



THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DREAMS

Bridging Clinical and Extraclinical
Research in Psychoanalysis

Edited by

Peter Fonagy, Horst Kächele,
Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber,
and David Taylor

ROUTLEDGE


THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DREAMS

Developments in Psychoanalysis Series

Series Editors: Peter Fonagy, Mary Target, and Liz Allison

Other titles in the series:

Developmental Science and Psychoanalysis: Integration and Innovation

Edited by Linda Mayes, Peter Fonagy and Mary Target

Mentalizing in Child Therapy: Guidelines for Clinical Practitioners

Edited by Annelies J. E. Verheugt-Pleiter, Jolien Zevalkink
and Marcel G. J. Schmeets

*Taboo or not Taboo? Forbidden Thoughts, Forbidden Acts in Psychoanalysis
and Psychotherapy*

Edited by Brent Willock, Rebecca C. Curtis and Lori C. Bohm

*Destructiveness, Intersubjectivity, and Trauma: The Identity Crisis of Modern
Psychoanalysis*

Werner Bohleber

*Early Development and its Disturbances: Clinical, Conceptual, and Empirical
Research on ADHD and other Psychopathologies and its Epistemological
Reflections*

Edited by Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, Jorge Canestri and Mary Target

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DREAMS

Bridging Clinical and
Extraclinical Research
in Psychoanalysis

Edited by

*Peter Fonagy, Horst Kächele,
Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber,
and David Taylor*



Routledge

Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2012 by Karnac Books Ltd.

Published 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2012 to Peter Fonagy, Horst Kächele, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, and David Taylor for the edited collection, and to the individual authors for their contributions.

The rights of the contributors to be identified as the authors of this work have been asserted in accordance with §§ 77 and 78 of the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A C.I.P. for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-13: 9781780490502 (pbk)

Typeset by Vikatan Publishing Solutions (P) Ltd., Chennai, India

CONTENTS

<i>ABOUT THE EDITORS AND CONTRIBUTORS</i>	ix
<i>SERIES EDITORS' PREFACE</i>	xvi
<i>FOREWORD</i> <i>Anne-Marie Sandler</i>	xx
<i>INTRODUCTION</i> <i>Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber and Peter Fonagy</i>	xxii
 PART I: CLINICAL RESEARCH ON DREAMS	
 CHAPTER ONE	
The re-awakening of psychoanalytic theories of dreams and dreaming <i>David Taylor</i>	3
 CHAPTER TWO	
Dreams and play in child analysis today <i>Margaret Rustin</i>	17

CHAPTER THREE

- The manifest dream *is* the real dream: the changing
relationship between theory and practice in the
interpretation of dreams 31
Juan Pablo Jiménez

CHAPTER FOUR

- Changes in dreams—from a psychoanalysis
with a traumatised, chronic depressed patient 49
Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber

PART II: EXTRACLINICAL RESEARCH ON DREAMS

CHAPTER FIVE

- Dreams as subject of psychoanalytical
treatment research 89
Horst Kächele

CHAPTER SIX

- The work at the gate—discussion of the papers
of Juan Pablo Jimenez and Horst Kächele 101
Rudi Vermote

PART III: CONCEPTUAL INTEGRATIONS

CHAPTER SEVEN

- When theories touch: an attempted integration
and reformulation of dream theory 109
Steven J. Ellman and Lissa Weinstein

CHAPTER EIGHT

- “It’s only a dream”: physiological and
developmental contributions to the feeling of reality 126
Lissa Weinstein and Steven J. Ellman

CHAPTER NINE

- Discussion of Steven J. Ellman’s and Lissa Weinstein’s chapters 147
Peter Fonagy

PART IV: CLINICAL AND EXTRACLINICAL
RESEARCH IN ONGOING PROJECTS
AND DREAMS IN MODERN LITERATURE

CHAPTER TEN

- Changes in dreams of chronic depressed patients:
the Frankfurt fMRI/EEG study (FRED) 157
*Tamara Fischmann, Michael Russ, Tobias Baehr,
Aglaja Stirn, and Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber*

CHAPTER ELEVEN

- Traumatic dreams: symbolisation gone astray 182
*Sverre Varvin, Tamara Fischmann, Vladimir Jovic,
Bent Rosenbaum, and Stephan Hau*

CHAPTER TWELVE

- Communicative functions of dream telling 212
Hanspeter Mathys

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

- ADHD—illness or symptomatic indicator for trauma? A case
study from the therapy comparison study on hyperactive
children at the Sigmund Freud Institute, Frankfurt 228
Katrin Luise Laezer, Birgit Gaertner, and Emil Branik

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

- No intermediate space for dreaming? 245
Findings of the EVA study with children at risk
*Nicole Pfenning-Meerkoetter, Katrin Luise Laezer, Brigitte Schiller,
Lorena Katharina Hartmann, and Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber*

PART V: DREAMS IN MODERN LITERATURE

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

- Orders of the imaginary—Freud's *The Interpretation
of Dreams* and the literature of classical modernity 271
Peter-André Alt

- INDEX 288



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

ABOUT THE EDITORS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Peter-André Alt studied German language and literature, political science, history, and philosophy at the Freie Universität Berlin. He earned his doctorate in 1984 and completed the habilitation process in 1993. Since 1995, Alt has been a full professor of German language and literature, first at Ruhr-Universität Bochum (1995–2002), then at the University of Würzburg (2002–2005), and since 2005 at Freie Universität Berlin. Alt has published sixteen books on German literature of the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, including works on literary allegory and hermeticism in the early modern period, the literary and cultural history of dreams, the Enlightenment, the aesthetics of evil, psychoanalysis and literature, Friedrich Schiller, and Franz Kafka. His publication record also comprises ninety articles in international journals and numerous essays for German newspapers (among them *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* and *Süddeutsche Zeitung*). From 2007 to 2009, Alt served as the dean of the Department of Philosophy and Humanities, and from 2007 to 2010 he was a member of the Academic Senate, of Freie Universität. He was the spokesperson of the Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School of Literary Studies from 2007 until 2010, and has been the director of the Dahlem Research School since 2008. On May 12, 2010, Alt was elected the seventh president of Freie Universität.

Tobias Baehr is a clinical psychologist at Fachklinik Hofheim, Germany, a clinic for psychiatry and the treatment of psychosomatic disorders. He is a former scientific researcher at the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main. He has contributed to publications on interdisciplinary research in questionnaire validation, sleep and dream research, as well as imaging technique studies in neurosciences.

Emil Branik, M.D. is a consultant in the psychiatry and psychotherapy of children, adolescents, and adults; a psychoanalyst (DGPT); and director of the department for child and adolescent psychiatry and psychotherapy, Asklepios Klinik Harburg, Hamburg, Germany. He is the author of numerous publications on various topics within the fields of clinical psychiatry and psychotherapy of children, adolescents, and adults as well as psychosomatics, especially issues of inpatient psychotherapy and psychic consequences of migration and the Holocaust.

Steven Ellman was professor in the Graduate School of City University of New York (CUNY) where he was director of the PhD program in clinical psychology. He is now, after thirty years as a professor at CUNY, professor emeritus. He has published more than seventy papers in psychoanalysis, sleep and dreams, and the neurophysiology of motivation. He has published several books including *Freud's Technique Papers: A Contemporary Perspective* (Karnac, 2002) and *When Theories Touch: A Historical and Theoretical Integration of Psychoanalytic Thought* (Karnac, 2010). He has been president of IPTAR twice, program chair, and he is a training and supervising analyst at IPTAR. He is also clinical professor at New York University's post-doctoral program in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. He was the first president of the Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies (CIPS). CIPS is the national professional organisation of the independent International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) societies of the United States. He is a member of the IPA and was previously on its executive council.

Tamara Fischmann, Priv.-Doz. Dr. rer. med., and psychoanalyst (DPV/IPA), is a staff member and scientific researcher at the Sigmund-Freud-Institut Frankfurt am Main, where she is chief methodologist in psychoanalytic empirical research, specialising in dream research. Her publications include those on interdisciplinary research in bioethics, dream research, attachment and ADHD, as well as imaging technique studies in neurosciences.

Peter Fonagy, Ph.D., FBA, is Freud Memorial Professor of Psychoanalysis and Head of the Research Department of Clinical, Educational, and Health Psychology at University College London. He is Chief Executive of the Anna Freud Centre, London. He is director of UCL Partners Mental Health Programme and is National Clinical Lead on the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies for Children and Young People. He is consultant to the Child and Family Program at the Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas. He holds visiting professorships at the Child Study Center, Yale University and at McLean Hospital, Harvard University. He is on the editorial board of twenty-five journals and currently chairs the research board of the International Psychoanalytical Association. He is a clinical psychologist and a training and supervising analyst in the British Psychoanalytical Society in child and adult analysis.

Birgit Gaertner, Ph.D., is a psychologist and psychoanalyst (DPV/IPA). She is professor of psychoanalytical psychology at the University for Applied Sciences, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Her research activities are in the field of early prevention, psychodynamics of pregnancy and early mother-child interaction, and clinical typology of children with ADHD symptoms.

Lorena Katharina Hartmann, DipPsych, is a staff member at the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main, Germany and Ph.D. student with the research interests of attachment and mentalisation.

Stephan Hau is professor in clinical psychology, Department of Psychology, Stockholm University. He is a psychoanalyst in private practice. From 1990 to 2004 he was a member of the research staff of the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. His special areas of research interest include experimental dream research, psychotherapy research, social psychology, and mass group behaviour.

Juan Pablo Jiménez is professor of psychiatry and director of the Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health East at University of Chile (Santiago), and visiting professor at University College London. He is a training and supervising analyst in the Chilean Psychoanalytical Association. He has held a number of important positions, including president of the Chilean Psychoanalytical Association (1994–1998), member of the House of Delegates of the International Psychoanalytic

Association (IPA) and representative at the Council (1994–1996), and president of the Latin-American Psychoanalytic Federation, FEPAL (2007–2008). He is a member of the International Research Board and of the Conceptual Integration Committee of the IPA. His research interests centre on issues of clinical epistemology and integration between clinical psychoanalysis and empirical research.

Vladimir Jović, MD, Ph.D., is a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst in private practice in Belgrade, assistant professor at the School of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Pristina in Kosovska Mitrovica, and a consultant at the Centre for Rehabilitation of Torture Victims of International Aid Network in Belgrade, Serbia.

Horst Kächele is the former director of the University Clinic for Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy at Ulm University, Germany (1990–2000), also former director of the Research Centre for Psychotherapy, Stuttgart (1988–2004); he teaches now at the International Psychoanalytic University in Berlin. He is a training analyst of the German Psychoanalytic Association and a member of the Society for Psychotherapy Research. For more details see his homepage: www.horstkaechele.de

Katrin Luise Laezer, Ph.D., is currently completing her post-doctorate thesis in psychoanalytical psychology at the University of Kassel, Germany. She works as a lecturer and research assistant at the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main. Her research interests focus on early development and maltreatment of children, prevention, attachment, ADHD, and ODD. She is in psychoanalytic training at the Frankfurt Psychoanalytical Institute.

Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber is professor of psychoanalytical psychology at the University of Kassel, Germany, and director of the Sigmund-Freud Institut, Frankfurt am Main. She is a training analyst of the Germany Psychoanalytical Association and a member of the Swiss Psychoanalytical Society. She is Vice-Chair of the Research Board of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), chair of the research committee of the German Psychoanalytical Association (DPV), visiting professor at University College London, and member of the “Action Group” of the Society for Neuropsychoanalysis. Her research topics include clinical and extraclinical research in psychoanalysis, developmental psychoanalysis, and early prevention, dialogue between psychoanalysis and the neurosciences, and contemporary German literature.

Hanspeter Mathys, D.Phil., studied clinical psychology, psychopathology, and theology at the University of Zurich. He is a clinical psychologist at several psychiatric hospitals in Switzerland and a senior researcher at the Department of Clinical Psychology, Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis, University of Zurich with a research focus on dream communication. He is in private psychoanalytic practice in Zurich.

Nicole Pfenning-Meerkoetter is a clinical psychologist, working as a researcher at the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main, Germany. She is completing her PhD thesis on the conditions of knowledge production in current psychoanalytic research. Since 2005 she has been in psychoanalytic training (German Psychoanalytical Association). Her research interests focus on attachment, therapy effectiveness studies, and depression.

Bent Rosenbaum is a specialist in psychiatry, M.D. sci., associate clinical research professor, University of Copenhagen Faculty of Health Sciences, and professor, Institute of Psychology, University of Copenhagen. He is a psychoanalyst in private practice and training analyst in the Danish Psychoanalytic Society. He was president of the Danish Psychoanalytic Society (2004–2011) and is currently chair of the programme committee and the research committee. He is European chair of the IPA New Group Committee and was president of the Danish Psychiatric Society from 1998 to 2000. His special areas of research interest include psychoanalytic psychotherapy for people with psychosis and psychoanalysis of personality disorders; general and developmental psychopathology; trauma; suicidology; group analysis; and semiotics.

Michael Russ Dr. rer. med., is a clinical neuropsychologist. His fields of professional experience and research are cognitive neurology, neuropsychology, and fMRI. He is affiliated to the Sigmund-Freud-Institut, Frankfurt am Main, Germany as a scientist conducting the fMRI investigations of the LAC depression study.

Margaret Rustin is a consultant child and adolescent psychotherapist at the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, and was head of child psychotherapy 1985–2007. She is an honorary associate of the Institute of Psychoanalysis, London. She has lectured and written widely on child psychotherapy theory and practice and on teaching psychoanalysis. She has jointly edited *Closely Observed Infants* (Duckworth, 1989), *Psychotic States in Children* (Karnac, 1997), *Assessment*

in *Child Psychotherapy* (Karnac, 1999), and *Work Discussion: Learning from Reflective Practice in Work with Children and Families* (Karnac, 2008); and is joint author with Michael Rustin of *Narratives of Love and Loss* (Verso, 1987) and *Mirror to Nature: Drama Psychoanalysis and Society* (Karnac, 2003). She has a private practice in London.

Brigitte Schiller is a child and adolescent psychotherapist, member of the training board, and head of the outpatient department of the Institute for Analytic Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy in Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

Aglaia Stirn, Priv. Doz. Dr. med., is head physician of the clinic for psychosomatic medicine and psychotherapy in Hamburg-West, in Germany. She is a staff member at the Frankfurt am Main university hospital's clinic for psychiatry, psychosomatics and psychotherapy. She is a specialist in psychotherapeutic medicine, psychotherapist, psychoanalyst, group analyst, and sexual therapist. Her publications include those about eating disorders, body modification, Buddhist art, and north-east India, as well as imaging technique studies in neurosciences.

David Taylor is a training and supervising analyst of the British Psychoanalytical Society. He is chair of the International Psychoanalytical Association's Clinical Research Sub-Committee. Currently he is the clinical director of the Tavistock's long-term research study evaluating the benefits of psychoanalytic psychotherapy in the treatment of chronic and refractory depression (TADS). Previously, he was a consultant psychotherapist and head of unit in the Adult Department of the Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust where he was also the medical director from 2000–2005. Publications include the book *Talking Cure* which he edited to accompany a BBC TV series about the Tavistock, along with papers on topics such as depression, dreams, psychotic parts of the personality, and the nature of psychic conflict. He has been an invited lecturer and supervisor in Australia, Brazil, India, USA, and Taiwan, as well as regularly supervising and teaching in Heidelberg and Vienna as well as in other European centres.

Sverre Varvin, M.D., Dr Philos, is a training and supervising analyst and Norwegian Psychoanalytic Society senior researcher at the Norwegian centre for studies on violence and traumatic stress, affiliated to the University of Oslo. His main research areas are traumatisation and

treatment of traumatised patients, treatment process, traumatic dreams, and psychoanalytic training. He has held several positions in the IPA, including vice-president and board representative. Presently, he is chair of the programme committee for the next IPAC in Prague and member of the China Committee.

Rudi Vermote is a practising psychoanalyst and full member of the IPA. He is professor of psychiatry at the Departments of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Sexual and Familial Sciences at the Catholic University Leuven (KUL), Belgium. He is the director of postgraduate training of psychoanalytic psychotherapy and of the unit for hospitalisation-based psychotherapy, in-patient and day treatment, at the University Psychiatric Centre of the KUL, Campus Kortenberg. His empirical research is about process outcome in the treatment of personality disorders. He has lectured and published on the concepts of Bion on psychic change. He is currently the president of the Belgian Society of Psychoanalysis. He is a member of the editorial board of *Tijdschrift voor Psychiatrie* (the Belgian-Dutch Journal of Psychiatry) and of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. He has been an active member of the European Psychoanalytical Federation (EPF) Working Party on Initiating Psychoanalysis for ten years.

Lissa Weinstein is an associate professor in the Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology at the City University of New York and a graduate of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Her interests include the interrelationship of neurobiology and psychoanalysis, sleep and dreams, as well as film and literature studies. She is the winner of several awards, among them the Heinz Hartmann Jr. Award along with Dr Arnold Wilson for outstanding publication in the theory or practice of psychoanalysis, for their papers on the relevance of the work of Lev Vygotsky to psychoanalysis, and the Margaret Marek award from the International Dyslexia Association for her book *Reading David: A Mother and Son's Journey through the Labyrinth of Dyslexia*. Her current research centres on the role of repetition in the psychoanalytic process and in the overcoming of traumatic states. Her film papers have appeared in *Projections*, *Projected Shadows*, and *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*. A story entitled "A Dimension of More than Sight and Sound" recently appeared in *Fiction*.

SERIES EDITORS' PREFACE

After the first hundred years of its history, psychoanalysis has matured into a serious, independent intellectual tradition, which has notably retained its capacity to challenge established truths in most areas of our culture. Above all, psychoanalytic ideas have given rise to an approach to the treatment of mental disorders and character problems, psychodynamic psychotherapy, which has become a thriving tradition in most countries, at least in the Western world. With an ever-expanding evidence base, founded on randomised controlled trials as well as investigations of brain function, psychodynamic psychotherapy can aspire to legitimacy in the world of science, yet retains a unique perspective on human subjectivity which continues to justify its place in the world of humanities and all spheres where human culture is systematically studied.

The biological psychiatrist of today is called to task by psychoanalysis, as much as was the specialist in nervous diseases of Freud's time, in turn of the century Vienna. Today's cultural commentators, whether for or against psychoanalytic ideas, are obliged to pay attention to considerations of unconscious motivation, defences, the formative impact of early childhood experience, and the myriad other discoveries which psychoanalysts brought to twentieth century culture. Twenty-first

century thought implicitly incorporates much of what was discovered by psychoanalysis in the last century. Critics who try to pick holes in or even demolish the psychoanalytic edifice are often doing this from ramparts constructed on psychoanalytic foundations. A good example of this would be the recent attacks by some cognitive behaviour therapists upon psychodynamic approaches. Vehement as these are, the critics have to give credit to psychoanalysis for its contribution to cognitive therapeutic theory and technique. These authors point to the advances they have made in relation to classical ideas, but rarely acknowledge that the psychodynamic approach has also advanced. An unfortunate feature of such debates is that often attacks on psychoanalysis are addressed to where the discipline was fifty or even seventy-five years ago.

Both the epistemology and the conceptual and clinical claims of psychoanalysis are often passionately disputed. We see this as a sign that psychoanalysis may be unique in its capacity to challenge and provoke. Why should this be? Psychoanalysis is unrivalled in the depth of its questioning of human motivation, and whether its answers are right or wrong, the epistemology of psychoanalysis allows it to confront the most difficult problems of human experience. When else is the motivation of both victim and perpetrator of sexual abuse going to be simultaneously considered? What other discipline will take the subjectivity of a newborn, or in fact, an in-utero infant as a serious topic for study? The discipline, which has found meaning in dreams, continues to search for understanding in relation to acts of the greatest humanity and inhumanity. It remains committed to attempting to understand the most subtle aspects of the intersubjective interplay that can occur between two individuals, one struggling to overcome the barriers that another has elected to create in the path of their own progress through the world. Paradoxically, our new understanding of the physical basis of our existence—our genes, nervous systems, and endocrine functioning—rather than finally displacing psychoanalysis, has created a pressing need for a complementary discipline which considers the memories, desires, and meanings which are beginning to be recognised as influencing human adaptation even at the biological level. How else, other than through the study of subjective experience, will we understand the expression of the individual's biological destiny, within the social environment?

It is not surprising, then, that psychoanalysis continues to attract some of the liveliest intellects in our culture. These individuals are by

no means all psychoanalytic clinicians, or psychotherapists. They are distinguished scholars in an almost bewildering range of disciplines, from the study of mental disorders with their biological determinants to the disciplines of literature, art, philosophy, and history. There will always be a need to explicate the meaning of experience. Psychoanalysis, with its commitment to understanding subjectivity, is in a leading position to fulfil this intellectual destiny. We are not surprised at the upsurge of interest in psychoanalytic studies in universities in many countries, which is driven by the limitations of understanding that modern science, including modern social science, all too often provides. The books in this series will aim to address the same intellectual curiosity that has made these educational projects so successful. The courageous accounts of psychoanalysts meet a fundamental human need for discovering the meaning behind actions, and meet this need head on. While some may consider psychoanalytic accounts speculative, we must not forget that in relation to many descriptions of action, feeling, and cognition, the explorations of psychoanalysis based in the consulting room have proved to be profound and readily generalisable. No one now doubts the reality of childhood sexuality, no one believes the conscious mind, in any sense, to represent the boundaries of subjectivity. Non-conscious conflict, defence, the mental structures that encode the quality of early relationships into later interpersonal functioning, and the motivation to become attached and to look after others, represent early psychoanalytic discoveries that have become an inalienable part of twenty-first century culture.

The theme of our series is a focus on advances in psychoanalysis—hence our series title “Developments in Psychoanalysis”. In our view, while psychoanalysis has a glorious and rich history, it also has an exciting future, with dramatic changes and shifts as our understanding of the mind is informed by scientific, philosophical, and literary enquiry. Our commitment is to no specific orientation, to no particular professional group, but to the intellectual challenge to explore questions of meaning and interpretation systematically, and in a scholarly way. Nevertheless, we would be glad if this series particularly spoke to the psychotherapeutic community, to those individuals who use their own minds and humanity to help others in distress.

In this series we are aiming to communicate some of the intellectual excitement which we feel about the past, present, and future of psychoanalytic ideas, and which we enjoy seeing in our students each

year. We hope that our work with the authors and editors in the series will help to make these ideas accessible to an even larger group of students, scholars, and practitioners worldwide.

Peter Fonagy, Mary Target, and Liz Allison
University College London

FOREWORD

It is with great pleasure that I have accepted to write a few words to introduce this rich and stimulating book. The core of this volume is based on the presentations and discussions of papers given during the 12th Joseph Sandler Research Conference which was dedicated to the topic of "The Significance of Dreams: Bridging Clinical and Extraclinical Research in Psychoanalysis".

The Joseph Sandler Research Conference has taken place in London for a number of years, but has since 2008, thanks to the support of the Sigmund Freud Institute and the dedication of Professor Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, most successfully been organised in Frankfurt. When Joseph Sandler became Freud Memorial Professor in 1984 at University College London, he wanted to counteract what he felt was a tendency among psychoanalysts to be inward looking. He had observed that psychoanalysts who dedicated most of their working time to clinical work and had thus amassed a great deal of clinical knowledge felt naturally tempted to share and discuss clinical and conceptual ideas with like-minded colleagues. This certainly was the source of a great deal of rich development of ideas within psychoanalysis but tended to ignore the work of certain psychoanalytic colleagues who were doing research in institutions, and of experimental psychologists,

and neurobiologists who researched and questioned certain facets of psychoanalytic theory. In an attempt to correct this tendency, Joseph Sandler organised regular international meetings on various central psychoanalytic topics, inviting psychoanalytic practitioners and clinicians as well as more academic researchers to share and discuss some of their new ideas. He tried to have research papers discussed by psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic presentations, both conceptual and clinical, discussed by researchers. This new approach was not always easy to organise but was met with enthusiasm, opening the door to psychoanalysis to a wider audience. A year after his untimely death, Peter Fonagy, with the support of the International Psychoanalytical Association, founded the Joseph Sandler Research Conference, which has been taking place every year on the first weekend in March.

In the last decade, some of the particularly successful conferences became the basis for a publication. This last book on the significance of dreams is particularly timely as it discusses and illustrates some of the important new understandings and changes in the conceptualisation, use, and interpretations of dreams. I would like here to express my gratitude to Peter Fonagy, David Taylor, Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber, and Horst Kächele for agreeing to be the editors of this volume, and extend also my warm thanks to the Sigmund Freud Institute and the IPA who, each in their own ways, have importantly supported the publication of this book.

Anne-Marie Sandler

INTRODUCTION

Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber and Peter Fonagy

Long before Sigmund Freud wrote *The Interpretation of Dreams*, people listened to and tried to understand their dreams, taking them as prophetic signs from the gods, or as expressions of severe inner conflicts. In the Bible, the prisoner Joseph, a dreamer and oneiromancer, was asked to interpret the pharaoh's strange dream of the seven lean and the seven fat cows. Through the dream, said Joseph, "God hath shewed Pharaoh what he is about to do" (*Genesis* 41:25). In *Hamlet*, the young prince suggests that dreams have the power to disrupt complacency: "I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams" (*Hamlet* 2.2.234).

Dreams are also a recurrent subject of paintings as the cover of this book with a reproduction of "Nightmare" by the Swiss painter Johann Heinrich Füssli illustrates. "Nightmare" is the most famous of his paintings and exists in different versions, all painted around 1781.

Do current psychoanalytical treatments still consider dream interpretation to be a *via regia* to knowledge of the unconscious?

Some remarks on clinical research on dreams in psychoanalysis

Artists seem to have known for centuries that the capacity to dream and to remember dreams is part of human creativity and problem solving, and thus of psychic health. Someone who cannot remember his own dreams misses a major possibility to be in dialogue with his unconscious and thus with his mind's attempts to find symbolic and creative solutions for unsolved problems of the present and past. In this context, Bohleber (2011) talks about the "creative unconscious".

Excessive restriction of psychic or physical freedom can cause individuals to lose their ability to dream. In turn, the institutions or societies to which these people belong lose their capacities for innovation and creative problem solving. This has serious consequences, particularly in the realm of education, but also for psychic and physical health more generally. This volume will therefore be of interest not only to psychoanalysts and psychotherapists, but also to educators, educational and social scientists, as well as people interested in individual and cultural creativity.

Such insights have been mainly developed through psychoanalytic clinical research. As one very successful manager reported during an interview from the large follow-up study of the German Psychoanalytical Association in the 1990s:

The most important result of my long psychoanalysis is that I am in a constant dialogue with my unconscious mind which gives me an inner orientation, a feeling of "being on earth", to be myself. If I am not able to remember my dreams for a longer period of time, e.g., then I realize that I have to step back in order not to lose myself. It will have severe consequences for me if I deny that my psyche and my mind need some inner space in order to express themselves in my dreams and my fantasies. If I neglect this I am losing my creativity and the basic feeling that I am living my own life in spite of all the challenges, which I have to deal with in my everyday job. If I don't take care of this I finally get sick—then something has been simply too much (Patient ZA, see Leuzinger-Bohleber, Rüger, Stühr & Beutel, 2002, p. 92).

This is just one among myriad examples. In the space of this introduction, we cannot give an overview of the huge clinical psychoanalytical

literature on dreams. Over 19,000 articles in the Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing archive make reference to dreams, a citation pattern that intriguingly has remained more or less unchanged over the history of psychoanalysis.

In order to give readers an insight into current clinical discourse on dreams, we take four papers that were presented on 5 August 2011 during the keynote panel on dreams at the 47th Congress of the International Psychoanalytical Association, held in Mexico City. The papers are by Elias Mallet da Rocha Barros (São Paulo), Luis J. Martín Cabré (Madrid), Harold P. Blum (New York), and Fred Pine (New York). (Versions of these papers were also published before the conference in the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 2011, volume 92.) These papers are illustrations of a number of threads running through current clinical theory about dreams: (1) dreams are a pre-symbolic transitional stage in thought fulfilling a key function in the patient's processing of emotional material, particularly of an overwhelming or traumatic kind; (2) dreams are key to a comprehensive understanding of the patient's unconscious attitudes and preconscious thoughts, particularly in relation to the clinical situation; (3) dreams on the couch are part of a complex pattern of communication established between patient and analyst over a considerable period charged with the burden of carrying content concerning all aspects of transference and countertransference communication. These points have been part of clinical analytic discourse for decades, and these recent examples show that they remain topical issues. After reviewing these central concerns we then outline some other focuses of the current psychoanalytic discourse on dreams.

Clinically, all the speakers, perhaps representing modern psychoanalysis, seemed to agree that dream interpretation was still one important "via regia", as Freud had seen it, to knowledge of the unconscious. At the same time, they all emphasised that psychoanalysts use dreams in their treatments to gain insights not only into unconscious wishes (which were the focus of Freud's interpretations), but also into the characteristics of primary object relations, into traumas, and into other features of mental life.

Dreams give clinical access to the primary process, i.e., to psychic processes that are not yet mentalised, and have not yet started to be experienced as mental rather than physical or perceptual phenomena. For most contemporary psychoanalysts, dreams therefore provide a rare opportunity to access unconscious and preconscious

fantasies and thinking. Da Rocha Barros compared dreams with a “private theatre” in which “meaning is generated and transformed”:

The dreams of our patients can be viewed as playing the part of a playwright who brings to light a very private theatre of the patient’s psychic reality and shows the way in which it has come into being and has been transformed since early childhood [The] psychical working out function performed by dreams is a form of unconscious thinking which transforms affects into memories and mental structures. It also comprehends a process through which meaning is apprehended, built and transformed. (Da Rocha Barros, 2011, p. 270).

In other words, underscoring the first clinical function we listed above, dreams may serve to metabolise emotional life and are connected to the capacity to mentalise, to create an internal world, a subjectivity (Fonagy, 2007).

For Martín Cabré (2011), beyond the construction of subjectivity, dreams had a twofold importance in clinical work. First, they are an incomparable source of information on the affects prevailing in the analytic space. They can therefore serve as an indispensable aid to the work of construction. Second, they reactivate and can symbolise emotions stemming from sometimes traumatic experiences which are stored in implicit memory and date back to the earliest periods of relational life and to a phase of presymbolic, preverbal mental functioning. They therefore open avenues for reconstructive work in psychoanalyses.

From a clinical point of view, said Martín Cabré, it is very important to discriminate between traumatic and non-traumatic dreams. Ferenczi (1931) pointed out that traumatic dreams can hardly be understood as fulfilments of unconscious wishes. But they do have the potential to enervate traumatic experiences. Ferenczi called this “traumatolysis”—a process, according to Martín Cabré, “whereby traumatic experiences were dissolved and undone” (2011, p. 273).

Blum (2011) elaborated on the clinical communicative functions of dreams, showing that dreams have a communicative function in general, but particularly in clinical contexts. They can be seen as an analyst’s gifts to the analyst or as magical messages. Dreams may open insights into early object relationships that have never been symbolised. By talking about a dream and trying to understand its meaning, analyst

and analysand alter its sensory (mostly visual) and affective contents. Therefore, the manifest dream should not only be considered as an envelope for its latent content. The content of the latent dream may also contain important unconscious meanings concerning early object relationships, conflicts, anxieties, etc. Thus, in psychoanalytic sessions, the meanings of dreams are usually explored from the surface downwards.

Pine (2011) denied that dreams have a special role in clinical work. Referring to an *I/P* controversy (Pine, 1998), he suggested that other information (such as transference–countertransference observations, reports of an analysand’s “moments of meeting” (Stern & the Process Study Group, 1998) in both the analytic situation and in the outside world, slips, etc.) could be as productive as dreams for gaining insights into unconscious fantasies and processes.

Recently, other clinical discussions of dreams have focused on nightmares and post-traumatic dreams. Surprisingly, these have not until now been major subjects in the psychoanalytic literature. Their neglect was prevalent even during the last decades, when trauma became one of the central topics in international psychoanalysis. Since they could not reasonably be considered wish-fulfilling, Freud placed post-traumatic nightmares in a special category of dreams (1933a). Even today, many psychoanalysts believe that post-traumatic dreams have no latent meaning. Lansky (1995, p. 8) characterised such a view thus:

Freud’s assumptions about the nature of posttraumatic nightmares are tantamount to an implicit model of posttraumatic nightmare. Those assumptions, shared for the most part by psychoanalytic and non-psychoanalytic thinkers alike, are (1) that the nightmare portrays the essence of what is traumatic about the trauma; (2) that the nightmare has no latent content of any importance, that is to say, that the nightmare is more like an affectively charged memory than a true dream; (3) accordingly, that the manifest content is not a product of transformation of the dreams work’s service defensive functions or portraying wishes as fulfilled; (4) therefore, the conflict represented in the nightmare scenario, usually one involving fear of external danger (occasionally with conscious remorse), is the central or only conflict to be addressed in the therapy; and (5) the nightmare is itself part of the stress response reaction, as inflammation is to physical tissue, and is (somehow) driven into existence by the trauma that is represented in the manifest content of the nightmare.

Lansky questions these assumptions based on a critical review of psychoanalytical papers by Adams-Sylvan and Sylvan (1990), Blitz and Greenberg (1984), Jones (1910), Kohut (1977), Lidz (1946), Mack (1965, 1970), Moses (1978), and Wisdom (1949), as well as on contributions from sleep researchers like Fischer, Byrne, Edwards & Kahn (1970), Hartmann (1984), and Kramer (1991).

Lansky himself carried out a large clinical study in an inpatient psychiatric unit at the West Los Angeles VA Medical Center. Between 1987 and 1993, all the patients—many of them were Vietnam War combat veterans—were asked about their nightmares via questionnaire. Their nightmares were also investigated in clinical interviews and psychoanalytic therapy sessions. This offered Lansky's research group "the opportunity to appreciate the complexity of the posttraumatic nightmare" (Lansky, 1995, p. 5). Lansky summarised his conclusions thus:

The central line of thinking ... does indeed support a revised concept of wish fulfillment, one that draws heavily on an understanding of shame, narcissistic injury and narcissistic rage and their relation to disruptive mental states in the light of which even the possession of an intact sense of self within the scenario of a terrifying anxiety dream can be seen as a wish. (p. 6).

Working with traumatic dreams might thus have an important therapeutic effect, as the case reports in this volume by Juan Pablo Jimenez, Margaret Rustin, and Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber also illustrate.

Another interesting clinical phenomenon that has recently been the focus of attention is the so-called countertransference dream. This is a dream of the analyst which features or includes a patient. For some writers, such as Zwiebel (1985), analysing such dreams allows for an understanding of current unconscious communications between patient and psychoanalyst.

Interdisciplinary research and theoretical pluralism in contemporary psychoanalysis

Another field of contemporary psychoanalytical dream research is *conceptual research* (see, e.g., Leuzinger-Bohleber & Fischmann, 2006), which was the focus of the 47th IPA Congress. Three central concepts in psychoanalysis—the unconscious, sexuality,

and dreams—were taken up in keynote papers aiming to develop or even integrate existing psychoanalytic theories. Clearly, dreams are still considered to be among the core phenomena of contemporary psychoanalysis.

All our illustrative Mexico City keynote speakers seemed to agree that data gained in clinical work with patients constitutes the unique field of discovery in psychoanalysis. Freud (1927a) described this idea in his famous formulation of the “Junktim Forschung”, the inseparable bond between therapy and research. This bond is also evident in contemporary struggles to develop psychoanalytic concepts and theories.

However, the speakers also had clear differences in their understandings of conceptual research in contemporary psychoanalysis. In particular, their different ways of developing the central psychoanalytical concept of the dream seemed to be closely connected to their varying positions on the status of psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline (see also Ahumada & Doria-Medina, 2010; Leuzinger-Bohleber, Dreher & Canestri, 2003). Some of the authors held that theoretical clarifications or even theoretical integrations—central aims of the conference—could be achieved by psychoanalysts themselves, through discourses taking place exclusively within the psychoanalytic community. Others argued that new, innovative developments in psychoanalysis would depend on an exchange with the outside scientific and societal world. This includes an interdisciplinary and international dialogue with other scientists, as well as with politicians, the media, and the arts.

A radical formulation of the latter position came from Steven Ellman (e.g., Ellman, 2010), whose work generated controversy during the final panel of the 2011 IPA Congress and is included in this volume. Ellman discussed his extensive experimental research into sleep and dreams, illustrating the ways in which he used interdisciplinary knowledge to make new theoretical integrations. The result is a new drive theory that brings together Freud and Fairbairn. It takes a developmental view of unconscious mental life and puts forward a new understanding of the function of dreams. Ellman sees the baby as both pleasure- and object-seeking, and dreams as strongly connected to early developmental processes. Furthermore, says Ellman, dreams remain a form of self-regulation and problem solving throughout life (see his contribution in this volume).

The speakers also took different positions concerning *theoretical pluralism in contemporary psychoanalysis*. Some of the speakers implicitly

shared the opinion of many psychoanalysts who think that the diversity of psychoanalytic theories allows us to perceive ever-new patterns in complex clinical material. These patterns can then be made use of in the joint process of acquiring knowledge with our patients. Some of the speakers argued persuasively that looking at clinical material from a Freudian, post-Kleinian, French, American object-relational, or South American perspective leads to specific insights. These insights can be deepened, supported, or sometimes even contradicted by shifting to another theoretical stance. Other speakers thought that theoretical integration is absolutely necessary. Still others warned that attempting such integration risks losing the conceptual and clinical richness developed in the different psychoanalytic cultures and regions (see, e.g., Ferro, 2011).

Some colleagues seemed to share the epistemological and methodological concerns of Charles Hanly (2010), who argued that further pluralism in psychoanalysis could lead to a fragmentation of psychoanalytic theorising. This, in turn, could lead to the proliferation of institutions fostering eclectic, *anything goes* approaches. Hanly warned that such approaches might promote fuzzy thinking, thinking that could indicate a neglect of psychoanalysis' continuous struggle to understand the "not understandable"—i.e., the complex, mainly unconscious psychic realities of our patients.

A healthy multiplicity of clinical perspectives and theory-informed observations does not relieve us of the need to recognise irreconcilable contradictions between various theoretical explanations of clinical phenomena. These contradictions need to be the subject of intra-psychoanalytic dialogue. Through such dialogue, we will be able to recognise both commonalities and divergences in our conceptual approaches. This is a prerequisite for further developing psychoanalytic theories, for finding innovative integrations, and for developing a culture of respectful, fruitful scientific debate within the IPA.

A historical perspective on the relationship between psychoanalysis, science, and society

Underlying the differences that emerged during the 2011 IPA Congress may be fundamental tensions between different conceptualisations of the nature of psychoanalysis and of its relationship to other areas of scientific enquiry. Freud himself grappled

with such tensions. As a young man, he was very interested in philosophy and the humanities. Only later did he turn with remarkable passion to the natural sciences. In the laboratory of Ernst Brücke's Institute of Physiology, he became acquainted with a strict positivistic understanding of science that attracted him throughout his whole life. Eventually, however, he turned away from the neurology of his time because he recognised its methodological limitations: the discipline was not appropriate for conducting research into the nature of the psyche.

With *The Interpretation of Dreams*, the founding work of psychoanalysis, Freud initiated his new method of "pure psychology" (1900a). Nevertheless, he kept thinking of himself as a physician making exact observations, just as a natural scientist would. His wish for a precise, empirical examination of hypotheses and theories protected him, as Joel Whitebook (2011) argues, from his own predilection for wild speculation. Thus, Freud, as a "philosophical physician", could establish a new *science of the unconscious*. In developing psychoanalysis, he initiated a complex discourse between the natural sciences and the humanities.

This discourse has been fraught with difficulties. Makari (2008) characterises these well when he describes an inevitable tension in psychoanalysis between a wish to assert again and again one's own identity as a psychoanalyst (e.g., by promoting the basic feeling of belonging to the psychoanalytic community and by continuing its specific tradition of thought), and an openness to challenges and discoveries from the non-psychoanalytic world (e.g., academic research or developments in globalised society).

Psychoanalysis as a discipline—not just individual analysts—has had to face such problems of identity. Two opposing dangers have threatened it throughout its history. On the one hand, there was the possibility that psychoanalysis would be swallowed by another academic discipline and stripped of its unique methodology. On the other hand, there was a possibility that it would keep its identity but be marginalised as a non-scientific cult or a secret religiously structured society.

One of Freud's great, lasting achievements was to preserve both psychoanalysis' disciplinary independence and the integrity of psychoanalytic research. He secured these ends in large part by founding the IPA in 1910. By creating this institution, he resisted subsuming psychoanalysis under the disciplines of medicine, the humanities,

or the cultural sciences. At the same time, he created an organisation that could foster psychoanalysis' identity and its methodological rigour.

Makari (2008) sees the decision to found a loyal psychoanalytic organisation outside the universities as an ambivalent step that alienated important scientific colleagues such as Eugen Bleuler. It also led to well known splits in the psychoanalytic movement—for example, the split between Freud and Jung. Makari shows in great detail that Freud brooded heavily over the danger connected with his decision to get rid of his “rebellious sons” (p. 290f.). Expelling certain members from the IPA could make it seem like a cult that was under Freud's autocratic control. To avoid this, Freud tried very hard to define psychoanalysis as a science.

As we know, the struggle for an adequate understanding of the *Wissenschaft* (science) of psychoanalysis goes on. As noted above, this was a latent topic in the 2011 IPA Congress discussions on dreams.

Related concerns about the role of psychoanalysis in modern societies also emerged during the congress. More than ever before, psychoanalysis is shaped by constant, global competition for political, financial, and medical acceptance. Many of us believe that psychoanalysis is both an efficient method for treating patients and a theoretical framework in which deeper understandings of societal problems (such as violence, anti-Semitism, right-wing radical adolescence, religious fanaticism, and terrorism) can be achieved. It is generally felt that if psychoanalysts can convincingly demonstrate and disseminate the unique and indispensable results of their research in clinical and cultural fields, they will not be marginalised.

At the same time, however, there is a danger that by attempting to play a more significant role in society, psychoanalysis will end up conforming to a conventional understanding of science, one that is inappropriate for a *Wissenschaft des Unbewussten* (a “scientific discipline of the unconscious”). Striving for public credibility, particularly through the expert-obsessed media, could cause psychoanalysis to lose its inconvenient but unique status as a method for true self-investigation and self-exploration. Thus, in its very attempt to preserve its relevance, psychoanalysis might efface itself.

It is only by remaining psychoanalytic that our discipline can have real value for society. Psychoanalysis is still convinced that individuals will only find their sense of self and identity if they explore their unique unconscious worlds of fantasies and conflicts—if they

examine how their specific life experiences and biographies determine their individual ways of feeling, thinking, and acting. The sceptical *Weltanschauung* of psychoanalysis is still in opposition to the *Zeitgeist* of anything goes and to the endless commercialisation of human resources and capacities.

It is partly because of this opposition that psychoanalysis can continue to offer necessary criticisms of contemporary culture. It is therefore essential that the psychoanalytic community communicates the richness of its clinical and extraclinical research—including research on dreams—to the scientific community, the public, and the media in an authentic way (see, e.g., Pfenning-Meerkötter, in press).

In this volume, we take up these controversial discussions in the hopes of contributing to an understanding of one of contemporary psychoanalysis's central clinical phenomena and concepts: the dream.

Short overview of the contributions in this volume and their scientific context

The majority of the papers collected in this volume were originally presented at the 12th annual Joseph Sandler Research Conference, which took place in Frankfurt in March 2011. The conference title was "The Significance of Dreams: Bridging clinical and extraclinical research in psychoanalysis". This topic was very much in keeping with the work of Joseph Sandler and his wife, Anne-Marie. The Sandlers always showed a unique and innovative openness to all forms of research in psychoanalysis, and were dedicated to building bridges between psychoanalysts working in their private offices, psychoanalytic researchers in institutions and at the universities, and non-psychoanalytic researchers and intellectuals (see the foreword by Anne-Marie Sandler).

The Sandlers' noble stance cannot be taken for granted: the discourse between psychoanalysts with different methodological and epistemological convictions has not always been open, friendly, and productive. The same is true for the relations between psychoanalysis and other disciplines. Nevertheless, many analysts, including the authors whose works appear in this book, carry on in the Sandlers' tradition. We are proud to present some of their important contributions here.

David Taylor (London) is an internationally known psychoanalytic clinician. Currently, the Clinical Director of the Tavistock Adult Depression Study, he has formerly held the posts of clinical director of

the Tavistock's Adult Section and of the Tavistock's Medical Section. Recently, he has collaborated with the Sigmund Freud Institute on its LAC Depression Study, in which his *Manual for Psychoanalytical Treatments of Chronic Depressed Patients* is used. In several papers, he has built bridges between clinical research in psychoanalysis and extraclinical research, considering scientific, conceptual, empirical, and interdisciplinary issues. In his chapter, "The re-awakening of the psychoanalytic theories of dreams and dreaming", Taylor looks at the part to be played by clinical research in further advancing our understanding of dreams and dreaming.

Margret Rustin (London) is one of the most internationally famous child psychoanalysts working today. In her chapter, "Dream and play in child analysis today", she elaborates on her clinical observation that not many of her child analytic colleagues seem to work with dreams in their treatments. She compares this with the central place that dreams had in the work of both Melanie Klein and Anna Freud. Rustin's interesting thesis is that this could indicate the contraction of intermediate space in children due to "changes in childhood", which include increasing overexposure to media and frequent overstimulation. A second hypothesis is that contemporary child psychoanalysts more frequently treat children who have suffered severe early trauma. These children have severe deficits in symbolisation, mentalisation, and dreaming. Rustin illustrates her arguments with impressive case examples that show the parallels between dreaming and playing in children (2011).

In his chapter, "The manifest dream *is* the real dream: the changing relationship between theory and practice in the interpretation of dreams", the Chilean psychoanalyst and researcher Juan Pablo Jimenez (Santiago de Chile) discusses how contemporary clinicians have an understanding of the manifest dream that is different from that of former generations. Dream interpretations are not built on "static interpretations of dream symbols" or exclusively on the associations of the patient. Rather, they are created by both the analyst and the analysand in a "co-construction". Jimenez illustrates these ideas—and his artful technique—through detailed accounts of psychoanalytic sessions with a chronically depressed and severely traumatised patient.

Another extensive case study of a severely depressed, traumatised patient is presented by Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber (Frankfurt) in her chapter, "Changes in dreams. From a psychoanalysis with a traumatised, chronic depressed patient". She argues that changes in the quality of the