno sam osjećao da moja asocijacija baš kao i san, imaju duboku vezu sa dinamikom grupe.**“

Refleksije uz komentar terapeuta: do kraja seanse u grupi nema asocijacija na san. Terapeut dalje reflektira u sebi na film u intervalu između seansi i javlja mu se niz asocijacija. Navodi ih u radu, pa je tako i nama moguće reflektirati. Izdvajam: „Prepoznao sam se u liku Lestera, nakon čega sam osjetio razarajuću ljutnju.“ I malo dalje: „Prva asocijacija mi je bila da se vjerojatno radi o projektiv-

The therapist's comment regarding their association with N's dream is important for our search for the *third*. For those who have not seen the movie – and I am one of them – here is a useful summary. My brief version: L., the main character in the movie, at first superficially adapted to the environment he lives in, goes through a transformation that opens the way to his true self. It is manifested through the fact that he throws his “truth” about his wife and his neighbor, a war veteran, into their faces. The neighbor is hurt and kills him. The therapist attempted to help the group and offered his association, but the group responded by silence. The therapist says: “**After the session I recalled the film and found a number of subtle analogies. In the movie, just like in the group, underneath a seemingly peaceful family life, there are very intense feelings and relations. Although at first I did not find the link, I felt intuitively that my association, just like the dream, had a deep connection to the dynamics of the group.**”

Thoughts on the therapist's comment: there are no association to the dream in the group until the end of the session. The therapist reflects on the film in the interval between the sessions and realizes a number of associations. He lists them in the article and therefore we too are able to reflect.

I single out the following: “I recognized myself in Lester's character, after which I felt a devastating anger.” A little while later. “The first association was that it was probably the case of projective iden-



noj identifikaciji, ali na taj način sam se pokušavao riješiti krivnje i pripisati svoje osjećaje članovima grupe.“ *Dalje:* „San se može interpretirati na razini predsvjesne fantazije, kao rivalitet među članovima grupe koji se bore za ljubav terapeuta. Nena zavidi Sanji, što kao i terapeut odlazi u Split i oboje se trude postati roditelji. Međutim, na dubljoj razini, slika djeteta, simbola stvaranja i kreativnosti koje se guši u vrtlogu, predstavlja duboku ambivalenciju. Na grupnoj razini, grupa je moje dijete, za kojeg se bojim da se ne uguši u emocionalnom vrtlogu.“

Što je sve ovdje prepoznao terapeut? I, kada? Između dviju seansi? Prije šutnje i kraja 49. seanse terapeut ne pita grupu za asocijacije, nego ih sam doživljava. Pita, istina je, sjeća li se tko tog filma koji je on asociirao. Šutnja. Kraj seanse. Zorno se vidi da' self-ekspresija' (Nena, voditelj) još uvijek nije isto što i intersubjektivnost. Značenje terapeut i grupa tek trebaju otkrivati, pripremati. Kako? Možda, pripremajući proradom grupnoanalitičko polje za stjecišta cikličnog i kronološkog vremena (8). To je u grupi slično kao i u klasičnoj psihoanalizi, znači pratiti proces i prepoznati trenutak za tumačenje (interpretaciju).

Sljedeću seansu terapeut najavljuje kao **zanimljiv rasplet**.

tification, but it was just my attempt to get over the guilt and attribute my feelings to the members of the group.” *He continues:* “The dream can be interpreted at the level of preconscious fantasy, as a rivalry among members of the group struggling for the love of the therapist. Nena envies Sanja, who travels to Split just like the therapist, and they are both trying to become parents. However, at a deeper level, the image of a child, the symbol of creation and creativity, drowning in a whirl, represents a profound ambivalence. At the group level, the group is my child and I fear it will drown in the emotional whirl.”

What did the therapist recognize in all of this? And when? Between two sessions? Before the silence and the end of the 49th session the therapists does not ask the group about the associations, but experiences them himself. He does ask if anyone remembers the film that he was reminded of. Silence. The end of the session. It is obvious that 'self-expression' (Nena, the leader) is still not the same as intersubjectivity. The meaning has yet to be found and prepared by the therapist and the group. How? Perhaps by preparing by working through the psychoanalytic field for the intersection of cyclic and chronological time (8). In the group, this is similar to what following the process and recognizing the moment for interpretations means in classic psychoanalysis.

The next session is introduced by the therapists as an **interesting resolution**.

Sekvenca 5. (Primjer 4. /50. Seansa)

Sekvenca je duga, izdvajam dijelove koji su moju refleksiju usmjerili prema *reverie* i *trećem*. Čitamo što kaže V., i kao da čujemo: *Ne samo da su grupa i psihijatrija neuspješne, nego su isto i opasne (kao i iskrenost konfrontacija u filmu?); postaje se psiho-tičan i potom isključen iz grupe (kao jedna prethodna pacijetka – čini se da V. tako misli -iz starog sastava grupe). Kaže li V. zapravo to? Terapeut se brani od projekcije usmjerene izravno na njega i instituciju, odbija je, i tješi sebe a valjda želi utješiti i V.-a. Empatija? Terapeut malo tumači: „Nekom se pomogne više a nekom manje.“, više prigovara: V. imao je napadaj panike, a prikriva. S. se zbog V.-a odvaži „napasti“ voditelja : „Recite Vi meni, kako mi možete pomoći?“), terapeut „zove u pomoć“ I. Ona ambivalentno „pristaje“ uz njega. Slijedi V-ovo „retoričko“ pitanje: „Doktore, vi se ljutite na mene?“ Zvuči provokativno. Terapeutov „odgovor“ doima se kao kontratransfer-ni (?) mirni self-disclosure (5): „Da, u pravu ste Vlatko. Mislim, da sam vama u grupi najmanje dao, s vama sam jedinin nisam radio individualno i vaša udaljenost, to što ne pričate o sebi mi teško pada. Imam osjećaj bespomoćnosti i frustracije.“ Silen-*

Session 5 (Example 4/50th session)

The sequence is long, so I single out parts that directed my reflection towards *reverie* and *the third*. We read what V. says and it is as though we hear: *Not only are the group and psychiatry unsuccessful, but they are also dangerous (like the honesty of confrontation in the movie?); one becomes psychotic and then excluded from the group (like one former patient – seems that V. thinks so – from an old makeup of the group). Is that what V. is really saying? The therapist defends from the projection directed at him and the institution, refuses it, and comforts himself, and perhaps is also trying to comfort V. Empathy? The therapist interprets: “The group can help you see some things about yourself,” but it sounds more like complaining: V. has a panic attack, but is hiding it. Because of V., S. dares to “attack” the leader: “Please tell me, how can you help me?” The therapist “asks for help.” She ambivalently “sides” with him. V.’s “rhetorical” questions follows: “Doctor, are you angry with me?” He sounds provocative. The therapist’s answer seems like countertransfereential (?), peaceful self-disclosure (5): “Yes, you are right Vlatko. I think that I have given you the least, when compared to others in the group, I have not worked individually with you, and it is hard for me to see you distant and not talking to me about yourself. I have a feeling of helplessness and frustration.” Silence. The*



ce Terapeutovo **priznanje** V.-u da mu je u grupi bio „lišavajući roditelj“ teče mirno, teško se može osjetiti ono što je izgovoreno: loše osjećanje u kojem prevladavaju 'bespomoćnost i frustracija'. Ili je stvar u tome, da je „scenu“ iz seanse, kao upravo nastali fenomen, teško bilo prenijeti u tekst? Terapeut nastavlja: „U svojoj terapijskog grupi sam šutio baš kao i Vi i mislio sam odustati, a nakon što sam ostao u grupi, najviše sam napravio.

Sada tek slijedi istinsko „razotkrivanje“. Evo „u čemu“ po mojem mišljenju: Vlatko: „Vi ste profesionalac i trebali bi to riješiti. Ja sam suvišan ovdje. Nitko me ne primjećuje.“

Može se ovo možda čuti kao da mu kaže: Riješite to sa sobom, a ovdje primjećujte nas! Učinite što trebate da me se u grupi primijeti! Učinilo mi se još i to, da je moguće „upisati“ i nastavak radnje' u V.-vom intrasubjektivnom prostoru, neku radost (pri pomisli kako je terapeutu „u lice bacio“ da riješi ono što treba), i: „Možda bi mi to pomoglo da popravim svoje stanje pa da idem na more guštat...“

Terapeut: „Imate svi podjednak prostor i nitko vam ne brani da ga koristite. Kao da očekujete da izvlačimo stvari iz vas. Meni je pak zanimljiv Nenin san o vrtlozima i utapljanju. Kao da prikazuje situaciju u grupi. Ispod površine puno je uzburkanih osjećaja.“

therapist's admission that in the group he was his "depriving parent" passes quietly, it's difficult to feel what has been said: a bad memory dominated by 'helplessness and frustration'. Or perhaps the point is in the fact that the "scene" from the session, as a newly created phenomenon, was difficult to translate into text? The therapist continues: "**In my therapeutic group I was silent just like you and I thought about giving up, but after staying in the group, I made the most of it.**"

Now comes the true "revelation". Here is "how", in my opinion: Vlatko: "**You are a professional and should solve this. I'm superfluous here. No one notices me.**"

This could be understood as him saying: Solve that with yourself, and notice us here! Do what you need for me to be noticed in the group! Also, it occurred to me that it is possible to "inscribe" the continuation of the plot in V's intrasubjective space, some happiness (at the thought that he had "thrown in the therapist's face" the fact that he should solve what he needs to) and: "Maybe that would help me to repair my condition and then go to the coast and enjoy myself..."

Therapist: "**You all have the same space, and nobody prevents you from using it. It's like you expect us to get things out of you. On the other hand, I find Nena's dream about the whirlpool and drowning interesting. As if it shows the situation in the group. There are a lot of stirred feelings below the surface.**"

Terapeut uzvraća „istom mjerom“, prelazeći preko činjenice da njegov i Vlatkov položaj u grupi ne bi trebali biti simetrični. Ali, s obzirom da je ovaj dijaloški isječak bio simetričan, ili čak asimetričan, ali u obrnutom smislu Bion (9). Terapeut napušta 'poziciju' kontratransfernog otvaranja" / „otvaranje“ je „dovršio“, V., boreći se za svoj subjektivitet (12)/. Kontratransferno agira, kao da kaže : *Niste mi vi zanimljivi, zato pogledajmo N.-in san. Je li (nesvjesno) zapravo ovako (?): Manje je opasan, premda strašan, N.-in san nego asocijacija na film: „Ja sam L.“* Ali kaže: „**Imam osjećaj bespomoćnosti i frustracije.**“

Vlatko: „Ja sam se preznojio.“

Ovdje završavam sa sekvencom. Nastavak seanse vidim kao povlačenje iz napetosti grupnoanalitičkog polja u segmentu koji se odvija intersubjektivno između terapeuta i V. Dalje su u ovoj seansi interakcije uglavnom negativnog predznaka. Projiciranje agresivnoga na T.

*Od čega se preznojio V.? Nagonska pobuđenost? Strah? Što je „čuo“ od terapeuta kroz zadnje dvije sekvence? Što je „čuo“ terapeut od V.-a? Što je izgovoreno, a što su bile obostrane „duboke“ fantazije? Jedno i drugo, međusobno uvijek najuže povezano. Bionovsko **H i L** zapleteno, tjelesno („emocionalno“) i misaono zapleteno. Opet Bion, i evo što*

The therapist responds by ignoring the fact that his and Vlatko's positions in the group should not be symmetrical. However, this piece of dialogue was symmetrical, or even asymmetrical, but in the reverse sense Bion (9). The therapist abandons the 'position' of countertransference opening / the "opening" was "completed" by V. by fighting for his subjectivity (12). He acts countertransference, *as if he is saying: You are not interesting to me, so let's take a look at N.'s dream. Is this (unconsciously) what is actually happening (?): N.'s dream is less dangerous, although frightening, than the association to the film: "I am L."* But he says: "**There are a lot of stirred feelings below the surface.**"

Vlatko: "I am all sweaty."

Here I finish the sequence. I see the rest of the session as a withdrawal from the tension of the psychoanalytic field in the segment that is intersubjectively taking place between the therapist and V. The rest of the interactions in this session are mostly negative. The projection of aggression to T.

*What made V. sweat? Instinctive excitement? Fear? What did he "hear" from the therapist in the last two sessions? What did the therapist "hear" from V.? What was said, and what were the "deep" fantasies on both sides? One and the other, always tightly interrelated. Bion's **H** and **L**, twisted, the body ("emotional") and the mind interweaved. Again Bion, and here is what we read regarding that in*



čitamo o tome u Greenu /1973, str.334/ „Kod Biona sam našao najbolje formulacije u pogledu zamršenosti *thinkinga i feelinga*, u odnosu koji on zauzlava između prekonceptije i pre-osjećanja; povezanost na istom nivou organizacije za psihičko, kao kleinijanske kategorije ljubavi i mržnje.“ (13). Teško je zapravo razlučiti tko se u toj sekvenci više „znojio“: Pacijent ili terapeut? Sa stajališta „analitičkog trećeg“, kao što nam je rečeno, nije ni bitno. *Prihvataćemo, jer ovo je intersubjektivno. Treće, moglo je biti u nastajanju.*

„Rad negativnog“ pomrsio je mogućnost daljnjega razvoja fenomena *trećeg* u smislu unapređenja grupnoanalitičkog procesa. O „Radu negativnog“, uči nas Green/1993, cit. po Whitebook, 2003/ (11): „Ukoliko je intersubjektivna komunikacija svjesni cilj, egzistira drugi subjektivitet ‘za-drugoga’. Drukčije kod analize. Pokušaj da se dođe do analitičkog razumijevanja mora učiniti obilazak, preko drugog subjektiviteta koji je u znatnoj mjeri u ‘sebi samom’, to znači preko psihe jedne druge osobe, čija neprovidnost /.../ nikada nije prevladana i jedva može biti i umanjena“ (s. 28). Primarno se ima posla ne sa svjesnom razinom značenja kojem se teži, nego s nesvjesnom razinom psihodinamskih snaga“ I još: „Psihoanalitička razmjena može doduše zaistinu biti ‘intersubjektivitet’, ali ipak takav koji s drugim računa kao sa zbiljskim

Green /1973, p. 334/ “In Bion I discovered the best formulations regarding the interconnection of *thinking* and *feeling*, in a relation which he creates between preconception and pre-feeling; the connection on the same level of organization for the psychological, like Kleinian categories of love and hate” (13). It is actually difficult to discern who was “sweating” more in this sequence: the patient or the therapist? From the position of the “analytic third”, as it has been said, it does not really matter. *We accept, because this is intersubjective. Thirdly, it could have been nascent.*

“The work of the negative” complicated the possibility of the further development of *the third* in the sense of improving the group analytic process. Green /1993, qtd. in Whitebook, 2003/ (11) teaches us about “the work of the negative”: “If intersubjective communication is the conscious goal, a second subjectivity exists ‘for-the-other’. This is different in analysis. The attempt to reach analytic understanding must make a detour, across the other subjectivity which is considerably ‘in itself’, which means through the psyche of another person, whose opacity /.../ is never overcome and can barely be reduced” (s. 28). We are primarily dealing not with a conscious difference of meaning we are striving towards, but with an unconscious level of psychodynamic forces. And more: “Psychoanalytic exchange may be ‘intersubjectivity’, but still one that considers the other the real other, and not simply as ‘for-the-Other”

drugim, a ne jednostavno kao 'za-Drugoga' (s. 27). Borba za priznanje, i borba protiv „priznanja“ a za subjektivitet, legitimni su aspekti intersubjektivnosti. Terapeutov *dis-closure* bilo je priznanje. Pacijentova provokativnost – borba za priznanje, ali i borba protiv (terapeutova) priznanja /*traži drugo, drukčije!*/. Projekcije, međutim, sastavni su dio grupnoanalitičke dinamike, i podudarne su, s aspekta ovoga rada, sa shvaćanjem autorice Lise Rafaelsen /1996/ (14): „Benigna ili maligna, kreativna ili destruktivna, projekcija je fundamentalni dio našeg poimanja svijeta oko nas, i nas međusobno“ /...../. Projekcija je eksternalizacija, a eksternalizacija i internalizacija su dvije strane istog novčića. Kad zavrtimo novčić, ne znamo koja će se strana okrenuti, ili koja će doći prva – ali svjesni smo njihove fundamentalne međugre i njihove jednake važnosti za ljudski život.“ („Ipak, više radimo s konceptom projektivne identifikacije“, komentira Pines u osvrtu na njezin istodobno pohvaljeni rad.)

„Uloga grupnog analitičara je da olakšava nastajanje druge, dublje razine. Ova dublja razina se nikad ne javlja u jasnom obliku, ona je uvijek u nastajanju. Razmišljanje o procesu na ovaj način, podrazumijeva da je uloga grupnog analitičara osjetiti što se događa u grupi, razumijeti i ne nužno interpretirati. Sudjelovanje članova grupe u nastajanju ovih dubokih fantazija,

(s. 27). The fight for admission, and the fight against "admission" are for subjectivity legitimate aspects of intersubjectivity. The therapist's *dis-closure* was an admission. The patient's provocative-ness – the fight for admission, but also a fight against (the therapist's) admission /*search for something else, something different!*/.

However, projections are an integral part of the dynamic of a group and are, from the aspect of this article, consistent with the understanding of Lisa Rafaelsen /1996/ (14): "Whether benign or malign, creative or destructive, a projection is a fundamental part of our understanding of the world around us and of each other." /.../. Projection is externalization, and externalization and internalization are two sides of the same coin. When we flip the coin, we do not know which side will come up, or which one will appear first – but we are aware of their fundamental connectedness and their equal importance for human life." ("However, we do more work with the concept of projective identification", says Pines in a comment on her simultaneously praised work.)

"The role of the group analyst is to facilitate the emergence of the second, deeper level. This deeper level never appears in a clear form, it is always in the making. Thinking about the process in this way implies that the role of the group analyst is to feel what is happening in the group, to understand and not necessarily to interpret. The involvement of group members in the emergence of these deep



bogatije je u terapijskom potencijalu u usporedbi sa razumije vanjem do kojeg se dolazi interpretacijama.“ (tako kaže C. Neri, 2003, i autor ga citira).

Slažem se, nije trebalo interpretirati. Nije bilo isto kao u psihoanalitičkom intersubjektivnom polju R.-P. Warsitza (8) i njegove (povremeno psihotične) pacijentice. Ovdje se nije našlo mogućnosti za moment *kairosa*.

Voditelj grupe, svjesno i nesvjesno, čini se da je i sebi i V.-u razastro ekran za projekciju N.-ina sna, i time je pomaknuo najdublje značenje svojih asocijacija („Ja sam L.“) iz jednoga sloja grupnoanalitičkog polja (dubljeg) u drugi („površniji“). N.-ino „smrzavanje“ kao da se još ticalo vanjskoga prostora i vremena više nego grupnoga. „Preznojavanje“, „govorno-tjelesno“ (12), bilo je tu, u grupi, sada L. je bio ubijen, „isto“ na jednom ekranu (film). I u „dubokim fantazijama“. Stoga, ova „scena“ je potaknuta dijeljenim *reveriejem* dva subjekta u registru „patricida“. N.-in maternalni prostor (smrzavanje, pa vrtlog koji guši i potapa) obrađen u grupi mogao bi biti i duboka fantazija maternalnog prostora u kojem se dijete guši, ali nije u ovoj situaciji snažnije „uhvaćena“. Pomogla je da se, tako mislim, na paralelnim (?) unutarnjim ekranima, snažnije projicirala duboka fantazija patricidnog paternalnog polja. Što je kome od toga pripadalo, ne ćemo razlučivati, tako nas je poučio autor citirajući Ogdena.

fantasies is richer in therapeutic potential than the understanding that comes through interpretation.“ (According to C. Neri, 2003, also quoted by the author).

I agree, there was no need for interpretation. It was not the same as the psychoanalytic intersubjective field of R.-P. Warsitz (8) and his (sometimes psychotic) patient. In this case, there was no possibility for the moment of *kairos*.

Whether consciously or not, the leader of the group created a screen for his and V's projection of N's dream, and thus moved the deepest meaning of his associations (“I am L.”) from one layer of the field of group analysis (the deeper one) to another (more “superficial” one). It is as if N's “freezing” was still connected with the external, rather than group, space and time. “Sweating” and “verbal-physical” (12) was there, in the group, right at that moment. L. was killed, “also” on one screen (the movie). And in “deep fantasies”. Thus, this scene was encouraged by the divided *reverie* of two subjects in the register of “patricide.” N's maternal space (freezing, followed by the whirlpool that suffocates and drowns) discussed in the group could also be a deep fantasy of maternal space in which a child suffocates, but in this situation, it was not “caught”. It aided, or so I think, a stronger projection of a deep fantasy of the patricidal paternal field on parallel (?) inner screens. We shall not discern which part of that belonged to whom, since that is what the author taught us by quoting Ogden.

Da je „intersubjektivistička paradigma“ jedan od puteva koji na „s(t)jecištu“ s drugim putevima može biti izabran, svjedoči nam, između ostaloga i izbor radova na koje se „naš autor“ (1) referira. Znamo, međutim, da izabrani putevi mogu biti ovakvog ili onakvog ishoda. Ako se putuje u istraživačke svrhe, uvijek postoji mogućnost da se naiđe na izvore spoznaje.

The “intersubjective paradigm” is one of the paths that can be chosen while “crossing” other paths, and this is evident from, among other things, the selection of articles the author refers to (1). However, we know that chosen paths can have a variety of outcomes. If one travels for the purposes of research, there is always the possibility of finding the sources of knowledge.

LITERATURA/REFERENCES

1. Bilić, A. Kontratransfer i reverie. Psihoterapija 2018; vol. 32, br. 1.
2. Pohlmann, W. „Intersubjektivitet“ – *ein neues Paradigma der Psychoanalyse?*
3. Psyche – ZPsychoanal 67, 2013, 261-275
4. Pernar, L.M. Supervizija supervizije. Psihoterapija 2017; vol.31, br.2: 195-216
5. Balmer, R.S. Refleksija o radu „Supervizija supervizije. Psihoterapija 2017; vol. 31, br.2:265
6. Jogan, E. Supervizija psihoterapijskog rada sa psihotičnim pacijentima iz teorijske i kliničke perspektive intersubjektivnosti. Psihoterapija 2017; vol.31, br.2: 140-59
7. Bion, W.R. Aux sources de l'experience (1962). Presses universitaires de France, 1979 (str.54)
8. Matačić, S., Okorn, J. „Reverie i sanjanje“ u superviziji kao intersubjektivnom procesu i iskustvu. Psihoterapija 2017; vol.31, br.2 : 240-56
9. Warsitz, R.-P. Der Raum des Sprechens und die Zeit der Deutung im psychoanalytischen Prozess. Psyche-Z Psychoanal 60, 2006, 1-30
10. Bion, W.R. Elements of Psychoanalysis (1963). Maresfield Reprints London
11. Bion, W.R. (1961) Experiences in Groups and Other Papers. London: Tavistock.
12. Whitebook, J. Die Grenzen des „intersubjective turn“. Eine Erwiderung auf Axel Honneth. Psyche-Z Psychoanal 57, 2003, 250-261
13. Busch, H.J. Intersubjektivität als Kampf und die Anerkennung des Nicht-Intersubjektiven. Kommentar zur Honneth-Whitebook – Kontroverse. Psyche-ZPsychoanal 57, 2003, 262-274
14. Green, A. Le discours vivant. Presses Universitaires de France, 1973, str.334
15. Rafaelsen, L.: Projections, Where Do They Go? Group Analysis, vol 29 (1996): 143-158