

OD PARANOIDNE PSIHOZE DO NEODSANJANIH FANTAZIJA

/ FROM PARANOID PSYCHOSIS TO UNDREAMT FANTASIES

Goran Tošić

SAŽETAK/SUMMARY

U ovom radu dan je prikaz psihodinamičkog pristupa pacijentu sa psihozom paranoidnog tipa. U kliničkoj slici pacijent je ostavljao dojam prisutnosti dvaju dijelova osobnosti: psihotičnog i nepsihotičnog dijela, koji su bili neintegrirani. Zbog fragmentiranog načina prezentacije terapeut je dugo bio u stanju neizvjesnosti u pogledu pacijentove bizarne priče i njezina definiranja u psihodinamičkom smislu. S vremenom se ispostavilo da disocirana razvedenost psihotične priče skriva potencijalno neodsanjano fantazijsko bogatstvo. Prerani prekid terapije od strane pacijenta onemogućio je proradu njegovih projekcija kao i povezivanje emocionalno prazne psihotične konstrukcije sa živim i bolnim osjećajnim svijetom, a u cilju bolje integracije dvaju dijelova njegova *selfa*: psihotičnog i nepsihotičnog.

/ This paper presents a description of the psychodynamic approach to a patient with psychosis of the paranoid type. The clinical picture of the patient indicated the presence of two parts to their personality: a psychotic and non-psychotic part, which were not integrated. Due to the fragmented presentation, the therapist was in a state of uncertainty for a long time regarding the patient's bizarre story and its definition in the psychodynamic sense. In time it became clear that the dissociated fragmentation of the psychotic story was hiding a potentially undreamt wealth of fantasy. Early cessation of the therapy on part of the patient prevented working through his projections and connecting the emotionally empty psychotic construction with the living and painful emotional world with the goal of better integration of two parts of the patient's self: the psychotic and the non-psychotic.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI / KEY WORDS

rascjep / *personality split*, psihotični dio osobnosti / *psychotic part of the personality*, neintegracija / *non-integration*, neizvjesnost / *uncertainty*, sanjarenje / *daydreaming*

Goran Tošić, psihijatar, psihoterapeut, grupni analitičar, edukator iz grupe analize, Neuropsihijatrijska bolnica „Dr Ivan Barbot“ Popovača, goran.tosic62@gmail.com

/ Goran Tošić, psychiatrist, psychotherapist, group analysis, educator in group analysis, "Dr Ivan Barbot" Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Popovača, goran.tosic62@gmail.com

TEORIJSKI UVOD

Psihoterapijski (psihodinamički) pristup pacijentima sa psihozom razlikuje se od terapijskog pristupa neurotičnom pacijentu (Civitarese, 2019., 2020., Tošić, 2019.) (1 – 3). Zbog drugačije psihodinamike i često fragmentiranog sadržaja terapeut je češće u neizvjesnoj poziciji nerazumijevanja te samim time mora dulje opservirati pacijenta kako bi uspio shvatiti smisao njegova sadržaja (Feldman, 2013.) 2017., Ghused, 2016., 2017.) (4, 5). *Setting* može biti drugačiji (ne samo u smislu duljeg trajanja seanse) nego u terapiji neurotskih pacijenata (Schulz, 1975., 1983., 2009., Fromm-Reichmann, 1940., 1950. 2006., 1948., 2016.) (6 – 10). Zbog straha od ponovnog proživljavanja katastrofičnih osjećaja u psihotičnom stanju pacijenti se brane različitim i tvrdokornim obranama (Federn, 1952., Little, 1990., Maletić, 1974.) (11 – 13). Tijekom terapije razvija se psihotični transfer, ali i drugi oblici transfera koji se moraju prorađivati i koji u terapeutu mogu izazvati snažne kontratransferne osjećaje (Schulz, 1983., 2009, Fromm-Reichmann, 1940., Maletić, 1974., Winnicott, 1988., Freeman, 2001., Tausk, 1933., Klein, 1952., Little, 1993a, 1993b, Searles, 1963., 1999a, 1975., 1999b, Abend, 2017., Ping-Nie, 1983., 2009., Volkan 2010., Sullivan, 1931., 2006.) (7, 8, 13 – 27). Terapijski pristup može biti različit: od suportivnog do strogo analitičkog (Rosenfeld, 1988.)

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The psychotherapeutic (psychodynamic) approach to patients with psychosis differs from the therapy approach for neurotic patients (Civitarese 2019,2020, Tošić 2019) (1-3). Due to different psychodynamics and the often fragmented contents, the therapist is more often in an uncertain state of lacking understanding, thus requiring longer observation of the patient to achieve an understanding of the meaning of their contents (Feldman(2013) 2017, Ghused (2016) 2017) (4,5). The setting can be different (not only in the sense of lengthier sessions) than in therapy for neurotic patients (Schulz 1975, (1983)2009, Fromm Reichmann 1940,(1950)2006,(1948)2016) (6-10). Due to the fear of reliving catastrophic feelings in the psychotic state, patients employ varied and tenacious defense mechanisms (Federn 1952, Little 1990, Maletić 1974) (11-13). Psychotic transference develops during therapy, but other forms of transference develop as well that must be worked through and can cause strong countertransference feelings in the therapist (Schulz (1983)2009, Fromm Reichmann 1940, Maletić 1974, Winnicott 1988, Freeman 2001, Tausk 1933, Klein 1952, Little 1993a, 1993b, Searles (1963)1999a,(1975)1999b, Abend 2017, Ping-Nie (1983) 2009, Volkan 2010, Sullivan (1931)2006) (7,8,13-27). The therapeutic approaches can be different: ranging from a supportive approach to a strictly analytical (Rosenfeld 1988) (28)



(28) ili današnjeg „mekšeg“ pristupa, sklonijeg intersubjektivnom (Ferro, 2017., 2018., 2020., Neri, 2009., Foresti, 2018., Civitarese, 2018., 2020., Ogden, 1997., Mazzacane, 2020., Manica, 2020., Pietrantonio, 2020.) (29 – 39).

KLINIČKI PRIKAZ

Način dolaska na psihoterapiju

Zbog nekih problematičnih situacija s bivšom partnericom pacijent Ivan vještačen je kao psihotičan i neubrojiv. Odlukom suda dobio je rješenje za provođenje psihoterapije tijekom šest mjeseci, uz zabranu prilaska bivšoj partnerici Ani. Ivan je imao mogućnost izbora: ili boraviti na sudsko-psihijatrijskom odjelu određeno vrijeme (dio je vremena tijekom vještačenja i boravio na odjelu) ili dolaziti na psihoterapiju. Odlučio se za psihoterapiju kao manje bolnu opciju za njega iako je zapravo bio uvjeren da mu psihoterapija uopće ne treba. Ivan nije imao uvid u svoje psihotične dijelove osobnosti, nije znao zbog čega mu je potrebna psihoterapija.

Setting

Terapija se održavala u istom prostoru, jednom tjedno, seanse su trajale najčešće osamdeset minuta, ali su, vrlo rijetko, varirale od trideset minuta (kad je

or the modern “softer” approach that is more prone to the intersubjective (Ferro 2017,2018,2020,Neri 2009,Foresti 2018,Civitarese 2018,2020,Ogden 1997,Mazzacane 2020,Manica 2020,Pietrantonio 2020) (29-39).

CASE REPORT

Presentation to psychotherapy

Due to some problematic situations with an ex-partner, the patient we will call Ivan was evaluated as psychotic and mentally unsound. A court decision mandated 6 months of psychotherapy and a restraining order regarding the ex-partner, Ana. Ivan was given the choice: either spend a certain amount of time in the forensic psychiatry ward (part of the time; he was also placed in the ward during the evaluation) or to attend psychotherapy. He decided on psychotherapy as the less painful option, despite being convinced that he did not need psychotherapy. Ivan lacked insight into the psychotic parts of his personality and did not know why he needed psychotherapy.

Setting

The therapy took place in the same location once per week, and sessions usually lasted 80 minutes, rarely varying between 30 minutes (when Ivan had obligations related to a disabled aunt) to 90 minutes (when he had the need to talk at length about his psychotic construc-

Ivan imao obvezu oko invalidne tete) do devedeset minuta (kad je imao potrebu mnogo pričati o svojim psihotičnim konstrukcijama). Terapeut i Ivan sjedili su jedan nasuprot drugoga.

Prikaz nekoliko početnih seansi

Prva seansa prošla je u uobičajenom uzimanju anamnestičkih podataka: Ivan živi na selu, radi u gradu, ima brata, roditelji su još živi, rastavljen je i s bivšom suprugom dobro se slaže, zajedno se brinu o odgoju kćeri. Ivan je imao vezu s Anom, kolegicom s posla, bili su zajedno oko dvije i pol godine. Po njegovu pričanju ona je bila sklona neobičnim povijesnim pričama, ali i nekim novijim mitovima ili pričama. Njezine aluzije ili otvorene zaključke o tome da bi on bio nasljednik Merovinga koji su pak bili nasljednici Isusove loze on je veći dio vremena dočekivao s podsmjehom i ironijom sve dok nije došlo do prekida veze. Nakon prekida on se, prema vlastitim riječima, oko mjesec dana „izgubio“ da bi zatim počeo uočavati i prepoznavati neki poseban paralelni svijet i počeo se prisjećati priča koje su mu navodno kao djetetu pričali Jehovini svjedoci o njegovu pradjedu kao potomku Isusa (pa dakle i o Ivanu kao Isusovu nasljedniku). Činjenice da ni njegovi roditelji ni drugi rođaci nisu nikad čuli za te priče o pradjedu niti su viđali te Jehovine svjedo-

tions). Ivan and the therapist were seated across from each other.

Description of several initial sessions

The first session was spent on the usual gathering of patient history: Ivan lived in the countryside, worked in the city, had a brother, his parents were still alive, he was divorced and had a good relationship with his ex-wife, jointly caring for their daughter. Ivan had a relationship with Ana, a colleague from work, with the relationship lasting approximately 2.5 years. According to his story, she had a liking for unusual historical tales as well as some newer myths and stories. Her allusions or open suggestions that she was a descendant of the Merovingian dynasty who were descendants of Jesus, he would mostly meet with derision and irony until their breakup. After their breakup, according to him, he got “lost” for about a month, and started noticing and recognizing some kind of special parallel world and remembering stories that were allegedly told to him as a child by Jehovah’s Witnesses about his great-grandfather as a descendant of Jesus (and thus making Ivan Jesus’ successor). The fact that neither his parents or his other relatives ever heard of these stories about his great-grandfather or saw these Jehovah’s Witnesses did not significantly affect the significance that the stories by the Jehovah’s Witnesses had for Ivan.



ke nisu znatnije uzdrmale značaj koji su priče Jehovinih svjedoka imale za njega.

Na trećoj seansi doznaje se da su pacijentov djed i pradjed znali za svoje (božansko) podrijetlo i da su udali Ivanovu majku u mjesto X... jer su Merovinzi za sebe govorili da su rođeni u zemlji i da su živjeli u soli kao vanzemaljci ili vanzemaljske duše. Rođeni u soli... jer ih ovozemaljsko društvo uvijek malo nagrizi. Na tren se Ivan distancira i kaže: „To je sve niz budalaština“, ali trenutak kasnije opet ulazi u priču koja u njegovoj interpretaciji za njega postaje vrlo vjerodostojna.

Ivan je nekim Jehovinim svjedocima u djetinjstvu pričao svoje snove o veprovima, a oni su njemu pričali o Merovinzi i njegovu pradjedu, nasljedniku Isusa.

Ana je od njega tražila tajnu promjene novca, on joj je pisao neka pisma, čak joj je i ubacio list iz mjenjačnice.

U jednom pismu potpisuje se kao vanzemaljac bez imena...

Sjeća se da je u djetinjstvu kad je imao visoku temperaturu sanjao da ga šibaju. Sanjao je i da valjak ide prema njemu te da vuče veprove za rep. Ana ima tetovažu s nekim od tih znakova.

Ivan voli žene, društvo, voli popiti pivu... Ana je to prepoznala kao Isu-

During the third session, it was revealed that the patient's grandfather and great-grandfather knew of their (divine) heritage and that they married Ivan's mother in the township of X because the Merovingians said they were born in the earth and that they lived in salt as aliens or alien spirits. Born in the salt... because this earthly society is always corroding them slightly. For a moment, Ivan achieves some distance and says "this is just a bunch of silliness", but a moment later he is once again engaged in the story that, in his interpretation, becomes very convincing to him.

In his childhood, Ivan told some Jehovah's Witnesses about his dreams about boars, and they told him about the Merovingians and his great-grandfather, Jesus' successor.

Ana had asked him for the secret of exchanging money, he wrote her some letters, even putting in a paper from a money exchange.

He signed one letter as: an alien with no name...

He remembered that when he had fever during childhood he would dream of being whipped. He also had a dream that a roller was moving towards him as well as a dream of pulling the tails of boars. Ana has a tattoo with some of these signs.

Ivan likes women, company, and the occasional beer. Ana recognized this as Jesus' behavior. She also recognized marks of the Merovingians on

sovo ponašanje. Ona je na njemu prepoznala i obilježja Merovinga. I nakon prekida veze ona mu je sugerirala da je on netko drugi, tj. da skriva identitet.

Još mu je znala dobacivati: „Tko je vozio?“ Jer, u prometnoj nesreći stradao je politički dužnosnik u njihovu mjestu, a vozio ga je vozač koji se preziva Gregurić. A zna se da su Merovinci imali svetog Grgura za zaštitnika. Još prije prekida veze počeo se bojati svoje partnerice, njezine mističnosti i čudnih pitanja, npr. je li posvojen. Plaše ga „gluposti koje partnerica izvodi“, misli da je možda ona luda.

U nastavku terapije paralelno s razgovorom o drugim sadržajima terapeut polako slaže mozaik navodne priče Jehovinih svjedoka, koji u svakoj novoj seansi dobije neku novu, neočekivanu kockicu. Terapeut je imao asocijaciju na priče Šeherezade kojima je djevojka od cara kupovala svoj život.

Osim radoznalosti u vezi s neobičnom pričom „Jehovinih svjedoka“ terapeut nije u kontratransferu ništa osjećao prema Ivanu u pogledu njegove psihotične priče i nije imao nikakvih asocijacija koje bi imale neku psihodinamičku vrijednost, kao da mu je bilo blokirano njegovo dotadašnje psihoterapijsko iskustvo. Tek pri kraju terapije počela se oblikovati jasnija slika o psi-

him. Even after their relationship was over, she suggested to him that he was someone else, i.e. that he was hiding his identity.

She would also often say: “Who was driving?” This was because of traffic accident involving a political figure in his town, and the driver was named Gregurić. It is well-known that the Merovingians had St. Gregory as a patron saint. Even before the breakup he had started being afraid of his partner, her mysticism, and her strange questions, e.g. asking whether he was adopted. He is frightened of the “stupid stuff that his partner does” and he thinks she might be crazy.

During the course of the therapy, in parallel with conversations on other content, the therapist slowly assembled the mosaic of the alleged story of the Jehovah's Witnesses, which takes on a new and unexpected facet in every session. The therapists had an association to the stories of Scheherazade which the girl used to buy her life from the emperor. In addition to the unusual story of the “Jehovah's Witnesses”, the therapist had no countertransference feelings towards Ivan regarding his psychotic story and had no associations of any psychodynamic value, as if his previous experience in psychotherapy was blocked. It was only towards the end of the therapy that a clearer picture of the psychodynamic background of the bizarre story started to form, as well as the therapist's countertransference “vivacity” regarding this story.



hodinamičkoj pozadini bizarne priče kao i terapeutova kontratransferna 'živost' po pitanju te priče.

Ivanovi snovi

Prema nekim autorima (40) snovi psihotičnih pacijenata nemaju simbolizaciju, imaju čudnu, bizarnu kvalitetu, u njima su moguće mnogobrojne transformacije, oni su konkretna halucinatorna konstrukcija na koju bolesnik nema asocijacije pa ih se ne može analizirati na klasičan način. Nekad ti snovi odražavaju regres i ego-dezorganizaciju ili predstavljaju sumanutu restituciju kao obranu od dezintegracije. Ponekad anticipiraju početak psihotičnog stanja.

Prema Macku (Mack, 1969.) snovi mogu biti dio sumanutosti ili mogu biti inkorporirani u bolesnikovo psihotično ponašanje kao što je slučaj kod Ivana (41).

Tijekom Ivanove terapije vraćala se priča o jednom snu koji je imao tri slike. U početku se samo zna da je Ivan u djetinjstvu, kad je imao visoku temperaturu, sanjao da ga šibaju. Sanjao je i da valjak ide prema njemu i da vuče veprove za rep. Prije kraja terapije doznaju se i neki detalji: Ivan se prvo sjećao da je taj san s tri slike sanjao između petnaeste i sedamnaeste godine pa zatim između desete i jedanaeste godine i na kraju u dvade-

Ivan's dreams

According to some authors (40), the dreams of psychotic persons lack symbolization, they have a strange, bizarre quality, may include numerous transformations, and represent a concrete hallucinatory construction that does not create associations in the patient and thus cannot be analysed in the classical way. Sometimes these dreams express regress and ego disorganization, or represent delusional restitution as a defense from disintegration. They may sometimes anticipate the beginning of a psychotic state.

According to Mack (Mack, 1969), dreams can be part of the delusion or can be incorporated into the patient's psychotic behavior, as was the case with Ivan (41).

During Ivan's therapy, there was a recurring story of a dream that had three images. Initially the story was that when Ivan was a child and would have a fever, he dreamt of being whipped. He also had a dream that a roller is coming towards him and a dream that he is pulling boars by the tail. Towards the end of the therapy, some additional details came to light: Ivan initially said that he had that triple image dream between 15 and 17 years of age but later said it was between the age of 10 and 11, and finally that it was at the age of 20. The images of the dream were also described in more detail.

1st image: the roller is coming towards him and he is buried to his neck in the earth, like in Westerns. As the roller ap-

setoj godini. I slike sna detaljnije su opisane.

1. slika – valjak ide prema njemu, a on je do vrata zakopan u zemlju kao u *westernu*. Kad se valjak približi, on vidi da je to bijeli trupac drveta, izblanjan (oguljene kore), i trupac prelazi preko njega.

2. slika – on veprove drži za rep, a oni ga vuku po blatu. Dugo se zadržao s njima u igri.

3. slika – majka ga šiba, on kleči pred njom. Jedino je uz tu sliku pacijent imao napomenu, tj. rekao je da se dugo igrao s veprovima i da je kasnio kući pa se majka ljutila i istukla ga. To zapravo više djeluje kao sekundarna elaboracija, tj. pokušaj povezivanja slika u snu, nego kao prava slobodna asocijacija.

Prije završetka terapije doznaje se kako je klečanje bilo vrlo posebno: kleči se jednom nogom, stopalo druge noge je na podu, na natkoljenicu te druge noge oslonjena su prsa, ruke su raširene, kao i prsti, a dlanovi su okrenuti prema zemlji. Terapeut je imao fantaziju – sliku raspetog i bičevanog Isusa koji kleči preopterećen težinom križa.

Ana je navodno od njega zahtijevala da kleči pred njom upravo na takav, poseban način, zapravo kao pred majkom, samo bez šibanja. Ipak, prije kraja terapije treća slika, u Ivanovu priča-

proaches, he can see that it is a white tree trunk that is "stripped" (with the bark removed), and the tree trunk passes over him.

2nd image: he is holding the boars by the tail and they drag him through the mud. He continues to play with them for a long time.

3rd image: his mother is whipping him, and he is kneeling in front of her. It was only for this image that the patient had an additional comment, saying that he had stayed to play with the boars for a long time in the dream and was late in coming home, so his mother was angry and beat him. This seems more like a secondary elaboration, i.e. as an attempt to link the images in the dream, than as a true free association.

Towards the end of the therapy, the patient reported that the kneeling was very special: he knelt on one knee, the foot of the other leg was on the floor, the torso was resting on the upper part of that leg, the arms and fingers were spread out, with the palms facing the ground. The therapist had a fantasy – an image of the crucified and whipped Jesus that is kneeling, overburdened by the weight of the cross.

Ana had allegedly demanded of Ivan to kneel in front of her in this particular way, i.e. as he knelt in front of his mother, but without the whipping. However, towards the end of the therapy, the third image appeared to change in Ivan's



nju, kao da se mijenja i postaje slika s visokim, crnim, išibanim muškarcem, što je slično slici u Aninom snu (o kojem znamo samo taj fragment: šibanje visokog crnog muškarca). Čini se da se kroz tu promjenu u snu vidi stanje u transfernom odnosu (možda bismo mogli reći i u terapijskom polju) koji kao da ponovo reproducira odnos s majkom i Anom, odnos u kojem je on mučen i šiban jer „protiv svoje volje mora dolaziti na terapiju“. San sa šibanjem djeluje kao slikovni, piktografski prikaz odnosa s bitnim ženama u životu: u početku s majkom, a kasnije i partnericom na koju se preslikava odnos s majkom, odnosi u kojima je on emocionalno neshvaćen i osjeća neko mučenje, a konkretna slika je šibanje. Majka i partnerica koje ga šibaju mogu se shvatiti i kao prikaz Ivanove unutarnje dinamike po kojoj psihotični i moćni dio *selfa* muči (šiba) zdraviji, ali i bespomoćni dio *selfa* (42).

Slika šibe i valjka kao da na konkretan način prikazuje cijelu Ivanovu situaciju: rani traumatični odnos s majkom „koja nema majčinski osjećaj“ i ponavljanje tog odnosa s partnericom koja je isto izjavljivala da „nema majčinski osjećaj“ (šibanje u snu) uz Ivanovu onipotentnu kompenzaciju (valjak, tj. svitak, papirus, pismo o nasljednom pravu Isusova nasljednika) povrijeđenog djeteta.

retelling and morphed into an image of just a tall, dark, whipped man, which is similar to the image in Ana's dream (of which we only have that fragment: the whipping of a tall dark man). It would seem that this change in the dream retelling indicates the state of the transference relationship (we might also say: in the field of therapy) which seems to reproduce the relationship with the mother and Ana, i.e. a relationship in which Ivan is tortured and whipped because he “must come to therapy against his will”. The dream of whipping seems like an image, a pictographic depiction of the relationship with the significant women in his life: initially his mother and later the partner on which he copies the relationship with his mother, a relationship in which he is not understood emotionally and feels tortured, with a concrete image of whipping. The mother and partner that whip him can also be understood as a depiction of Ivan's inner dynamic in which the psychotic and powerful part of the self tortures (whips) the healthier but helpless part of the self (42).

The image of the whip and the roller seem to represent a concrete depiction of Ivan's whole situation: an early traumatic relationship with the mother “who has no maternal feelings” and a repetition of that relationship with a partner who also said she “had no maternal feeling” (whipping in the dream), along with Ivan's onipotent compensation (the roller i.e. a scroll, papyrus, or letter on the hereditary rights Jesus' successor) of a hurt child.

Intervencije terapeuta

U sedamnaestoj seansi Ivan se prisjeća prekida s partnericom. Kaže da se tada „izgubio“ i da mu je trebalo mjesec dana da se sabere.

Terapeut kaže da mu se čini da ga je taj prekid veze jako pogodio jer je mjesec dana bio izgubljen.

Ivan s lakoćom to odbija: prvo je on nju ostavio jer je ona izišla s kolegom s posla. Ivan je to čuo i telefonski prekinuo vezu. Njezina reakcija bila je dramatična, plakala je da će je netko ubiti, pa su nastavili vezu. U trenutku koji mu se učinio prikladan terapeut se vratio na situaciju rastanka i opet stavio naglasak na tešku posljedicu rastanka jer je nakon toga „mjesec dana bio kao izgubljen“. U slobodnijoj formi razgovora terapeut je Ivanu pokušao približiti kako je bolesna (psihotična) jezgra u njemu preplavila njegov zdravi dio koji se onda „pogubio“. Ivan je to zainteresirano slušao, ali bez komentara. Nakon prekida, kada je ona njega ostavila, on joj je pisao pisma, a ona ga je tada prijavila zbog uznemiravanja.

Terapeut komentira da pisma djeluju nerazumljivo, onome tko ne zna pozadinu priče i fragmentirano.

Ivan kaže da je u pismima ispipavao povlači li netko drugi iz pozadine konce: možda Masoni ili Jehovini svjedoci.

Interventions by the therapist

During the 17th session, Ivan recalled his breakup with Ana. He says he felt lost for a time and needed about a month to recuperate.

The therapist said that it seemed to him that this breakup hit him very badly because he was lost for a month.

Ivan easily dismisses this: firstly, he left her because she went on a date with a colleague from work. Ivan heard this and broke up via a phone call. Her reaction was dramatic, she cried and said that someone would kill her, so they continued the relationship. At a point that seemed opportune, the therapist brought the conversation back to the situation of the breakup and once again emphasized the severe consequences of the breakup that caused Ivan to “feel lost for a month”. In a more freeform conversation, the therapist tried to show to Ivan how the diseased (psychotic) core in him overwhelmed the healthy part of his personality, that was then “lost”. Ivan listened with interest but with no comments. After the breakup, when she left him, he wrote her letters and she then reported him for harassment.

The therapist commented that the letters seem fragmented and hard to understand to those who do not know the background story.

Ivan says he used the letters to feel out whether there was someone else in the



Masoni se vjenčavaju tako da pred drugima imaju seksualni odnos. On se na to nije mogao natjerati.

Nakon dvije seanse govorimo o čitanju. Voli Andrića, ali voli i Krležu. Čitao je i Gospodara prstenova. Jednom je pročitao jednu Krležinu rečenicu na njemačkom da se kod grmljavine treba čuvati hrasta i sakriti se pod bukvu. Pitao je oca što to znači.

Terapeut primjećuje da je zanimljivo da Ivan provjerava značenje Krležine rečenice, a nije provjeravao sve te priče od Ane koja mu je govorila neobične stvari.

To ga iznenadi i zainteresira. Slijede asocijacije na situacije u kojima su ga po njegovu doživljaju bivše partnerice prevarile: jedna s terminom rađanja djeteta, a druga jer se predstavljala kao skromna, a poslije je vidio da ona voli raskoš.

U idućoj seansi vraćamo se na njegov odnos sa ženama.

Terapeut mu kaže da mu se iz dosadašnjih razgovora čini da Ivana u njegovim odnosima sa ženama ne zanima pravi smisao njihove poruke u komunikaciji, nego on poruku tumači na način koji mu odgovara i kao da je sklon konstrukcijama uz malo ili nimalo dokaza.

Ivan kaže da su mu odnosi površni, ne voli ići u dubinu. Na kraju seanse tera-

background pulling the strings: perhaps the Masons or Jehovah's Witnesses. Masons get married by having sexual intercourse in front of others. He could not make himself do that.

After two sessions, we get to the topic of reading. He likes Andrić, but also Krleža. He also read the Lord of the Rings. He once read a sentence by Krleža in German saying that during thunder one should be wary of oaks and hide under a beech tree. He asked his father what that meant.

The therapist noted it was interested that Ivan checked the meaning of the sentence by Krleža but did not verify all those stories from Ana who told him many unusual things.

This surprises and interests him. That is followed by associations of situations in which, in his view, his ex-partners tricked him: one regarding timing for a pregnancy and another because she presented herself as humble but he later saw she liked luxury.

In the next session, we return to his relationship with women.

The therapist tells Ivan that from the conversations so far it would seem that in relationships with women Ivan is not interested in the real meaning of the messages they are communicating but that he interprets the message in ways that suit him, and that he seems to be prone to constructions based on little or no evidence.

peut kaže da je vrijeme prošlo i da će se vidjeti idući tjedan. Ivan najednom postaje ljut zbog toga što opet mora dolaziti. Ljut je na psihijatricu vještakinju koja ga je „proglasila manijakom“. Kaže da će razgovarati sa psihijatricom koja ga je uputila terapeutu.

Terapeut kaže da napravi onako kako misli da je za njega najbolje.

Na iduću seansu dolazi ljut, smrknuta lica.

Terapeut: Vidim da ste ljuti.

Ivan odgovara kako ne bi bio ljut kad mora dolaziti ni kriv ni dužan. I to baš danas na rođendan njegove kćeri. Ljut je na vještakinju koja je napisala da boluje od manične psihoze. Ljut je i na mene. Ljut je što nitko ne ispituje bivšu partnericu, ona je prava luđakinja. Agresivno i provokativno pita terapeuta: „Od čega se ja zapravo liječim?“

Terapeut je u tom trenutku osjećao intenzivnu unutaraju dvojbu. Ako mu kaže: 'Liječite se od psihoze', mogao bi izazvati veliku bol u njemu. Ako mu ne kaže pravu istinu, onda kao da potvrđuje besmislenost njegovih dolazaka. Intuitivno se terapeut odlučio za prvu varijantu pa je rekao: 'Liječite se od smetnji koje se mogu opisati kao paranoidna psihoza.'

Ivan kaže: „Sve su to gluposti“, ali djeluje kao da je pogođen, uzdrman,

Ivan says his relationships are shallow, that he does not like to enter too deeply into them. At the end of the session, the therapist says that the time is up and that they will see each other next week. Ivan suddenly becomes angry for having to come again. He is angry at the evaluating psychiatrist who “pronounced him to be a maniac”. He says that he will talk to the psychiatrist who referred him to a therapist.

The therapist says that he should do as he thinks is best.

Ivan arrives at the next session with an angry, dark expression.

Therapist: I can see that you are angry.

Ivan says that it is no wonder he is mad since he is forced to come for no reason. And especially today on his daughter's birthday. He is angry at the evaluating psychiatrist who wrote that he suffers from manic psychosis. He is also angry at me. He is angry that no one is questioning his ex-partner; she is the real crazy person. He aggressively and provocatively asks the therapist: what am I actually being treated for?

At that moment, the therapist was feeling an intense inner dilemma: if he says – you are being treated for psychosis – he could cause great pain in the patient. However, if he does not tell the patient the truth, he is confirming the futility of coming to his therapy sessions. Intuitively, the therapist decided on the first version and said: you are being treated for



postaje „mekaniji“, odlučuje terapeutu u glavnim crtama opisati što se događalo. Ana je vjerovala da je on iz posebne loze i to mu pokušavala dokazati. On na to u početku nije obraćao pozornost, ali ga je zatim to nekako preuzelo i kao da se tome više nije mogao oduprijeti, počeo je sve to doživljavati kao prilično realno, počeo se bojati, nije želio da se to sazna, da se obznani drugim ljudima. Sjeća se kako ga je Ana uvjeravala za pisma od pradjeda.

Terapeut pita: Gdje je zapravo to pismo?

Ivan: Pismo ne postoji.

Terapeut: Cijelo vrijeme ste govorili da postoji.

Ivan: Pokušao sam se nekako izvući iz cijele priče. Na kraju seanse, prije odlaska, Ivan se ispričava terapeutu što se ljutio na njega.

Terapeut mu kaže da drugi put ako mu termin ne odgovara to slobodno kaže.

Ivan odgovara: Hoćete iskreno?

Terapeut: Da.

Ivan: Ja sam i sam zaboravio na rođendan svoje kćeri.

Terapeut osjeti ljutnju, zbog već druge laži u istoj seansi, ali ne komentira, vrijeme seanse je prošlo.

issues that can be described as paranoid psychosis.

Ivan said “that’s all stupid”, but seems to be hit hard and shaken, and becomes “softer”, deciding to describe the main points of what happened: Ana believed he had a special ancestry and tried to prove this to him. He initially paid no attention to this, but was eventually overcome and it was as if he could no longer resist it, he started to view all of that as fairly realistic, he started being afraid and did not want this to become known, for other people to find out. He remembers how Ana tried to convince him about the letter from his great-grandfather.

The therapist asked: where is that letter now?

Ivan: The letter does not exist.

Therapist: You kept saying that it existed.

Ivan: I was trying to get out of the whole story somehow. At the end of the session, before leaving, Ivan apologizes to the therapist for being angry at him.

The therapist says that next time he should be free to say if the session date does not suit him.

Ivan: Do you want the truth?

Therapist: Yes.

Ivan: I myself had forgotten my daughter’s birthday.

The therapist experienced a feeling of anger at the second lie in the same ses-

Na početku sljedeće seanse Ivan odmah, uzbuđeno, komentira da je istina da je njemu već dosta dolaženja, ali misli da tu ima nešto. Čini mu se da se uplašio mogućnosti da se nakon vjenčanja s Anom ne bi mogao od nje rastati, misli da se panično boji vezanja, ničem u životu se nije dao sto posto. Opisuje što mu se zapravo dogodilo: s majkom je išao u trgovinu po namirnice. Vozeći se cestom mimoišao se s Anom, tj. s njezinim autom, a vidio je i nju unutra. Ona je išla u suprotnom smjeru. I onda, dok je u trgovini nešto kupovao, iznenada se okrenuo i vidio pred sobom Anu kako ga prodorno gleda. Odmah je pomislio da je to njezin znak, da mu poručuje da imaju iste oči, da su oči zrcalo duše i da su njih dvoje srodne duše. Uplašio se, takoreći pobjegao, odmah otišao do majke da joj kaže da je Ana tu, u trgovini i odmah je izišao iz trgovine... to što se dogodilo ne može objasniti, ne zna zašto se toliko uplašio, sebi je potvrdio da je zbilja paranoičan. Tu nešto ima i on to mora do suda pobijediti.

Terapeut mu nudi mogućnost da je strah od vezanja možda strah u kojem su bolesni dijelovi njega i partnerice u interakciji, a u takvoj je interakciji on bio izgubljen.

Ivan: ne zna ni sam, možda je to moguće... to vezivanje ga muči.

session but made no comment, as the session time had passed.

At the start of the next session, Ivan immediately and excitedly comments that while it is true that he is already fed up with coming to therapy he thinks there may be some point to it. It seems to him that he was frightened by the possibility that after marrying Ana he could not divorce her, he thinks he has a panicked fear of commitment, and he never fully committed to anything in his life. He describes what actually happened to him. He was driving to the store with this mother to get groceries. While driving he passed Ana, i.e. her car, and saw her in the car. She was going in the opposite direction. Then, as he was shopping, he suddenly saw Ana in front of him, staring intensely at him. He immediately thought that this was her sign, that she was telling him that they have the same eyes, that the eyes are the window to the soul and that the two of them are soulmates. He got scared and basically ran away, immediately going to his mother to tell her that Ana was here, in the store, and immediately went outside... he cannot explain this event, he does not know why he was so scared, and can confirm that he was truly being paranoid. There is something there and he has to beat it before the court date.

The therapist offers the possibility that fear of commitment may be a fear in which the sick parts of him and his partner interact, and he was lost in that interaction.



Terapeut se naglas pita ima li to možda veze s njima dvojicom (s Ivanom i terapeutom) i s Ivanovom ponekad dramatičnom reakcijom povezanom s redovitim dolaženjem jer na taj način terapeut veže njega, Ivana.

Ivan asocira na vezu s Anom i na vjenčanje pri čemu bi problem bio to što ne bi bilo rastave, „ta bi veza bila zauvijek“. Uvijek je na nekoj distanci s ljudima oko sebe. Bojao se da ga Ana ne posjeduje u smislu „ti pripadaš meni“, jer ona je tako nastupala. Asocira na coprije. Ipak, Ivan nikad nije vjerovao u magične stvari. Seansa je bila pri kraju, terapeut nije otvarao svoju moguću „vještičju“ ulogu u odnosu s Ivanom.

Nakon nekoliko seansi razgovor je spontano došao na apstraktnu umjetnost. Iz međusobne, intersubjektivne interakcije, stvorio se u terapeutu doživljaj Ivana kao malog djeteta koje upoznaje svijet oko sebe i koje traži da mu se objasne nepoznate stvari. Terapeut je nešto čitao o apstraktnom kiparstvu i osjetio je potrebu da neke jednostavne informacije o jednom apstraktnom kiparu podijeli s Ivanom. Na seansi nakon toga Ivan kaže da se nakon prošle seanse pitao je li terapeut namjerno govorio o apstraktnoj umjetnosti da bi ispipao je li Ivan oduševljen velikom učenošću jer tako ga je jednom prije pitala njegova odvjetnica, a u vezi s Anom.

Ivan: I don't know, maybe that's possible... it's the commitment that bothers him.

The therapist asks out loud if this may be related to the two of them (Ivan and the therapist) and Ivan's occasional dramatic reactions regarding regular attendance because he perceives the therapist as tying him down in this way.

Ivan associates about the relationship with Ana and the wedding, where the issue would be that there would be no divorce, “this relationship would be forever”. He is always distanced from people around him. He was scared of Ana possessing him in the sense “you belong to me”, because this was the position she would take. He associates about witchcraft and curses. However, Ivan never believed in magic. The session was at an end, and the therapists did not broach the subject of his possible “witchcraft” role in his relationship with Ivan.

After several sessions, the conversation spontaneously drifted to abstract art. The intersubjective interaction created an impression in the therapist of Ivan as a small child getting to know the world around him and asking for explanations of things that were unknown to him. The therapist had read something about abstract sculpture and felt the need to share some basic information on one abstract sculptor with Ivan. During the next session, Ivan said he had wondered after the previous session whether the therapist had talked about abstract art on purpose to feel out whether Ivan was

Terapeut mu kaže da ga to podsjeća na sumnju Ivana da ga on, terapeut, snima mobitelom na jednoj od seansi a da mu to nije otvoreno rekao. To je pitanje povjerenja, kao da Ivan doživljava terapeuta kao manipulativnog i lažljivog.

Ivan kaže da nije ni čudno da je sumnjičav nakon svega što mu se dogodilo s Anom.

Terapeut ga u vezi iskrenošću podsjeća da je govorio da pradjedovo pismo postoji, a poslije je ispalo da ne postoji.

Ivan kaže da je govorio onako kakva su bila vjerovanja bivše partnerice.

Terapeut mu kaže da je njegov (terapeutov) doživljaj bio kao da mu je Ivan to predočavao iz prve ruke, kao svoje vjerovanje. Osim toga, opet u vezi s iskrenošću podsjeća ga kako mu je Ivan prije nekoliko seansi pokušao izazvati krivnju povezanu s rođendanom Ivanove kćeri kojeg se ni sam nije sjetio. Dakle, pitanje iskrenosti i manipulacije.

Ivan misli da mu terapeut pokušava reći da je on, Ivan, zapravo neiskren i manipulativan, a da to pripisuje terapeutu. Ipak, terapeut ga mora razumjeti, događaju mu se stvari koje ni sam ne zna objasniti, kao npr. susret s Anom u trgovini. Kad mu je terapeut spomenuo psihozu, to mu je bila prekretnica, prvi

impressed by his erudition, because this was what his lawyer had asked him regarding Ana.

The therapist says that this reminds him of Ivan's suspicion that the therapist was covertly using a mobile phone to record their session. This is an issue of trust, with Ivan seemingly perceiving the therapist as lying and manipulative.

Ivan says it is no wonder he is suspicious after everything that happened with Ana.

Regarding honesty, the therapist reminds him that he first said that the letter from the great-grandfather existed and that later turned out to be false.

Ivan says that he was talking about the beliefs of his ex-partner.

The therapist says that his (the therapists) impression was that Ivan was talking about this as his own belief. Furthermore, the therapist reminds him that a few sessions ago Ivan tried to evoke a feeling of guilt about missing the birthday of his daughter that Ivan had not actually remembered himself. Therefore, an issue of trust and communication.

Ivan thinks that the therapist is trying to tell him that he, Ivan, is actually insincere and manipulative and that he is ascribing these traits to the therapist. However, the therapist must understand him, as things are happening that he himself cannot explain, e.g. meeting Ana in the store. When the therapist mentioned psychosis – this was the turning point, he realized for the



put je shvatio da drugi ljudi mogu tako doživjeti njegovu priču.

Terapeut kaže da se Ivanovim roditeljima i prvoj supruzi Ivanova priča o pradjedu činila čudnom, nerealnom, paranoičnom.

Ivan navodi da je bio potpuno uvjeren u svoje doživljaje, a sada vidi da drugi ljudi istu stvar mogu drugačije doživjeti.

Terapeut kaže da je Ivan jednu slučajnu, spontanu stvar kao što je bilo njihovo zajedničko pričanje o umjetnosti doživio kao prikrivenu namjeru terapeuta da od njega nešto dobije i sazna na prijeveru.

Nakon nekoliko seansi čini se da je Ivan razmišljao o onome što se dogodilo na prijašnjim seansama: kaže da sve te priče pokušava izbjeći od djetinjstva, ali „oni su uvijek tu“. Zatim kaže: „Sad djelujem paranoično.“

Nakon nekoliko seansi Ivan priča o pradjedu koji je imao sef u Švicarskoj i u njemu francuske dokumente. Pradjed je imao švicarske franke i mijenjao ih u Francuskoj za francuske franke po prodajnom tečaju pa se opet vratio u Švicarsku i opet napravio konverziju po prodajnom tečaju i na taj način se bogatio. To je bila čuvana tajna.

Terapeut izražava skepsu prema toj priči o kojoj Ivanova majka ne zna ni-

first time that other people could perceive his story in this way.

The therapist says that Ivan's parents and first wife found Ivan's story about his great-grandfather to be strange, unrealistic, and paranoid.

Ivan says he was full convinced of his experiences but now sees that other people can perceive them differently.

The therapist says that Ivan took an accidental, spontaneous thing like their talk about art and perceived it as a hidden agenda on part of the therapist to gain something and covertly find something out.

Several sessions later, it seems Ivan thought about what happened in the previous sessions: he says that he has been trying to avoid all these stories since childhood, but they "are always here". He then says: I'm sounding paranoid right now.

After a few sessions, Ivan tells the story of his great-grandfather who had a safe in Switzerland that contained French documents. The great-grandfather had Swiss francs and changed them in France into French francs at the exchange rate, and then went back to Switzerland and once again converted them at the exchange rate, earning money that way. This was a well-kept secret.

The therapist expresses skepticism towards that story of which Ivan's mother was unaware of, other than that his

šta osim da je pradjed, njezin otac, bio običan siromašan čovjek, seljak.

Ivan na to nema posebnih komentara, ali u nastavku priča o svojem ožiljku na desnoj ruci koji je u obliku slova L što bi značilo „letere“, tj. pismo po kojem bi on bio nositelj nasljednog prava.

Terapeut kaže da uočava puno sličnosti između Ivana i Isusovih obilježja, po Ivanovoj priči.

Ivana to ne zanima, to su vjerovanja od pradjeda.

Opet je prošlo nekoliko seansi. Ivan priča o Jehovinim svjedocima. Povremeno se pitao je li njemu netko stvarno pričao te priče u djetinjstvu. U sjećanju mu je doživljaj da je netko pričao, ali to ne može provjeriti. Slijedi priča o pradjedu kojem je isto kao i Isusu i Ivanu nedostajala donja petica (zub).

Terapeut kaže da priča o pradjedu djeluje kao neki napeti krimić: pradjed kao da ima dvije osobnosti, jedna je običan seljak, a druga je svjetski putnik, znalac jezika, tečaja itd., a rodbina ne zna ništa o njemu. Pradjed bi bio kao neki dr. Jackil i mr. Hyde.

Ivan kroz smijeh kaže da je i on kao mr. Hyde, a kao dr. Jackil će biti kad Ani objasni kako stvari stoje.

Na idućoj seansi pričamo o situaciji na poslu kada je ponizio svojeg pret-

great-grandfather, her father, was a simple, poor man, a farmer.

Ivan had no special comments about this, but continues to talk about a scar on his right hand that is shaped like the letter “L” which would mean “letere”, i.e. a letter according to which he would carry hereditary rights.

The therapist says he notices many similarities between Ivan and Jesus’ characteristics, according to Ivan’s story.

Ivan does not care about this; these are the beliefs of his great-grandfather.

Several sessions later, Ivan is talking about Jehovah’s Witnesses. He occasionally wondered if anyone actually ever told him those stories in childhood. He remembers an experience of being told the stories, but he cannot verify it. This is followed by a story about his great-grandfather who, like both Jesus and Ivan, was missing the second mandibular bicuspid (a tooth).

The therapist says that the story about the great-grandfather seems like a tense crime thriller: it is as if the great-grandfather has two personalities, one is a simple farmer and the other is a worldly traveler versed in languages, exchange rates, etc., and the family knows nothing of the latter. The great-grandfather was like some kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

Through laughter, Ivan says that he is like Mr. Hyde and that he will be like Dr. Jekyll once he explains to Ana how things are.



postavljenog koji se „napuhava pred glavnim šefom“. Nastavlja kako je zvao telefonom svojeg bivšeg šefa da ga pita o svojem trenutačnom statusu, bio je arogantan, izazivao je krivnju u bivšem šefu koji je onda odbio susret koji je Ivan tražio.

Terapeut konfrontira Ivana s njegovom arogancijom, sa sklonošću da napada i da izaziva krivnju, a onda se čudi reakcijama drugih ljudi. Kao da osjeća druge ljudi slabo prepoznaje.

Ivan prihvaća terapeutovu opservaciju.

Nakon nekog vremena Ivan priča kako je s Jehovinim svjedocima u djetinjstvu dogovorio da će on njima dati sef, a oni njemu ženu, tada je imao dvanaest godina. Dogovor je bio: ako ih izigra u pogledu sefa, oni ga mogu ubiti. On je svojoj budućoj ženi trebao dati pismo, zub i krv i to bi išlo tim „likovima“ radi sefa.

Terapeut kaže da zvuči vrlo dramatično da dijete od dvanaest godina odlučuje o svojem životu i vjenčanju.

Ivan se sjeća kako je s Jehovinim svjedocima hodao na putu od škole do kuće i kako je razgovarao o sefu i ženidbi. U vrijeme raskida s Anom njemu se „otvorila cijela priča“. Tek tada je shvatio pozadinu i veze s Jehovinim svjedocima. Danas u cijelu priču ne vjeruje, ali ga ta priča prati.

At the following session, we talk about a situation at work when he humiliated his superior who was “showing-off in front of the top boss”. Ivan continues by saying that he called his ex-superior by phone to ask him about his current status, and was arrogant and caused a feeling of guilt in the ex-superior who then refused the meeting that Ivan asked for.

The therapist confronts Ivan with his arrogance and tendency to attack and cause guilt in others and then be surprised at their reactions. As if he can only poorly recognize the feelings of others.

Ivan accepts the therapist's observation.

After some time, Ivan talks about how he made an agreement with Jehovah's Witnesses in childhood that he would give them the safe and that they would give him a wife, and he was 12 at the time. The deal was: if he tricks them about the safe, they can kill him. He was supposed to give his future wife the letter, tooth, and blood, which would go to those “guys” because of the safe.

The therapist says it sounds very dramatic for a 12-year-old to make decisions on their life and marriage.

Ivan remembers walking with Jehovah's Witnesses on the way from school to his home and talking about the safe and marriage. At the time of the breakup with Ana, the “whole story opened up inside him”. Only then did he realize the background and link to the Jehovah's

Na sljedećoj seansi Ivan priča kako mu je Ana govorila kako je prelazila preko jednog mosta kraj kojeg je kafić u kojem su ga dvoje Jehovinih svjedoka pokušavali upoznati s budućom ženom. On je poslije to povezivao, moguće je da je ta mlada cura bila baš Ana.

Terapeut ga pita zar mu Ana nije nikad rekla da ga je prepoznala kao mladića iz kafića.

On negira. Konstatiramo kako je ni on nikad nije pitao je li to bila ona.

Terapeut kaže: 'Znači, nikad je niste pitali, nego ste u svojoj glavi kombinirali o čemu bi mogla biti riječ?'

Ivan se slaže. Nakon njezine priče odlučio je o svemu razmisliti. Mislio je da će je pitati, ali nije, bio je zbunjen.

Terapeut: Odustali ste od jednostavnog rješenja – pitati partnericu je li vam bila obećana i odlučili ste se za komplicirano rješenje, tj. za misaonu kombinatoriku u glavi.

Ivan kaže da je pogriješio što se kao dijete obećao budalama.

Terapeut se tada sjeti jedne situacije iz djetinjstva i podijeli je s Ivanom: kad je bio dijete nedjelje su bile duge i dosadne, kao i radijski prijenosi nogometnih utakmica (terapeut je više volio košarku). Ipak jedan prijenos do danas mu je ostao u sjećanju. Spiker je uzbu-

Witnesses. Today he no longer believes in this story but it keeps following him.

During the next session, Ivan retells the story how Ana said she crossed a bridge where next to which there was a café in which two Jehovah's Witnesses were trying to introduce him to his future wife. Later on, Ivan connected those stories and said it was possible the young girl was actually Ana.

The therapist asked whether Ana never said she recognized him as the young man from the café.

He denies this and states that he never asked her whether that was her.

The therapist says: So you never asked her but just came up with combinations in your mind regarding what could have happened.

Ivan agrees. After her story he decided to think about everything. He wanted to ask her but did not; he was confused.

Therapist: You gave up on the simple solution – asking your partner whether she was promised to you – and decided on the complicated solution, i.e. running the combinations in your mind.

Ivan says he made a mistake in promising himself to idiots when he was a child.

The therapist then remembers a situation from his own childhood and shares it with Ivan: when he was a child, Sundays were long and boring, as were radio broadcasts of football matches (the



đenim glasom komentirao kako jedan igrač nadire prema голу, predriblao je jednog... drugog... trećeg igrača, golman je već istrčavao, gol je bio prazan... ali naš se igrač nekako spetljao, nije dodao slobodnom suigraču i na kraju je izgubio loptu. Spikerov komentar bio je: 'Najteže je igrati jednostavno.' Ili, u našem slučaju, rekao je terapeut, najteže je živjeti jednostavno.

Ivan uz smijeh (u kojem sudjeluje i terapeut) kaže: ja sam se znači zapetljao u driblanju.

Pred kraj seanse opet se počinje ljutiti što mora dolaziti na terapiju.

Terapeut mu kaže da nije malo dijete i da napravi ono što misli da je za njega najbolje.

Nakon toga Ivan dolazi još dva puta zatim se vraća na posao i više ne može u radno vrijeme dolaziti na terapiju pa se terapija prekida.

Osvrt na intervencije terapeuta

Zbog Ivanove kaotične priče terapeut dugo nije imao uvid u širu sliku Ivanova unutarnjeg psihološkog stanja, a ni uvid u smisao psihotične konstrukcije. Često je svoj puni kapacitet trošio da zapamti i iz mnoštva riječi uhvati smisao Ivanove poruke. I često je Ivana, u njegovu brzom govorenju, usporavao da bi ga mogao pratiti. Zbog toga

therapist preferred basketball). However, he still remembers one broadcast even today. The commentator was talking in an excited voice about one player rushing towards the goal, he dribbled past one player... another one... a third player, the keeper was rushing forward, the goal was empty... but our player got confused, did not make a pass towards a free teammate, and finally lost the ball. The commentator's comment was: it's hardest to play simply. Or, in our case, said the therapist, to live simply.

As Ivan laughs (the therapist also taking part in the laughter), he says: so I messed up my dribbling.

Towards the end of the session he once again starts being angry about having to come to therapy.

The therapist tells him he is not a child and should do what he thinks is best for him.

After this Ivan comes two more times, and then returns to work and can no longer come to therapy during working hours, so the therapy ends.

Comments on the therapist's interventions

Due to Ivan's chaotic story, it took the therapist a long time to achieve insight into the broader picture of Ivan's inner psychological state and insight into the meaning of the psychotic construction. The therapist often had to use his full

je terapeut u početku bio ograničen na intervencije koje su bile najjednostavnije i koje su se ticale testiranja stvarnosti, npr. da su pisma koje je upućivao Ani –nerazumljiva i fragmentirana, da je njegovim roditeljima priča čudna i nestvarna, da priča o pradjedu djeluje kao napeti krimič, a ne stvarnost, da je neobično da dijete s dvanaest godina odlučuje o svojoj ženidbi i sudbini. Neke intervencije odnosile su se na potrebu za važnošću u onipotentnom smislu (Ivan kao Isus). Neke su se odnosile na teškoće s mentalizacijom i empatijskim razumijevanjem drugih ljudi (uključujući i terapeuta). U nekoliko navrata Ivan je konfrontiran sa svojom potrebom da u komunikaciji bude agresivan, da provocira krivnju u sugovorniku kao i da laže i manipulira. Paranoidni transfer terapeut je otvarao kad god bi se takav transfer pojavio. Ivan je s pretjeranom lakoćom odbio konfrontaciju da ga je raskid s Anom dramatično pogodio jer je nakon toga bio mjesec dana izgubljen.

Ivan je u svojem psihotičnom dijelu osobnosti imao problema sa simbolizacijom. Konkretizacija apstraktnog vidi se od početka priče kada Ivan priča da se rodio u zemlji i živio u soli, a zapravo se nazivi mjesta u kojima se rodio i živio, mogu asocijativno povezati sa zemljom i sa solju. Zatim inicijali njegove partnerice bili su doživljeni kao ime egipatskog božanstva, a ne kao

mental capacity to remember and grasp the meaning of Ivan's message from his prolific talking. The therapist also often had to slow down Ivan's rapid speech in order to be able to follow it. Consequently, the therapist was initially limited to the simplest interventions based on reality testing, i.e. that the letters Ivan sent to Ana were incoherent and fragmented, that his parents found his story to be strange and unrealistic, that the story about the great-grandfather seems more like a crime thriller than reality, and that it is strange for a 12-year-old to decide their marriage and fate in life. Some interventions were related to the need for significance in the sense of omnipotence (Ivan as Jesus). Some were related to difficulties in mentalization and empathizing with others (including the therapist). On several occasions, Ivan was confronted with his need to be aggressive in communication, to induce guilt in his interlocutor, and to lie and manipulate. Paranoid transference was addressed by the therapist whenever it took place. Ivan was overly dismissive of the confrontation that the breakup with Ana hit him badly because he was "lost" for a month afterwards.

Ivan had problems with symbolization in the psychotic part of his personality. Concretization of the abstract was observable from the start of the story when Ivan said he was born in the earth and lived in salt, when the place names of the locations where he was born and lived



Anini inicijali. Inicijali hotela u kojem su odsjeli Ivan i Ana također su bili doživljeni (na Aninu sugestiju) kao Ivanovi inicijali. U nekoliko seansi bila je uočljiva konkretizacija prezimena, npr. vozač auta u kojem je poginuo političar prezivao se Gregurić, a to je povezivano sa svetim Grgurom (čini se isto na Aninu inicijativu) koji je navodno bio zaštitnik Merovinga. Nadalje Ivan je govorio da je Ana iznajmila stan kod Trninića jer je „kalež stolovao na stolu od trna“. A kad mu je Ana prijetila šibanjem ako joj se ne pokloni, onda je on iznajmio stan kod gospođe Šibalić da vidi kako će to šibanje biti izvedeno. Kad je terapeut primijetio da mu je neobično da se prezimena konkretiziraju na takav, doslovan način, Ivan je rekao da je to u vezi s vjerovanjem u nasljeđe Merovinga.

Terapeut je pokušao (ali neuspješno) i neke konfrontacije s dostupnim ili općepoznatim činjenicama koje se nisu slagale s Ivanovom pričom, a da bi bar pokušao učiniti nestabilnom tu čvrstu konstrukciju Ivanove priče. U psihotičnom svijetu dogma nema alternative.

Ponekad terapeut „od drveća nije vidio šumu“, a zbog logoroične rafalne paljbe disociranim beta-elementima od strane Ivana. Ivan je verbalno vrlo moćan.

U novije vrijeme teoretičari tzv. „analitičkog polja“ kao i neki inter-

can be associatively linked with earth and with salt. The initials of his partner were perceived as the name of an Egyptian deity, not as Ana's initials. The initials of the hotel in which Ivan and Ana stayed were also perceived (at Ana's suggestion) as Ivan's initials. During several sessions, concretization of surnames could be observed, i.e. that driver of the car in which a politician died was called Gregurić, which was linked to St. Gregory (it would seem also at Ana's initiative) who was allegedly the patron saint of the Merovingians. Furthermore, Ivan said that Ana rented an apartment near Trninić because the "grail stood on a table of thorns". And when Ana threatened to whip him if he did not bow to her, he rented an apartment from Mrs. Šibalić (the surname can be loosely translated as "Whipper") to see how the whipping would be done. When the therapist noted that it is unusual for surnames to be concretized in such a literal way, Ivan said this was related to belief in the Merovingian heritage.

The therapist also attempted some confrontations with available or generally known facts that did not agree with Ivan's story, in order to at least attempt to weaken the solid construction of Ivan's story. In a psychotic world, there is no alternative to dogma.

Sometimes the therapists could not "see the forest for the trees" due to the rapid fire of beta elements on Ivan's part. In other words, Ivan was very powerful verbally.

subjektivisti (Ferro, Neri, Foresti, Civitarese, Ogden, Mazzacane, Manica, Pietrantonio) predlažu uporabu metafore umjesto klasične interpretacije, tj. metafore koja će ponuditi neizravnu, nezasićenu interpretaciju kroz pričanje priča i koja bi imala kapacitet da „pogura“ emocije na površinu (29 – 39). U toj terapiji terapeutovo je samootvaranje ponekad nudilo priču za daljnju proradu.

To samootvaranje dogodilo se u tri navrata: jednom kad je, potaknut Ivanovom primjedbom o nerazumljivosti apstraktne umjetnosti, rekao da i sam ne zna puno, a ono što zna rekao je u obliku nekih svojih opservacija o jednom apstraktnom kiparu. Drugi put kada se sjetio nogometnog prijenosa iz djetinjstva s izjavom spikera *Najteže je igrati jednostavno*. Treći put kad se, kao reakcija na Ivanovo pričanje o psu ljubimcu koji je uginuo (ali kao da je Ivanov osjećaj tuge bio suspregnut), sjetio jednog dokumentarca koji je gledao: zbog nekog istraživanja kravu su izdvojili iz stada, doveli je u klaonicu, njoj očito stran i hladan geometriziran betonski prostor ravnih linija, daleko od sunca, livade i trave, daleko od poznatih mirisa i zvukova i stavili je na pokretnu traku koja vodi negdje iza zastora. U krupnom planu u kravljem oku skupljala se suza. Poput lažnog strijeljanja ni nju nisu ubili. Pri povratku u stado veselo je trčala, njuškala svoje

Recently, theoreticians of the so-called “analytical field” as well as some intersubjectivists (Ferro, Neri, Foresti, Civitarese, Ogden, Mazzacane, Manica, Pietrantonio) recommend the use of metaphor instead of classical interpretation, i.e. a metaphor that will offer an indirect, unsaturated interpretation through storytelling that would have the capacity to “push” emotions to the surface (29-39). In this therapy, the therapist’s self-reveals sometimes provided stories that could be worked through further.

These self-reveals happened on three occasions: once when he, stimulated by Ivan’s remark on the incomprehensibility of abstract art, said that he does not know much about it himself but talked about what he did know in the form of some observations on an abstract sculptor. The second time was when the therapist recalled the football match radio broadcast from childhood and the commentator’s statement: it’s hardest to play simply. The third time was when, as a reaction to Ivan’s recollections of a pet dog that had died (but it was as if Ivan’s feeling of sadness was restrained), the therapist remembered a documentary he had watched: for the purpose of some kind of research, a cow was separated from the herd and brought to the slaughterhouse, which was to her an obviously foreign and cold, geometrically regular space with straight lines built from concrete, far from the sun, meadow, and grass, far from familiar smells



poznanike, a zatim kao da se osamila, samo stajala i bila zbunjena.

U prvom terapeutovu samootvaranju Ivan je reagirao paranoidnom opservacijom da terapeut to priča kako bi ispipao je li Ivan oduševljen velikom učenošću. Moguće je da je Ivan reagirao zavišću koja proizlazi iz narcističke povrede tog dijela njegove osobnosti. Iz toga je lako izvući pouku da kod pacijenata s narcističnim značajkama osobnosti treba biti oprezan sa samootvaranjem u kojem pacijent može doživjeti inferiornost u odnosu na terapeuta. Osim toga, pojavljuje se i pitanje je li za Ivana doživljaj bio prejak, pa dakle i preopasan, osjećaj bliskosti i dijeljenja (kao u odnosu roditelja i djeteta ili učitelja i učenika) pa u sljedećoj seansi Ivan postaje paranoidan u odnosu na terapeuta jer je lakše držati na distanci i odbaciti nekoga koga se doživljava lošim.

Na samootvaranje u pogledu nogometnog prijenosa i poruke da je najteže igrati (živjeti) jednostavno, što je zapravo bila konfrontacija s njegovim izbjegavanjem odnosa i komunikacije kao i konfrontacija s usamljeničkom, paranoidnom sklonošću konstruiranju reagirao je smijehom i prihvaćanjem. Na treće samootvaranje, u kojem je terapeut pustio da mu se osjeti tuga u glasu povezana s kravom koju su izdvojili iz stada Ivan nije pokazivao

and sounds, where she was placed on a conveyor belt that led behind a screen. The camera zoomed in on a tear gathering in the cow's eye. Like in a fake execution, she was not killed. When returning to the herd she ran around happily, sniffing her companions, and then she seemingly withdrew, just standing alone and confused.

Ivan reacted to the first therapist's self-reveal with a paranoid observation that the therapist was talking about this to feel out whether Ivan is impressed by erudition. It is possible that Ivan reacted out of envy that resulted from a narcissistic injury to that part of his personality. This can easily serve as a lesson on how careful one must be during self-reveals to patients with narcissistic personality traits when the patient can experience inferiority in relation to the therapist. Furthermore, this raises the question of whether the experience of closeness and sharing (as in a relationship between parent and child or teacher and student) was too strong and thus too dangerous, so Ivan became paranoid towards the therapist in the next session because it was easier to keep someone at a distance and reject them if they are perceived as bad.

The self-reveal in relation to the football broadcast and the message that it is hardest to play (live) simply, which was in fact a confrontation with Ivan's avoidance of relationships and communication as well as a confrontation with his hermit-like, paranoid tendency

reakciju, ni verbalnu ni neverbalnu. U terapiji nismo dalje razgovarali o osjećaju zbunjenosti i izgubljenosti koji je bio vidljiv kod životinje nakon povratka u stado i nismo ga povezivali s Ivanovom izgubljenošću nakon raskida s partnericom ni s mogućnošću da se rastanak može odžalovati. Odvajanje krave kojoj je prijetila tjelesna smrt nije se povezivalo s razdvajanjem Ivana od partnerice nakon koje je nastala psihička smrt, tj. psihotična epizoda. Ivan nije imao potrebu razrađivati tu priču. Emocionalni dio ostao je nedostupan, vjerojatno prebolan za otvaranje.

„Nogometna“ priča i priča o klaonici mogle bi se doživjeti i kao metaforične, neizravne interpretacije, ali Ivan nije imao potrebu za njihovom daljnjom elaboracijom.

Zanimljivo je da je na samootvaranje terapeuta, koje je u interakciji nudilo najviše emocionalne bliskosti povezane s pričom o umjetnosti Ivan nepogrješivo reagirao s paranoidnom distancom. Priča o kravi, koja je nudila terapeutovu otvorenu osjećajnost, možda ga je zbunila i držala u neutralnoj poziciji, poziciji iščekivanja, a osjećajno najudaljenija i zbog toga za njega najmanje opasna priča o nogometu ga je nasmijala. Slično tome Ivan je prihvatio (čini se ipak samo na razini dosjetke) terapeutovu asocijaciju na dr. Jackila i mr. Hyda koja se, istina,

towards mental constructions, resulted in Ivan laughing and accepting it. The third self-reveal, in which the therapist allowed sadness for the cow separated from the herd to seep into his voice, elicited no reaction from Ivan, neither verbal nor non-verbal. There were no further conversations in the therapy on the feeling of confusion and being lost that was visible in the animal after the return to the herd, and this was not lined with Ivan feeling lost after his breakup or the possibility of mourning for a parting. The separation of the cow that was in danger of physical death was not lined to Ivan's parting from Ana that was followed by mental death, i.e. a psychotic episode. Ivan had no need to further develop that story. The emotional part remained inaccessible, probably due to being too painful to open up.

The “football” story and the story of the slaughterhouse could be seen as metaphoric, non-direct interpretations, but Ivan showed no need to elaborate on the further.

It is interesting that in the self-reveal of the therapist that resulted in the most emotional closeness regarding the story about art, Ivan unerringly reacted with paranoid distancing. The story about the cow, that offered the therapist's open empathy, may have confused him and kept him in a neutral stance of expectation, whereas the emotionally most distant, and thus the least dangerous story for him, concerning football made him laugh. Similarly, Ivan accepted (it would



odnosila na pradjeda, ali oslikavala je i Ivanov unutarnji rascjep na psihotični i nepsihotični dio.

Transferno-kontratransferna isprepletenost

U terapiji je terapeut, primarno, s pacijentom gradio odnos. U ovom kliničkom prikazu navedeni su dijelovi razgovora koji su više upućivali na Ivanovu patologiju, a izostavljeni su, količinski zapravo jednako zastupljeni, dijelovi koji se odnose na običan život i kroz koje se s Ivanom gradio osjećajni odnos. Razgovaralo se tako o svakodnevicu: o odnosima s kćeri (i njezinim pubertetskim „mušicama“, zatvaranju u sebe, sklonosti nasilnim igricama na računalu i sl.) i s bivšom suprugom (s kojom se dogovarao oko odgoja kćeri: on ne voli forsirati ni vjersko ni nacionalno), s roditeljima (napetiji odnos s ocem koji je „galamdžija“, impulzivan, hoće da sve bude po njegovom, a malo je nepromišljen, počinje posao bez plana), s prijateljima i kolegama na poslu, o poslovima na poljoprivredi (Ivan je objašnjavao koji su najpovoljniji omjeri sastojaka kod pravljenja kobasica) i sl. Terapeut se povremeno otvarao nekom anegdotom iz svojeg života koja je bila povezana sa zbivanjem u seansi.

Na seansi je terapeut radio s onime što mu je pacijent nudio. U svakoj seansi

seem only at the level of a witticism) the therapist's association regarding Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde that, admittedly, referred to the great-grandfather but also depicted Ivan's inner split into a psychotic and non-psychotic part.

Transference/ countertransference intertwinement

In this therapy, the therapist primarily worked on building a relationship with the patient. This case report presents those parts of the conversations that indicate Ivan's pathology, leaving out a similar quantity of content that referred to everyday life and through which the therapist built an emotional relationship with Ivan. We talked about everyday things: his relationships with his daughter (and her adolescent "whims", isolating herself, predisposition for violent computer games, etc.) and his ex-wife (with whom he talked regarding raising their daughter: he does not like forcing neither religion nor nationalism on his daughter), with parents (the more tense relationship with his father who is a "loudmouth", impulsive, wants everything done his way, and is somewhat hasty, starting a job without a plan), with friends and colleagues at work, about farming work (Ivan explained the best ingredient ratios when making sausages), etc. The therapist occasionally opened up using some anecdote from his own life that was related to the topic under discussion in the session.

terapeut je procjenjivao je li s obzirom na pacijentovo stanje neki sadržaj moguće otvarati ili je bolje pričekati povoljniji trenutak.

U toj terapiji terapeut je u svojem doživljaju prepoznao različite reakcije na Ivana, ugrubo bi se moglo reći: na njegov psihotični, karakterni, neurotični i zdrav dio. Terapeut se intuitivno prilagođavao onom dijelu osobnosti koji je pacijent nudio u situaciji „ovdje i sada“.

Ping-Nie Pao (Ping-Nie Pao, 1983.) uočava da terapeut tijekom razgovora može doživjeti potpunu nesposobnost za emocionalni kontakt ili povremeno prekidanje tog kontakta kad je on već uspostavljen. To je u velikoj mjeri povezano sa stupnjem bolesnikove bolesti i stupnjem anksioznosti koju bolesnik doživljava u tom trenutku. Ping Nie Pao podsjeća na Bionovu teoriju o napadu na vezivanje. Jer, emocionalna (empatijska) veza je bliskost koja je bolesniku opasna, koje se boji i koju mora blokirati, što se događa i kod Ivana (25).

Terapeutova reakcija na Ivanov psihotični dio u početku terapije bila je zbunjenost velikom količinom fragmentiranog i, činilo se na početku, bremenitog značenjem ali, nažalost terapeutu nerazumljivog materijala, a i radoznalost potaknuta neobičnim sadržajem priče. Kasnije tijekom terapije terapeut je vjerojatno u trenucima

During sessions, the therapist worked with what the patient offered. In every session, the therapist assessed whether a given topic could be broached given the patient's condition or whether it was better to wait for a more opportune moment.

In this therapy, the therapist recognized different reactions to Ivan in himself, regarding Ivan's psychotic, personality, neurotic, and healthy parts, roughly put. The therapist intuitively adjusted to the part of the patient's personality that was being offered "here and now".

Ping-Nie Pao (Ping-Nie Pao, 1983) observed that the therapist can experience complete inability for emotional contact or occasional breaks in that contact after it has been established. This is closely related to the stage of the patient's disease and the level of anxiety they are experiencing in that moment. Ping-Nie Pao reminded us of Bion's theory of containing attachment. Emotional (empathetic) connection represents a closeness that is dangerous to the patients and something that they fear and must be blocked, which happened with Ivan (25).

The therapist's reaction to the psychotic part of Ivan's personality was initially confusion as a result of the large amount of fragmented material that initially seemed pregnant with meaning but unintelligible to the therapists, which was accompanied by curiosity engendered by the unusual contents of the story. Later during therapy, the therapist, likely



fuzije s Ivanovim psihotičnim dijelom osjećao da je Ivanova priča potpuno istinita. U tim trenucima terapeutu je „iz prve ruke“ bilo jasno zašto je Ivan svoju priču doživljavao kao jedino istinitu, čvrstu i monolitnu i koju nije potrebno provjeravati. Terapeut je osjećao anksioznost pri doživljaju „uplovljavanja“ u Ivanov psihotični svijet, anksioznost koja je srećom, brzo aktivirala terapeutove zdrave opservirajuće dijelove koji su stvarali odmak od isključivosti fantazijskog svijeta. Tijekom većeg dijela terapije dok je Ivan iznosio stare i nove sadržaje svoje bizarne priče, terapeut nije imao nikakve asocijacije u pogledu tog sadržaja, niti mu je taj sadržaj izazivao bilo kakve druge osjećaje prema Ivanu osim zbunjenosti i radoznalosti. Povremeno je osjećao kao da je nesposoban misliti o Ivanovu psihotičnom sadržaju. Ta nesposobnost trajala je i između seansi (tjedan dana). Tek u razdobljima kada je Ivan morao izostati sa seanse i kad se razdoblje između dviju seansi produljio na dva tjedna, kao da se terapeutu vraćala sposobnost razmišljanja o psihotičnom sadržaju, mogao ga je asocijativno povezivati, prepoznavati Ivanove projekcije i slično. Prije kraja terapije, kad je Ivan iznio još neke dodatne informacije, slika psihotičnog mozaika sve se više popunjavala i terapeut je imao jasniji dojam o Ivanovim projektivnim slikama.

in moments of fusion with Ivan's psychotic aspect, felt that Ivan's story was completely true. In these moments the therapist could feel "first-hand" why Ivan saw his story as the only true, firm, and monolithic one that does not require verification. The therapist experienced anxiety when "sailing into" Ivan's psychotic world in this way, an anxiety that, luckily, quickly activated the therapist's healthy observing parts of the psyche that created a reality-based distance from the exclusivity of the fantasy world. During most of the therapy, while Ivan was bringing up old and new content related to his bizarre story, the therapist had no associations regarding these contents nor did the contents engender any other feelings towards Ivan other than confusion and curiosity. He occasionally felt incapable of thinking about Ivan's psychotic contents. This inability would last even between sessions (one week). It was only in the periods when Ivan had to skip some sessions and the time period between them extended to two weeks that the therapist felt the ability to think about the psychotic contents returning and could associatively link the contents, recognize Ivan's projections, etc. Toward the end of the therapy, Ivan brought up some more information and the picture of the psychotic mosaic progressively filled out, resulting in the therapist having a clearer impression of Ivan's projective images.

Otto Kernberg (Kernberg, 2013) described different manifestations of narcissistic

Otto Kernberg (Kernberg, 2013.) u svojem radu daje prikaz raznih pojava oblika narcističke patologije i terapijski pristup u okviru transferno fokusirane psihoterapije (tijekom koje se analiziraju i situacije u vanjskoj stvarnosti i koje se povezuju s transfernom situacijom) (43). Elemente tog pristupa primjenjivao je terapeut u radu s Ivanom. Ivanov karakterni dio (elemente narcističnog i graničnog poremećaja osobnosti) terapeut je doživio kao oklop oko Ivanove psihotične jezgre jer je Ivan terapiju doživljavao kao narcističku povredu na koju je agresivno reagirao često se ljuteći zašto mora dolaziti na terapiju. Na Ivanovu potrebu da laže i manipulira terapeutom terapeut je reagirao ljutnjom koju je prepoznao, taj tren nije manifestirao, ali ga je nakon nekoliko seansi suočio s tom potrebom.

Reakcija na Ivanov neurotični dio bio je osjećaj da nije vrijeme za otvaranje nekih neurotskih dijelova, npr. edipalnog ili homoerotskog, prije nego se barem pokušaju integrirati bazičniji, psihotični dijelovi.

Reakcija na Ivanov zdravi dio je bila doživljaj Ivana kao tople, brižne osobe koja vodi brigu o svojoj kćeri, roditeljima, invalidnoj teti (koju je nekoliko puta godišnje vozio iz susjedne države i vraćao je natrag i kojoj je pomagao oko preseljenja, tražeći odgovarajući

pathology, as well as a therapy approach within the framework of transference-focused psychotherapy (during which situations in the outside reality are also analyzed and linked with the transference situation) (43). Elements of this approach were used by the therapist in his work with Ivan. Ivan's personality (with elements of narcissistic and borderline personality disorders) were viewed by the therapist as an armor surrounding Ivan's psychotic core, because Ivan perceived therapy as a narcissistic injury to which he reacted with aggression, often expressing anger for having to attend therapy. Ivan's need to lie and manipulate the therapist was met with anger on part of the therapist, which he did not express at the time, but faced that need after a few sessions.

The reaction to Ivan's neurotic part was a feeling that it was not time to open some neurotic elements, e.g. the oedipal or homoerotic, before at least trying to integrate the more basic, psychotic elements.

The therapist's reaction to Ivan's healthy part was an impression of Ivan as a warm, caring person who takes care of his daughter, his parents, his disabled aunt (whom he would drive from a neighboring country and back several times a year and whom he helped when changing homes, looking for an adequate apartment with no barriers for the aunt and her wheelchair), a person who cares about his clients at work and cares for the animals that were part of the house-



stan bez barijera za tetu i njezina kolicca), osobe koja se brine o klijentima na poslu, o životinjama koje ima u domaćinstvu (psu kojeg je jako volio). Nekad se Ivan sjećao djetinjstva i skakanja na sijeno s nekoliko metara visine. Terapeut je imao potrebu graditi odnos sa zdravim dijelom Ivanove osobnosti i povremeno je pričao neke situacije iz svojega svakodnevnog života ili iz djetinjstva. Problematično je bilo to što je Ivan ponekad na te priče reagirao sa svojim psihotičnim, a ne zdravim dijelom.

Neke neodsanjane fantazije

Terapeutov doživljaj Ivanovih priča ostavio je otvorena mnogobrojna pitanja o kojima se nije stiglo razgovarati ni razmišljati. Ivan je sklon zamrznutim slikama i monolitnim sjećanjima koja se ne preispituju, s kojima se ne smije biti zaigran jer nose neku sudbinsku težinu, a krajnji je ulog vlastiti život (prijetnja smrću od strane Jehovinih svjedoka).

Tako su ostala neodsanjana razna pitanja: npr. ako su (po Ivanovu pričanju) muškarac i žena Bog, a Ivan se boji vezivanja je li riječ o prihvaćanju vlastita ženskog dijela? Ili npr. ako neka duša ulazi u tuđa tijela, postoji li prava veza duše i tijela, tj. personalizacija prema Winnicottu, ili je riječ o posljedičnom lažnom *selfu* (u obliku Ivanove pril-

hold (he had a dog who he loved very much). Sometimes Ivan recalled his childhood and jumping onto hay from a height of several meters. The therapist felt a need to build a relationship with the healthy part of Ivan's personality and occasionally related some situations from his everyday life or his childhood. It was problematic that Ivan sometimes reacted to these stories through his psychotic instead of his healthy part.

Some undreamt fantasies

The therapist impression of Ivan's stories left many unanswered questions that there was never time to talk or think about. Ivan was prone to frozen images and monolithic memories that remain unquestioned, with which he cannot afford to be playful because they carry a fateful weight, with his life as the final stake (the death threat by the Jehovah's Witnesses).

Many questions therefore remain undreamt: e.g. if (according to Ivan) a man and woman are God, and Ivan is afraid of commitment, is this an issue of acceptance of his own feminine part? Or if e.g. a soul enters the bodies of others, is there a real connection between body and soul i.e. personalization according to Winnicott or is this a consequent false self (in the form of Ivan's adaptations to his partner i.e. her psychological state, through the sacrifice of his own real self, just so he wouldn't be abandoned by his partner and mother),

godbe partnerici, tj. njezinu psihološkom stanju, uz žrtvovanje svojeg pravog *selfa* samo zato da ga partnerica kao i majka ne bi ostavila) ili je možda riječ o intruziji Isusove (strane) duše u Ivanovo tijelo? Je li licemjernost tajnih sefova i računa u banci Isusovih nasljednika izraz utjecaja sadašnje društvene okoline na Ivana? Zatim, ako snovi (prema Ivanu) govore samo o prošlom životu, znači li da ne možemo odsanjati (prema Bionu) sadašnji život? „Liječi“ li se traumatičnom „realitetnom“ terapijom (bacanje djece u vodu, a zapravo neempatija njegovatelja) njihova uronjenost u fantaziju (omnipotenciju)? Znači li klečanje na „Isusov“ način (gol pred partnericom, uz simulaciju raspeća) da se u odnos sa ženom ulazi s unaprijed određenom pozicijom žrtvovanoga i mučenoga, kao možda nekad u odnosu s majkom? Možemo li s obzirom na kontratransfernu „emocionalnu prazninu“ u pogledu Ivanove psihotične konstrukcije cijelu tu konstrukciju promatrati kao veliki otpor, odnosno zbog terapeutove radoznalosti za tu priču kao otpor „terapijskog polja“ u kojem je terapeut bio jednako zapleten kao i Ivan i iz kojeg se terapeut nije imao snage izvući? Može li se to zvati otpor ili je to, kao u Šeherezadinu slučaju, borba za život jer dovršavanje priče i otvaranje dubljeg psihološkog smisla psihotične konstrukcije znači približavanje Winnicottovu kaosu, Bio-

or is it perhaps an intrusion by Jesus' (foreign) soul into Ivan's body? Is the hypocrisy of the secret safes and bank accounts of Jesus' heirs an expression of the influence of the current social environment on Ivan? Furthermore, if dreams (according to Ivan) only talk about a past life, does that mean (according to Bion) that we cannot dream our current life? Does traumatic "reality" therapy (throwing children into the water, in fact a lack of empathy by the caregiver) "cure" their immersion in fantasy (omnipotence)? Does kneeling like "Jesus" (naked in front of the partner, simulating a crucifixion) mean that one enters a relationship with a woman with a preordained position of a sacrifice and object of torture, as perhaps it once was in the relationship with the mother? Can we, given the "emotional emptiness" of countertransference regarding Ivan's psychotic construction, view this whole construction as a huge manifestation of resistance, i.e., due to the therapists curiosity about the story, as a resistance of the "therapy field" in which the therapist was as entangled as Ivan and out of which the therapist did not have the strength to escape? Can this be called resistance, or is it, as with Scherezade, a struggle to survive because finishing the story and opening the deeper psychological meaning of the psychotic construction means approaching Winnicott's chaos, Bion's "O", and the mother's early insufficiency. Do Ivan's lies in our relationship have a dual meaning: as a survival instinct (the story about the



novu „O“, majčinoj ranoj insuficijenciji. Ima li Ivanovo laganje u našem odnosu dvojak smisao: kao nagon za preživljavanje (priča o pradjedu, tj. psihotična konstrukcija kao obrana od kaotičnog „O“), ali i kao agresivna manipulacija izazivanjem krivnje u terapeutu? Dobičaju li snovi, s obzirom na poremećen doživljaj vremena u psihozi (atemporalnost) i na Ivanovo naknadno uvođenje vremenske dimenzije snova kao i na detaljniji prikaz nekih scena, ipak neku novu simboličku dimenziju, npr. edipalnu (tijelo u zemlji kao penis u majci, trupac kao kažnjavajući očinski penis) i homoerotsku (repovi veprova i blato poput penisa i fecesa)? Bi li se primjerenim razgovorom o tim simboličnim dimenzijama (približno istih) snova možda mogla „oživjeti“ i njihova psihotična „zamrznuta“ razina?

Zanimljivo je, povezano s pričom o Šeherezadi, kako se priča cara Šahrijara podudara s Ivanovom pričom jer je car kojeg je prema legendi žena prevarila s robom (kao što su i Ivana njegove partnerice u njegovu doživljaju varale na razne načine) zamrzio ženski rod (kao što se i Ivan ljutio na Anu, a s drugim ženama nije htio sklapati nove veze) i svake noći spavao s novom djevicom koju bi ujutro ubijao, samo što je u terapiji, kao u nekom kondenziranom snu, Ivan imao ulogu Šeherezade. I tako dalje.

great-grandfather, i.e. a psychotic constriction as a defense from the chaotic “O”), but also as an aggressive manipulation inducing guilt in the therapist? Given the warped experience of time in psychosis (atemporality) and Ivan’s later introduction of the temporal dimension into his dreams and the detailed descriptions of some scenes, do the dreams achieve an additional symbolic dimension after all, for instance oedipal (the body in the ground as a penis in the mother, the roller as a punishing patriarchal penis) or homoerotic (the tails of the boars and the mud as penises and feces)? Would an appropriate conversation on these symbolic dimensions (of nearly the same) dreams “revive” their psychotic, “frozen level”?

Regarding the story of Scherezade, it is interesting how the story of the monarch Shahryar coincides with Ivan’s story, since the monarch’s wife had, according to the legend, cheated on him with a slave (as Ivan was cheated by his partners in various ways in his view), causing the monarch to grow to hate all women (as Ivan was angry at Ana and refused to form new relationships with other women), and would sleep each night with a different virgin who he would kill in the morning, except that in the therapy it was Ivan who held the role of Scherezade. And so on.

The same images in different context provide different meanings that seem unquestionable in psychosis. Even when an opportunity arose for playful association

Iste slike u različitim kontekstima daju različita značenja koja u psihozi kao da se ne smiju preispitivati. Kad bi ponekad i bila prilika za zaigrano asociiranje na slike i fantazije, na scenu stupa „nasljedne Merovinga“ i igra prestaje.

Pokušaj parcijalnog razumijevanja Ivanove psihotične konstrukcije

Dolazak na psihoterapiju u bolnicu (koja je u njegovu kraju još uvijek na „zlu glasu“) Ivan je doživljavao kao narcističnu povredu, kao i bilo kakav psihološki rad na sebi jer je osjećao da problem nije u njemu nego u drugima: bilo da je to bivša partnerica Ana, bilo da su to Jehovini svjedoci koji su mu cijelu njegovu sadašnju priču, prema njegovu doživljaju, dobar dio njegova djetinjstva pričali u fragmentima. Često je bio ljut na terapeuta što mora dolaziti na terapiju kao da je terapeut bio taj koji mu je odredio provođenje terapije. Kasnije se u terapiji otvorio i strah od vezivanja na čiju ćemo se moguću psihodinamičku pozadinu kratko osvrnuti u nastavku. U početku je Ivan donosio puno materijala jer je imao dojam da ga nitko nije slušao, da nitko nije imao vremena čuti njegovu priču do kraja i da je nepravedno optužen. Kasnije je prema otvaranju Ivan bio ambivalentan, tj. predstavljalo mu je neugodu sve to ponovo pričati i ra-

of images and fantasy, the “Merovingian heritage” would appear on the scene and the game would cease.

An attempt to partially understand Ivan’s psychotic construction

Ivan saw coming to the hospital (which still had a “bad reputation” in his community) for psychotherapy sessions as a narcissistic injury, and he viewed any psychological self-improvement in the same way because he felt that the problem was not in him but in others: either Ana, the ex-partner, either the Jehovah’s Witnesses who were telling him this whole story, according to him, in a fragmented manner for a good part of his childhood. He was often angry at the therapist for having to come to therapy, as if the therapist was the one who mandated therapy for him. Later in the therapy he also opened up regarding a fear of attachment, the psychodynamic background of which we will briefly discuss below. Initially, Ivan brought a lot of materials because he was under the impression that no one was listening to him, that no one had taken the time to hear his story to the end, and that he had been unjustly accused. Ivan was subsequently ambivalent about revealing this, i.e. he was embarrassed to talk about all of that again and clarify the details, he wanted to forget the whole story and not deal with it again. On several occasions, he decided to stop coming to the sessions as he felt they were pointless, but he



zjašnjavati detalje, želio je cijelu priču zaboraviti i više se njome ne baviti. Nekoliko puta odlučivao je prekinuti dolaske koji su mu bili besmisleni, ali se svaki put predomislio (nije se želio vraćati na sudsko-psihijatrijski odjel), dok konačno nakon osamnaest mjeseci terapije i vraćanja na posao nije prekinuo terapiju.

Na početku terapije terapeut je osjećao da je suočen s mnoštvom novog, nepoznatog, nepovezanog materijala u kojem se nije snalazio. Slaganje mozaika Ivanovih priča, tj. priča Jehovinih svjedoka trajalo je cijelo vrijeme terapije. Tijekom terapije terapeut postupno doznaje da su Ivan i Ana često čitali knjigu Sveta krv, sveti gral (44 – 46) i da su gledali film Da Vincijev kod, on barem dvaput, i da su o tome često razgovarali.

Osnovne su ideje iz knjige i filma sljedeće: Isus nije bio razapet. Pobjegao je u Francusku gdje je s Marijom Magdalenom imao dijete. Njegovi nasljednici Merovinzi prema jednom autoru bili su vanzemaljci. Lijevo i desno, muško i žensko daju cjelinu. Dokaz loze je DNA testiranje. Postoji obred seksualnog odnosa pred članovima društva.

S vremenom se pokazalo da se šest priča (o Isusu, Merovinzima, Jehovinih svjedocima, Ivanu, Ani, Ivanovu pradjedu) koje su Ivanu navodno pri-

changed his mind every time (he did not want to return to the forensic psychiatry ward) until he discontinued therapy after 18 months when he returned to work.

At the start of the therapy, the therapist felt confronted with a wealth of new, unknown, and fragmented material in which he could not navigate. Piecing together the mosaic of Ivan's stories, i.e. the stories of the Jehovah's Witnesses, lasted throughout the therapy. Over the course of the therapy, the therapist gradually found out that Ivan and Ana often read the book *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail* (44-46) and that they watched the film *The Da Vinci Code*, he at least twice, and often talked about this.

The basic ideas from the book and film are as follows: Jesus was never crucified. He escaped to France where he had a child with Mary Magdalene. His descendants, the Merovingians, were aliens, according to one author. Left and right, male and female, form a whole. DNA testing provides proof of ancestry. There is a ritual involving performing sexual intercourse in front of society members.

In time it became clear that the six stories (about Jesus, the Merovingians, Jehovah's Witnesses, Ivan, Ana, Ivan's great-grandfather) that were allegedly told to Ivan by Jehovah's Witnesses, were intertwined in fragments from session to session. Ivan projected his personality traits and memories into characters from these six stories. It was therefore revealed that Jesus was born

čali Jehovini svjedoci isprepletalo u fragmentima iz seanse u seansu. Ivan je svoje osobine i sjećanja projicirao u likove iz tih šest priča. Tako se doznaje da se Isus rodio u zemlji (naziv mjesta gdje je Ivan rođen asociira na zemlju), da je živio u soli (naziv mjesta gdje je Ivan živio asociira na sol), utapao se u rijeci života (kao što se i Ivan utapao), imao je brata (kao i Ivan), imao je zeleno smeđe oči, manjak petog zuba lijevo dolje, volio je popiti i bio je veseljak, dlijetom se porezao po desnoj ruci, imao je tri žene, partnerica ga je ponižavala, sanjao je veprove – što su sve Ivanove značajke i životne situacije.

Iz svega toga čini se da su Ivanove priče nastale kao kombinacija elemenata fikcije iz knjige i filma zajedno s vlastitim projekcijama koje zbog ograničenog prostora ne možemo sve detaljno opisati.

S obzirom na psihodinamiku mogli bismo reći da je dominantna psihodinamička pozadina Ivanova stanja (osim podjele na psihotični i nepsihotični dio *selfa*) paranoidno-shizoidna, u kojoj je odvajanje od objekta nepodnošljivo za *self* pa svemoćna i progoniteljska majka, kao psihotični dio *selfa*, ostaje sastavni dio Ivanove osobnosti.

U Ivanovim pričama mogu se prepoznati i neke psihodinamički poznate situacije, kao npr. edipalna (viđena

in the earth (the place name of the location that Ivan was born in is associated with earth), that he lived in salt (the place name of the location that Ivan lived in is associated with salt), that he drowned in the river of life (as did Ivan), that he had a brother (like Ivan), that he had green-brown eyes, was missing the second mandibular bicuspid, liked to drink and was a merrymaker, that he cut his right hand on a chisel, that he had three wives, that his partner humiliated him, and that he dreamt of boars – all of these being Ivan's characteristics and life experiences.

All of this indicates that Ivan's stories were created as a combination of fictional elements from the book and film together with his own projections, which we cannot describe in detail herein due to space limitations.

Regarding psychodynamics, it could be said that the dominant psychodynamic background of Ivan's state (other than the psychotic and non-psychotic parts of the self) was paranoid-schizophrenic, where the separation from the object is unbearable to the self, resulting in the omnipotent and dominating mother, as the psychotic part of the self, remains an integral part of Ivan's personality.

Some well-known psychodynamic situations can be recognized in Ivan's stories, such as for instance oedipal (seen through the relationships between Ivan, Ivan's mother, and Ana) or homoerotic. This topic was not broached in thera-



kroz odnose Ivana, Ivanove majke i bivše partnerice Ane) ili homoerotska. Na terapiji se to nije otvaralo jer je težište bilo na postizanju boljeg uvida u psihotični dio osobnosti i na njegovoj integraciji sa zdravim dijelom. Čini se da su Ivana osjetljivost na odvajanje i prekid veze jako potresli i vratili u rane fiksacije i gurnuli u regres u kojem se on prvo „izgubio“ da bi zatim nastala psihotična, onipotentna rekonstrukcija njegova života. To upućuje na neke rane vjerojatno neodgovarajuće odnose s majkom o kojima ne znamo ništa osim da „majka nije imala majčinski osjećaj“, a to se ponavlja i u priči o pradjedovoj majci. Tijekom terapije na ponovljene upite o majci Ivan izjavljuje da se ne sjeća ranih odnosa s majkom ili daje neke uopćene informacije. Prije kraja terapije još se doznaje da je „majka bez glave, radi što joj otac kaže“ u pozadini čega se naslućuje edipalna zavist zbog majčina preferiranja oca, a ne njega.

Rezultati terapije

Tijekom terapije Ivan je povremeno pokazivao neki napredak i bolji uvid nego prije terapije, npr. dopustio je mogućnost da drugi ljudi njegovu priču doživljavaju kao čudnu, povremeno mu nije bilo jasno je li stvarno slušao priče Jehovinih svjedoka, shvaća da su mu odnosi površni, da se boji duboke

py as the focus was on achieving better insights in the psychotic part of his personality and integrating it with the healthy part. It would seem that Ivan was seriously shaken by his oversensitivity to separation and the breakup, causing him to return to early fixations and pushed him into a regress in which he was initially “lost”, followed by a psychotic, omnipotent reconstruction of his life. This indicated early and probably inadequate relationships with his mother that we know nothing about, other than that his “mother lacked maternal feelings”, which also appears in the story about his great-grandfather’s mother. In response to repeated queries about his mother during therapy, Ivan stated that he does not remember his early relationships with his mother or gave generalized information. Towards the end of the therapy, it was revealed that his “mother was headless, doing what father told her”, which hints at oedipal envy at the mother’s preference for the father over him.

Therapy results

During therapy, Ivan occasionally showed some progress and better insights than before therapy, e.g. the allowed for the possibility that other people might view his story as strange, it was sometimes unclear to him whether he really listened to the stories of the Jehovah’s Witnesses, he understood that his relationships were superficial and that he fears deeper relationships, the accepted his propensi-

veze, prihvaća svoju sklonost manipulaciji i intelektualnoj kombinatorici bez provjere u realitetu. Povremeno je iz svojega zdravog dijela komentirao da su sve te priče „čista glupost“ i „ludost“, ali samo trenutak kasnije kad je priča ponovo započinjala, gubio je kritički odmak i distancu. To je nešto poput postojanja dvaju paralelnih svjetova pri čemu su aktivni ili jedan ili drugi u brzim izmjenama ili su aktivni istodobno, ali bez prožimanja i detaljnijeg promišljanja zdravog dijela o bolesnom (47).

Na terapiji se nije stigao prorađivati rani, možda kaotični, odnos sa majkom koja „nije imala majčinski osjećaj“ i koja je, kasnije, mogla biti doživljena kao vještica koja „copra“ i kontrolira svoje dijete ne dajući mu autonomiju (putem simbiotskog i seksualnog vezanja), a nisu se stigla proraditi ni mnoga druga prethodno navedena pitanja.

Kako suzbiti vlastitu radoznalost i dopustiti pacijentu autonomiju u odluci želi li nastaviti psihoterapiju? U situacijama Ivanova nezadovoljstva zbog dolazaka na terapiju (a nakon što je istekao obavezni sudski dio) terapeut je poticao zdravi dio Ivana da preuzme odgovornost za sebe i sam odluči hoće li još dolaziti na terapiju. Time se odmicao od transfernog „vješticeg“ dijela koji ima potpunu vlast nad Ivanom i koji se počinjao pojavljivati u

ty for manipulation and intellectual combinatorics without verification in reality. He would occasionally make a comment stemming from the healthy part of his personality how all those stories were “completely stupid” and “crazy”, but just a moment later he would lose the critical approach and distance when he started the story again. This was akin to the existence of two parallel worlds where one of them is active in rapid changes or they are both active but without intermingling and detailed analysis of the sick part by the healthy part (47).

There was no opportunity during therapy to work through the early, possibly chaotic, relationship with the mother who “had no maternal feelings” and who could later be perceived as a witch who “curses” and controls her child by denying him autonomy (through symbiotic and sexual attachment), nor was there time to work through the various questions posed above.

How does one suppress one's own curiosity and allow the patient the autonomy of choosing whether to continue with the psychotherapy? When Ivan expressed unhappiness about coming to therapy (and after the court-mandated part was complete), the therapist encouraged the healthy part of his personality to take responsibility for himself and decide on his own whether he would continue coming to therapy. This created distance from the transference, “witchy” part that had total control over Ivan and which started to appear in the changed version of Ivan's



promijenjenoj verziji Ivanova sna o šibanju. Terapeut je osjećao da ne može izravnije otvoriti negativan transfer s obzirom na dubinu fantazije i mogući anksiozni potencijal za Ivana.

Terapija je prekinuta zbog Ivanova vraćanja na posao (a zapravo zbog Ivanovih prejakih psiholoških blokada, tj. onipotentnih prijetećih unutarnjih objekata) pa je suštinski dojam da dva dijela osobnosti, psihotični i nepsihotični dio, ostaju u Ivanu egzistirati u paralelnim svjetovima koji se ne prožimaju i ne integriraju. Ostali su neproživljeni cijeli svjetovi nesvjesnih fantazija, mogući odgovori na razna pitanja, prorada i igra značenjima. Vjerojatno je i povremena blokada terapeutove alfa-funkcije (uz Ivanovu obilnu pomoć) znatno pridonijela da Ivanovi skriveni paralelni fantazijski svjetovi i nadalje ostanu takvi.

ZAKLJUČAK

Psihodinamički pristup pacijentima sa psihozom razlikuje se od terapijskog pristupa neurotičnim pacijentima. U početku opisane terapije dominirala je bizarnost i fragmentarnost priče i terapeutova potreba za koherencijom i orijentacijom u priči kao i građenje odnosa s pacijentom uz slušanje (dugo je terapeut samo slušao i tu i tamo ponešto pitao zbog veće jasnoće

dream about whipping. The therapist felt he could not use a more direct way of opening negative transference given the depth of the fantasy and the potential anxiety in Ivan.

The therapy was discontinued due to Ivan's return to work (or rather due to Ivan's overly powerful psychological barriers, e.g. omnipotent threatening inner objects), so the final impression is that these two parts of his personality – the psychotic and non-psychotic part – continue to exist in Ivan as parallel worlds that are not intertwined and integrated. Whole worlds of unconscious fantasies remain unexplored, as well as possible answers to various questions and working through and playing with various meanings. It is likely that the occasional blockage of the therapist's alpha function (with copious assistance from Ivan) significantly contributed to Ivan's hidden, parallel, fantastical worlds continue to remain as such.

CONCLUSION

The psychodynamic approach to patients with psychosis differs from the therapy approach for neurotic patients. The start of this therapy was dominated by the bizarreness and fragmented nature of the patient's story and the therapist's need for coherence and orientation in a story as well as building a relationship with the patient through listening (for a long time, the therapist only lis-

priče), a ponekad i uz dijalog o pacijentovoj svakodnevnici. Tijekom terapije terapeut je svojim intervencijama konfrontirao pacijenta s njegovim psihotičnim dijelom *selfa* (s omnipotencijom, paranoidnošću, konkretizacijom, zamrznutom emocionalnošću) kao i s nekim karakterno problematičnim postupcima.

S vremenom pacijent postiže djelomičan uvid u neka svoja stanja.

Čini se da je rani neodgovarajući odnos s majkom pridonio pacijentovoj krhkoj strukturi s rano srušenom omnipotencijom, strukturi osjetljivoj na razdvajanje i narcističke povrede koje su dovele do regresa, a zatim i do stvaranja psihotične konstrukcije novog realiteta u kojem kontrolirajuća, svemoćna i sadistička majka ne dopušta odvajanje i u kojem pacijent reparatorno ima omnipotentnu božansku, a ne poniženu ulogu.

Terapija je prerano prekinuta pa nije bilo vremena za transfernu proradu ranog odnosa s majkom ni za približiti pacijentu projektivnost njegova sadržaja u navodnim pričama Jehovinih svjedoka, a ni za odsanjati mnoga druga pitanja koja su se pojavila u terapiji i tako povezati emocionalno praznu i obrambeno žilavu psihotičnu konstrukciju sa živim i bolnim osjećajnim svijetom.

tened and asked the occasional question for clarity's sake) and sometimes through dialogue about the patient's everyday life. During therapy, the therapist used his interventions to confront the patients with the psychotic part of his self (the omnipotence, paranoia, concretization, emotional frozenness) as well as some problematic actions related to the patient's personality. In time, the patient achieved partial insight into some of his conditions.

It would seem that an early inadequate relationship with his mother contributed to the patients fragile structure with an early collapse of omnipotence, a structure oversensitive to separation and narcissistic injury, which led to regress and then to the creation of a psychotic construction of a new reality in which a controlling, all-powerful, and sadistic mother does not allow separation and in which the patient has a reparatory omnipotent and divine role, instead of a humiliated one.

The therapy was terminated too early, and there was not enough time for transference analysis of the early relationship with the mother, help the patient understand the projective nature of his contents in the alleged stories of the Jehovah's Witnesses, or, ultimately, to dream on the answers to many other questions that cropped up in therapy and thusly connect the emotionally empty and strongly defensive psychotic construction with the living and painful emotional world.



LITERATURA/LITERATURE

1. Civitarese G. The reversal of thinking: Bion's theory of psychosis. In: Lombardi R, Rinaldi L, Thanopoulos S. ed. *Psychoanalysis of the Psychoses*. London and New York: Routledge, 2019. pp. 187-201.
2. Civitarese G., Ferro A. *A Short Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.
3. Tošić G. A historical overview of psychodynamic understanding of psychosis. *Psihoterapija*. 2019 jan 33(2):192-221.
4. Feldman M. The Value of Uncertainty. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 2017 sep 82(1):51-61.
5. Ghused JF. An Analyst's Uncertainty and Fear. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 2017 sep; 85(4):835-850
6. Schulz CG. An Individualized Psychotherapeutic Approach With the Schizophrenic Patient. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 1975 summer; 1(13):46-69.
7. Schulz CG. Technique with Schizophrenic Patients. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*. 2009 oct; 3(1):105-124.
8. Fromm-Reichmann F. Transference Problems in Schizophrenics. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 1940 june; 91(6): 412-426.
9. Fromm-Reichmann F. Notes on the Development of Treatment of Schizophrenics by Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. *Interpersonal and Biological Processes*. 2016 nov; 11(3):263-273.
10. Fromm Reichmann F. *Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia*. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006 apr; 111(6):410-419
11. Federn P. *Ego psychology and the psychoses*. New York: Basic Books, 1952.
12. Little M. *Psychotic Anxieties and Containment*. London: Jason Aronson, 1990.
13. Maletić A. Problem otpora u psihoterapiji psihoza. *Psihoterapija*. 1974 june; 4(2):225-234.
14. Winnicott DW. *Chaos*. In: Winnicott DW. *Human Nature*. London: Free Association Books, 1988.
15. Freeman Th. *Treating and Studying Schizophrenias*. In: Williams P. ed. *A Language for Psychosis*. London and Philadelphia: Whurr Publishers Ltd. 2001. pp.54-68.
16. Tausk V. On the Origin of the 'Influencing Machine' in Schizophrenia. *Psychoanal. Q.* 1933; 2(3-4):519-56.
17. Klein M. *Porijeklo prijenosa (1952)*. U: *Zavist i zahvalnost*. Zagreb: Naprijed, 1983.
18. Little M. On Delusional Transference (Transference Psychosis) (1958). In: Little M. *Transference Neurosis and Transference Psychosis*. London: Jason Aronson, 1993. pp.81-91.
19. Little M. 'R' – The Analyst's Total Response to His Patient's Needs (1957). In: Little M. *Transference Neurosis and Transference Psychosis*. London: Jason Aronson, 1993. pp.51-80.
20. Searles H. *Transference psychosis in the Psychotherapy of Schizophrenia (1963)*. In: Searles H. *Collected Papers on Schizophrenia and Related Subjects*. Connecticut: IUP, 1999. pp 654-716.
21. Searles H. *Countertransference and Theoretical Model (1975)*. In: Searles H. *Countertransference and Related Subjects*. Madison Connecticut: IUP, 1999. pp.373-379.
22. Abend SM. *Countertransference and Psychoanalytic Technique*. *The psychoanalytic Quarterly*. 2017 nov; 58(3):374-95.
23. Winnicott DW. *Hate in the Countertransference*. In: Winnicott DW. *Collected Papers*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1958. pp.194-203.
24. Little M. *Transference/Countertransference in Post-Therapeutic Self-Analysis (1964)*. In Little M. *Transference Neurosis and transference Psychosis*. Northvale, New Jersey, London: Jason Aronson, 1993. pp.247-263.

25. Ping-Nie Pao. Therapeutic Empathy and the Treatment of Schizophrenia. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*. 2009 oct;3(1):145-167.
26. Volkan VD. *Psychoanalytic Technique Expanded: A Textbook on Psychoanalytic Treatment*. OA Publishing: Istanbul,2010.
27. Sullivan HS. The Modified Psychoanalytic Treatment of Schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2006 apr; 88(3):519-540.
28. Rosenfeld H. On the Treatment of Psychotic States by Psychoanalysis:An Historical Approach. In: Buckley P. ed. *Essential Papers on Psychosis*. New York:NYU,1988. pp.147-176.
29. Ferro A. Dream model of the mind. In: Ferro A. ed. *Contemporary Bionian Theory and Technique in Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2018. pp.114-148.
30. Ferro A. *The New Analyst Guide to The Galaxy*. London: Karnac books, 2017.
31. Neri C. The enlarged notion of field in psychoanalysis. In: Ferro A, Basile R. ed. *The Analytic Field*. London: Karnac Books,2009.pp.45-80.
32. Foresti G. Psychoanalytic interpretation and clinical dialogue. In: Ferro A. *Contemporary Bionian Theory and Technique in Psychoanalysis*. London and New York:Routledge,2018.pp78-113.
33. Civitarese G. Spectres of Transference. In: Ferro A. ed. *Contemporary Bionian Theory and Technique in Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge:2018.pp.44-77.
34. Ogden T. Reverie and metaphor. Some thoughts on how I work as a psychoanalyst. *Int J Psychoanal*. 1997. 78 (Pt 4):719-32.
35. Mazzacane F. Paranoias. In: Ferro A ed. *Psychoanalytic Practice Today*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.pp.109-131.
36. Manica M. Psychosis. Listening to psychosis in a state of profound ignorance. In: Ferro A ed. *Psychoanalytic Practice Today*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.pp.132-160.
37. Ferro A. Abandonment. In: Ferro A ed. *Psychoanalytic Practice Today*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.pp.163-167.
38. Civitarese G. Rage and shame. In: Ferro A ed. *Psychoanalytic Practice Today*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.pp.185-204.
39. Pietrantonio V. Borderline. In: Ferro A ed. *Psychoanalytic Practice Today*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.pp.85-108.
40. Cappelletti P, De Masi F. The Meaning of Dreams in the Psychotic State: Theoretical Considerations and Clinical Applications. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 2001 Oct;82(Pt5):993-52.
41. Mack EJ. Dreams and psychosis. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc*. 1969. 17(1):206-221.
42. De Masi F. *A Psychoanalytic Approach to Psychosis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2020.
43. Kernberg O. An overview of the treatment of severe narcissistic pathology. *Int J Psychoanal*. 2014 june; 95(5):865-888.
44. Baigent M, Leigh R, Lincoln H. *Sveta krv, Sveti gral*. Zagreb: Stari grad, 1977.
45. Dan Brown. *Da Vincijev kod*. Zagreb: VBZ, 2016.
46. Cohen M. The Da Vinci Code Dynamically De-Coded. *Journal of The American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry*. 2005 winter; 33(4):729-740.
47. De Masi F. On the nature of intuitive and delusional thought: Its implications in clinical work with psychotic patients. *Int.J Psychoanalysis*. 2008 june; 84(5):1149-1169.