

## RHYTHM AND BLUES

### AMALIA'S 152<sup>ND</sup> SESSION

FROM PSYCHOANALYSIS TO CONVERSATION AND METAPHOR ANALYSIS - AND RETOUR

**Abstract:** Conversation analysis and psychotherapy process research is an evolving field promising new insights for therapeutic practice. After the specimen case of Amalie, esp. her 152<sup>nd</sup> session was analyzed using different methods – of which we give a short overview – we offer a new analysis of session 152 based on a new transcription which allows for more detailed listening to the prosodic properties of this analytic dyad. Our findings show a) how analyst and patient co-create their common conversational object called psychoanalysis; b) how a lot of up-to-now not described analytical tools are applied, that can be described as “practices”; c) how a “dance of insight” is enacted by both participants in a common creation making patterns of interaction visible from “both sides”; d) how participants create metaphors as conversational and cognitive tools to reduce the enormous complexity of the analytic exchange and for other purposes; e) that prosodic rhythmicity and other prosodic features are best integrated in a threefold model for analytic conversation consisting of “interaction engine”, “talking to” and “talking about” the patient. The study is presented as hypothesis-generating research based on verbal, not statistical data.

"The qualitative explanation is that, though undescribed Nature certainly exists, scientific knowledge of Nature exists only in the form of logically organized descriptions. There are stages of our knowledge in which the descriptions that we realize at cognitive level become too precise that the fundamental features of cognition, that is to say of logic and of language, acquire the same importance as the features of what is being described." (Conte et al. 2009, S. 5)

## INTRODUCTION

---

The use of specimen pieces of psychoanalytic work has been installed by Freud reporting on the so-called Irma-dream (Freud 1900). This material has been re-analyzed a number of times (for example Erikson, 1954). In the same vein, the Dora-case (Freud, 1905) has retained a prestigious pivotal position in availing itself to continuous re-elaboration and re-interpretation (Sachs, 2005). However, few detailed examples are available to extended scrutiny where "primary data" (Luborsky & Spence 1971) are at hand.

The Ulm study group on psychoanalytic process research in many details has analyzed a tape-recorded psychoanalytic treatment, the case of Amalia X (Kächele et al., 2006). The treating analyst himself considered the Session 152 as a specimen example of modern psychoanalytic technique when he presented this session to the participants of the International

Psychoanalytic Congress in 2004. This session was debated by a fair number of experienced psychoanalysts (Wilson, 2004). Among those, the clinical evaluation by Akhtar (2007) was especially strong in pointing out the key features of the analyst's technique in this session:

"Dr. Thomä's technique shows flexibility, resilience, and broad-mindedness. It is centered upon helping the patient achieve ego freedom through interpretation and transference resolution.

However, it incorporates a variety of listening attitudes and a broad range of interventions that can be seen as preparatory for, as well as in lieu of, the interpretive enterprise" (2007, p. 691).

To test this intriguing clinical evaluation Levy et al. (2012) analyzed the same session with the tool of the Psychotherapy Process Q-Set (Jones 2000):

„ In this particular session,,....., a specific set of interactions that serves the process well

involves A allowing P some room to resist, minimal confrontation at these moments, before resuming productive inquiry and exploration.“ (Levy et al. 2012, p. 524)

It therefore seemed a fruitful enterprise to scrutinize this particular session again by taking an even more microscopic look by mean of conversational analysis (MB+HK 2013, MB 2014).

### THE SPECIMEN SESSION

We begin with the reproduction of a segment of Amalia's 152<sup>nd</sup> session in normal newspaper-like transcription in order to give you an impression what happens here:

(Start minute 32:55)

P: das hab ich vielleicht im Studium mal getan da hatt ich so ne Zeit und das kam jetzt auch wieder eben durch Sie ausgelöst worn

*P: I did that perhaps sometimes while studying I had a time like that and it has now come back again triggered by you*

T: hm hm

*T: hm hm*

P: und da will ich so ein ganz kleines bißchen n Loch in den Kopf in den Kopf. In den Kopf schlagen  
*P: and so I feel just a bit like knocking a hole in the head in the head. Knocking a hole in the head in the head*

T: mhm ja=

*T: mhm yes=*

P: und da ein bißchen was von meinen Gedanken rein tun so. Das kam mir neulich ob ich nicht ein bißchen Ihr Dogma gegen meins austauschen kann

*P: and sort of putting some of my own thoughts in there. It came to me the other day that I might be able to swop some of your dogma for my own*

T: hm

*T: hm*

„Normal transcription” is our term for the kind of interviews news papers reproduce when they inform readers about their talks with politicians, musicians, artists etc. This kind of reproduction suffices because readers are not interested in the special style of “talk-in-interaction” but in content and information. This is the “word-level” of semantics. However, in psychoanalysis we cannot be satisfied with reproducing an atmosphere of a session by just telling words-in-lines. In order to correctly evaluate the process of a session more is required. To make the difference visible we now present the precise transcription of the same snippet including a small amount of diacritical signs which will be explained:

P: das hab ich (1) vielleicht im Studium mal getan (-) da hatt ich so ne Zeit (1,2)  
*P: I did that (1) perhaps sometimes while studying (-) I had a time like that (1,2)*

T: Ja Ja  
*T: Yes Yes*

P: und das kam jetzt auch wieder (..) eben durch Sie ausgelöst worn  
*P: and it has now come back again (..) triggered by you*

T: hm hm  
*T: hm hm*

P: und DA! =will=ich=so ein GANZ (.) kleines Bißchen (.) n Loch in den Kopf (.) in den  
*P: and SO! =I=feel=just a BIT (.) like knocking (.) a hole in the head (.) in the*

T: °mhm°  
*T: °mhm°*

P: Kopf! In den Kopf (.) schlagen=  
*P: head! Knocking a hole (.) in the head=*

T: mhm ja=  
*T: mhm yes=*

P: = und da ein bißchen was von=von °meinen Gedanken rein tun° °so°. Das kam mir  
*P: = and sort of putting some of=of °my own thoughts in there ° °so°. It came to me*

T: mhm  
*T: mhm*

P: neulich (..) ob ich nicht ein bißchen IHR=Dogma (.) gegen MEINS austauschen kann  
*P: the other day (..) that I might be able to swap some of YOUR=dogma (.) for MY own*

T: mhhhh.=mm ((ansteigende  
 Intonation))  
*T: mhhhh.=mm ((rising intonation))*

Of course, such a transcription is not the ultima ratio of skillfulness (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013). Psychotherapists of every kind showed themselves convinced that “tone makes music”. But, as well-known researchers (Weiste & Peräkylä, 2014) wondered, hardly any psychotherapy researcher studying empathy paid attention to prosody which includes pitch, tone, rhythm and some more aspects. We restrict ourselves here to a new (made by MB) transcription according to standards of Conversation analysis (CA) with the aim to show what can be heard by an attentive listener without using special technical equipment beyond an audio record (Mondada, 2013). Equipped with normal ears you can hear (and see in transcription) a lot more. Reading transcriptions of that kind (Hepburn and Bolden 2013) requires patience. One must make oneself accustomed as to reading a statistic table and have an eye to the details. We will give some explanation what we think is happening here. The first thing is that the patient speaks in a rhythmic format. There are lengthy pauses, duration of which is indicated by seconds in brackets like (1). Pauses less than a second are

indicated by dots (.) which means a micro-pause of not more than 0.25 seconds. When you use transcription utilities like (free-of-charge) audacity-program you find pause-length precisely indicated. Pauses of half a second are indicated by (..), lasting 0.75 second one uses (-).

For stretching or lengthening a syllable a colon is used, sometimes two or three. If speakers overlap talking square brackets [ indicate where both begin to speak. Sometimes this cannot be precisely detected so one writes the second speakers utterance at nearly the position where this utterance can be heard.

Another kind of talk-in-interaction is very fast turn-taking. One speaker ends and in just that moment the next one takes over. This is indicated by =.

Nonverbal utterances like breathing or puffing are indicated by .hhhh for inhaling; and hhh. for exhalation. Other hearable utterances are written in brackets ((moaning)). And loudly spoken syllables are written in capital letters, accent or emphasis is indicated by underlining.

What makes rhythm more interesting is the synchrony of prosodic utterances in face-to-face-interactions, here they come from the therapist. One can differentiate a one-stroke utterance like “hm” from a two-stroke utterance like “hm hm”. Sometimes in this transcript we will see utterances increasing to “hm hm YES”, whereby the final syllable is uttered with more loudness (here in capital letters). Prosodic hms can be differentiated into *information received token* (equivalent to ok), *go ahead tokens* or *compliance token* (Yes! I agree!). All these tokens contribute to the rhythmicity of the coproduced conversation, as they come by the listener very often precisely in the minimal turn-internal pause of the speaker.

There are some more diacritical signs conversation analysts use. But this shall be enough for the moment. We want to return to the example.

It is taken from the last third of the session when the analyst and the patient have been talking about the patient’s wish to put a nice little hole into the analyst’s head. And by the help of these diacritical signs you can now see that she does it (read the italics). She is hammering with her words practicing just that what she is talking about. In order to bring that out we extinguish all the semantic information and reproduce the same snippet again by showing the pure rhythmic course, where | indicates the accents, - indicates the unstressed parts of slightly longer duration. Faster rhythm is indicated by a series of dots: ...<sup>1</sup>

P: - - - (1) - - - | - - - (-) - | - - . . - (1,2)  
P: - - - (1) - - - | - - - (-) - | - - . . - (1,2)

---

<sup>1</sup> We know that this is a rather simple way of describing rhythmicity of speech. We do not want to make things too technical here Uhmman (1996).

T: Ja Ja  
T: yes yes

P: ----- .. (..) ---- |: .. -  
P: ----- .. (..) ---- |: .. -

T: hm hm  
T: hm hm

P: - |! ..... |: (.) - - | (.) - - .. | (.)! .. -! ..-(.) - =  
P: - |! ..... |: (.) - - | (.) - - .. | (.)! .. -! ..-(.) - =

T: ° mhm° mhm ja=  
T: ° mhm° mhm yes=

P: --- .. .. ° ---|--- ° °°-° . ---  
P: --- .. .. ° ---|--- ° °°-° . ---

T: mhm  
T: mhm

P: - -(.) .... - - | =.. (.) .. |... -  
P: - -(.) .... - - | =.. (.) .. |... -

T: mhhhh.=mm ((ansteigende Intonation))  
T: mhhhh.=mm ((rising intonation))

What we find is, *first*, a rhythmic repetition of “in den Kopf” (“*in the head*”), three times. Like a hammer hitting the nail on the head. And this is committed as an *enactment* – what the words tell is done by the rhythm of just these same words. Enactments are not necessarily something beyond words. *Second*, we find that the therapist follows this rhythmic structure precisely, uttering his prosody just in the small little pauses the patient provides. *Thirdly*, these small little conversational objects are very well modulated. They are spoken with a quiet voice, sometimes slightly, producing an air of vague consent and his last utterance expresses a kind of felt surprise and agreement. *Fourthly*, these utterances are structured rhythmically, too.

Both participants can be observed in producing a kind of interaction that we call *psychoanalysis*. The question if this is “psychoanalysis proper” is futile. We have a very individualized dyad, which has established an opportunity to express things like “hammering a hole into the other’s head” and the other does not withdraw or counterattack or call for the police. No, this kind of interaction has a flair of tenderness. We suppose it is this special rhythmicity that has the potential of transforming an assumed aggressive act into a kind of tender touching the other’s head, entering the other’s mind, coming to a very close exchange with each other.

## THE INTERACTION MACHINE

Conversation analysts have turned their eyes to how this exchange is organized (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013). Rhythmicity of turn-taking can be modeled (O'Dell, Nieminen, & Lennes, 2012). When Freud maintained (Freud, 1916) that in psychoanalysis nothing happened but an “exchange of words” he did not want to restrict psychoanalytic conversation to a semantic level only. Of course, he wanted to exclude nebulous things like mesmerism and hypnotism and show the rationale core of psychoanalytic treatment. But never did he exclude non-verbal moments of interaction. Psychoanalysts remember Dora and her handbag and know how attentive Freud was in bodily utterances. In his correspondence with Ferenczi he debated the meaning of a farth on the couch, Freud was an “embodiment theorist” *avant la lettre* in his clinical observations. The Anna-O.-coined term “talking cure” thus does not mean words alone, but the whole of conversation.

Conversation analysts have paid a lot of attention not only to nonverbal “behavior”, but to the *organization* of “talk-in-interaction” (Heritage, 1984). How comes that people do not interrupt each other permanently? How do they select who is the next speaker or the next topic? The answer is that they produce their utterances according to “what is going on” and they follow certain rules that can be described precisely. E.g., if someone poses a question there is some “conditional relevance” to answer – and if you do not the conversation rules force you for some account; you apologize, you declare the question will be answered a minute later etc. If you violate such rules other “repair”-activities begin to operate in order to reestablish the “normal state of affairs”. Not greeting somebody who greeted you is a serious violation. The first who lifted his hat will think about if you are sad, mad or bad. Since many years of very intensive work conversation analysts are convinced that these rules operate in various cultures in an universal shape (Stivers et al., 2009). A linguist, Levinson (2006), has coined the term “interaction engine”. This is a funny term but one should not be abhorred by the “mechanical” touch; it is not more mechanical than in psychoanalysis a word like “defense mechanism” or “psychic apparatus”. “Interaction engine” is a term for some “mechanical features” *between* two persons, “defense mechanism” was originated for something “mechanical” *within* a person.

Levinson (2006) shows how important it was that the interaction engine emerged during evolution. Man is deeply dependent on cooperation and thus, the interaction engine developed in order to make sure that an utterance was heard and responded, that a deictic gesture was eye-tracked, that a cry was heard as a need for, e.g. help, not as a noise only. Gradually, and this is an interesting point for psychoanalysis, interaction was organized around cooperative

principles. These included a response not only to (visible) behavior, but to understand (invisible) moment-to-moment intentions and, later, more abstract plans and, as we want to show later, to images. “Interaction is by and large cooperative” (Levinson 2006, p. 45), it produces chains and sequences which can be learned by each newcomer of a culture and which make prediction of the other’s behavior easier. Thus, these chains and sequences are not governed by rules, but by expectations, Levinson (2006, p. 45) stresses. Interaction is, thus, not dependent on language, but language helps a lot. Interaction is the “deeper layer” than language is. But interaction produces certain role-positions (Goodwin, 2011; Korobov & Bamberg, 2007; Salgado, Cunha, & Bento, 2013; Tateo, 2014) in situated contextual production like questioner-answerer, giver-taker resulting in a turn-taking structure.

Although language and verbal conversation emerged from interaction, the interaction engine is independent of language. You can have interaction with people from very strange languages like Chinese, you can interact with an aphasic man (Goodwin, 2000, 2003) or, on the other hand, you can have intellectual-symbolic exchange with ancient philosophers like Plato or Kant – but no interaction is possible with them in the same way as you can have a languaged telephone call and exchange words. And here one can see the so-called “binding problem”: Rhythm of speaking and other elements must fit to other multimodal signal streams contained in your talk. In everyday interaction there is the same binding problem as we expect that our gestures and mimic “fits” to the “idea” we want to exchange with others. There is a bodily base for this binding (Dausendschön-Gay & Krafft, 2002; Franke, 2008; Vuust, Wallentin, Mouridsen, Ostergard, & Roepstorff, 2011). We have seen an example: how the patient “hammers” with the rhythmicity of her wording while she is talking about just doing that. The therapist softly transforms a semantic aggressiveness into an acceptance to be touched tenderly. His therapeutic activity produces a solution for the binding problem of the patient. In psychoanalytic terms: the aggressive wish to penetrate into the therapist’s mind can come to words, it is made conscious. Precisely can we observe how this theoretical formulation comes to work here.

There is an overall developmental line: from behavioral observation – to concluding invisible short-term intentions – to binding multimodal signal streams – to repair activities – to assuming long-term plans – to situated role – role-antagonist directed interactions – to role reversals – to the emerging level of “images”. This developmental line has been discovered in a very similar fashion by early childhood observers; what they have meanwhile found neatly fits into the picture. Infant observers (Braten, 2009) show how a mother’s early “repair”-activities towards her baby demonstrate how deeply children feel the violation of their



expectations and how sensitive healthy mothers are for these violations; they operate on a rhythmic base (Mazokopaki & Kugiumutzakis, 2010; Osborne, 2010). Conversation analysts (Wootton, 1997, 2012) report similar observations. Mothers “read” their baby’s intentions and babies become at the age of nine months (Meltzoff et al. 1999; Tomasello, 1999, 2003) not only sensitive for the short-term intentions of others; more, they do understand that “being a subject” means to accept that people act upon (invisible) ideas they have and they learn it by playing role-reversal interaction games of the following kind: mother feeds her baby with a spoon, in the next moment the baby wants to take the spoon and feed mother. The extended literature on “theory of mind” and “mentalization” (Allen & Fonagy, 2006) follows similar lines.

Charles Rycroft once wrote:

„After the analyst has introduced the patient into the analytical situation, explicit, symbolic communication begins. The analyst invites the patient to talk to him, listens and, from time to time, he himself talks. When he talks, he talks *not to himself nor about himself qua himself but to the patient about the patient*. His purpose in talking is to extend the patient’s awareness of himself...” (Rycroft, 1956, p. 472)

Rycroft shows that psychoanalytic conversation is a two-level endeavor: to talk *to* and to talk *about* the patient. Object level and meta-level of conversational operations is here clearly differentiated. But, the “interaction engine” is a deeper level. What follows is that psychoanalytic conversation can best be described, at least, by a three-level model. On the level of the interaction engine we find those phenomena as recently described by Peräkylä (2010): patients talk and, in a “first” turn psychoanalysts give an interpretation, the patient responds with small corrections and then, in the third turn the analysts re-adjusts his formulation, often softening his first formulation. The patient’s talk, then, is operating on an object level which we could term the “narrative level” and the meta-level of “aboutness” then is implemented by psychoanalytic activities. But it would be an error to assume this as the entire psychoanalytic level of conversation. It is one level *added*. The whole of three levels constitutes what we consider as psychoanalytic conversation.

The interaction engine makes sure that utterances of “to” and “about” can be uttered, that utterances are expected and, sometimes, can become completed or corrected (Peräkylä, 2010) and that each other’s intentionality, plans, situated roles, role reversals and image are to be acknowledged “if things shall go on” to a transformation and therapeutic change. Thus it can happen that a good analytic hour begins with something that impresses as a kind of mind reading.

## CASCADES OF TURNS

The session of Amalia we study here begins with a very interesting exchange of next session arrangement:

T: Ich darf vielleicht noch in Erinnerung bringen dass der Montag [dann=  
*T: Perhaps I am allowed to remind you that Monday [then=*

P: [17 Uhr=  
*P: [5 p.m.=*

T: =17 Uhr is ja das  
 ?:: ((flüstern))  
 (3)

T: =5 p.m. is the  
 ?:: ((whispering))  
 (3)

P: und der Donnerstag ham wir nicht ausgemacht  
 (2)  
*P: and we didn't make an appointment for Thursday*  
 (2)

T: Donnerstag ?  
*T: Thursday ?*

P: Da hatten Sie noch nichts gesagt weil (1) ich erst dachte ich könnte nicht aber ich hab ja keinen Vortrag  
*P: You didn't say anything because (1) I first thought I couldn't come but I don't have a lecture*

T: Aja (.) Aja (-) [Da wegen des Ausfallens der Stunde [ Donnerstag dann (1) ja  
*T: Yes (.) Yes (-) [So because there was no session [ then Thursday (1) yes*

P: [°Aber Sie haben da mittags [und Freitags°  
*P: [°But then you have at midday [and on Fridays°*

T: öh (1,5) achtzehn Uhr dreißig wär dann (1) am günstigsten für mich >oder siebzehn Uhr dreißig<?=  
*T: um (1,5) then 6.30 p.m. would be (.) best for me >or 5.30<? =*

P: =is mir egal  
*P: =whatever*

T: ö::hm=  
*T: e::hm=*

P: =Wenn's Ihnen passt  
*P: =If it's all right with you*

T: <Siebzehn Uhr> (.) >>Siebzehn Uhr dreißig dann<<  
*T: <5 p.m.> (.) >>5.30 p.m. then<<*

P: mm mh  
*P: mm mh*

T: JA?  
*T: YES?*

P: mm mm

P:

*mm mm*

P: (°stöhnt°) (6) hhhhhhhh.  
(59)

P: (°groans°) (6) hhhhhhhh.  
(59)

P: °hm°  
(1:07)

P: °hm°  
(1:07)

P: hhhhhh (7) °Ich habe heut nacht geträumt...

P: hhhhhh (7) °Last night I dreamt...

The therapist starts with a softly connotated remark („Perhaps, I am allowed to remind you of...”) and not having finished his utterance the patient takes the turn (“5 o’clock”) which is confirmed by the analyst. After 3 seconds the patient continues that Thursday is without agreement, the therapist remembers with a forceful (“Oh yes oh yes”) and takes the turn again – accompanied by the patient’s calm voice – like the prompter in the theater. And in a very fast exchange written here as a “cascade” of utterances rapidly joining and completing each other they cooperate in concluding the next date. Often enough conversation analysts have observed that interrupting another speaker is a violation of orderliness of turn-takings. Here, we do not see this. What we find instead is astonishing. Both speakers seem to share a common intention, to finish this forerunner of the entire analytic session as fast as possible. It takes approximately one minute. This analytic couple knows each other quite well, well enough that the patient can act as a prompter suggesting the analyst’s other appointments and to bring them to his mind. This reminds one of the kind of “doctor-nurse”-games (Stein, 1967). The nurse in a back position suggests the doctor what he should propose and when he finally directs the nurse to do this it appears as if it were his original idea. His authority is protected – and this is an aspect operating here, too. The patient subjects herself to the analyst’s timetable, he demands for her consent with a loud “YES?” and with a rhythmic “mm mm” this sequence is ended by a long pause of nearly two minutes. We do not know what happens in this silent moment, we hear the patient’s moaning. But when she returns on the conversational stage we can assume that she has tried to reorganize her mind in order to tell her dream. Perhaps, Balint (1950) would have formulated that she was in the area of a “one-person”-psychology. A better term might be what Stolorow & Atwood (1999) have termed the “unvalidated unconscious”; the patient needs a pause to reorganize her dream experience and how to tell it. The therapist waits.

Before we turn to the dream-telling let's have a look to other cascades in this session. The patient begins after another pause by acknowledging that the analyst wants to talk, she has read his intention to speak informed by his utterances like "mhm". She gives way.

((36:45))

P: Sie wollten was s[agen

P: *You wanted to s[ay something*

T: [JA! Ja ich wollte sagen (.) nun (.) isse (..) Sie haben doch glaub ich selbst jetzt  
äh eine err Lösung dafür auch (.) gefunden nämlich Sie möchte:n (1) Sie haben sich ja doch  
durchgerungen dass Sie mir soviel Stabilität zutrauen dass ich also ein kleines Loch überstehe [ nicht wahr und

T: *[YES! Yes I wanted to say (.) well(.) is it(.) I think you have found a err solution for that (.) yourself because you would lik:e (1) you have brought yourself to credit me with so much stability that I would survive a small hole [ wouldn't you and*

P: [ja: hmhm

P: [yes: hmhm

T: Sie das da reinstecken aber Sie möchten natürlich mmm >KEIn KLEInes< Loch (.) Sie möchten auch nicht wenig sondern viel reinstecken

T: *You put it in there but you want of course ummm >NOt a SMALL< hole (.) You don't want to put just a little but a lot in there*

P: vermutlich (.) ja:

P: *I supp:ose so(.) yes:*

T: Sie haben einen schüchternen Versuch gemacht [zu die Stabilität des Kopfes

T: *You have made a cautious attempt [to the stability of the head*

P: [vermutlich

P: [probably

T: zu probieren mit dem Gedanken [ (..) wie groß n kleines Loch (.) machen

T: *to attempt with your thought [ (..) how big a small hole (.) make*

P: [hhhhhh.

P: [hhhhhh.

T: nicht wahr aber Sie möchten n großes machen n leichtn Zugang ha[ben

T: *isn't that the case but you want to make a big one and have easy ac[cess*

P: mh mh mh mh [mhmh

P: mh mh mh mh [mhmh

T: nicht Schwerzugang Sie möchten mit der Hand! err das auch tasten können was da ist nicht nur mit den Augen sehen. Mit den Augen sieht man auch nicht gut wenn n Loch nur klein ist nicht wahr? (3) Mit n Augen sieht man auch nicht viel wenn n Loch nur klein ist nicht wa:hr=Also [ äh err ich glaube Sie möchten ein

T: *not hard to reach you want to use your hand! umm be able to touch what's there not just see it with your eyes. One can't see good when there's only a small hole, can one? (3) Also one can't see much when there's only a small hole, can on:e=So [ um err I think you want a*

P: [mpf

P: [mpf

T: größeres err=

T: *bigger one=*

P: =hh. ich möchte sogar ein err in Ihrem Kopf spazieren gehen können=  
P: =hh. *I'd even like to be able to go for a walk in a err in your head=*

T: = Ja mm=  
T: = *Yes mm =*

P: =das möcht!=ich=  
P: =*I want!=that=*

T: =.hh=Ja mm=  
T: = .hh=*Yes mm=*

P: =und auch ne Bank möchte ich ham=tztz  
P: =*and I'd like a bench as well=tztz*

T: = ja! ja!=  
T: = *yes! yes!=*

P: = wie so'n Pa:rk!  
(3)  
P: = *like a pa:rk!*  
(3)

P: und (2) n:ja (1) is glaub ich leichter (1,5) zu verstehn was ich noch alles möchte  
P: *and (2) n:yes (1) I think it's easier (1,5) to understand what else I want*

T: Ja! Mehr Ruhe auch (.) des [ Kopfes err die Ruhe die ich hier habe hier hab ich  
T: *Yes! More quiet, too (.) of the [ head err the quiet I have here I have*

P: [ja  
P: [*yes*

T: eine Ruhe (.) nicht? di:e ist wird auch gesucht nicht wahr?=  
T: *quiet (.) or not? tha:t is what is being looked for, isn't it ?=*

P: hhhhhh. = ich hab mir vorhin gedacht (2,5) °wenn Sie  
sterben (2) dann können Sie sagen (2) Sie ham n herrlichen Arbeitsplatz gehabt! Irgendwie  
komisch°

P: hhhhhh = *I was just thinking (2,5) °when you die*  
*(2) then you can say (2) you had a wonderful place of work! Somehow funny°*

T: Mit dem Blick auf n Friedhof=  
T: *With a view of the graveyard=*

P: =JA! NA=n! (.) KOMISCH! NEIN! (1) gar nicht an n Friedhof  
gedacht=überhaupt=nicht [(1) sondern wir hatten immer so schön  
P: =*YES! NO=O! (.) FUNNY! NO! (1) wasn't thinking of the graveyard=not*  
*at all [(1) but we've always had so beautifully*

T: [ JA  
T: [*YES*

P: dann (.) Licht! Und=und die Blätter  
P: *then (.) light! Und=and the leaves*

T: hm hm=  
T: *hm hm=*

P: =klingt jetzt beinah so=so kitschig aber (2) irgendwie (.) dacht ich (1,5) also das kann ich auf  
jeden Fall sagen (3) °Friedhof oder so ((immer so ? )) (5) glatt  
(27)

P: =now it almost sounds so=so corny but (2) somehow (.) I thought (1,5) well anyway I can definitely say (3) °graveyard or so ((always so ? )) (5) straight (27)

The analyst starts here with a long utterance concerning what he thinks the patient wants. But observe the format of this utterance.

We want to differentiate at least the following aspects:

- a) He does not say: “You want this and this...”, he accentuates his subjective position (“I think”); many of this analyst’s utterance are introduced with such *mitigators*;
- b) the analyst frames his utterance in a way as if he just repeats what the patient allegedly has found out for herself (“found a err solution for that (.) yourself”) although he goes far beyond what the patient has formulated (Antaki, 2008) before; we call this a *practice of joining*;
- c) from this starting point onward he gives credit to the patient’s accomplishment to overcome herself (“you have brought yourself to credit me with so much stability ...”); we call this a *practice of empowerment*;
- d) all these format properties are accompagnied by prosodic utterances of the patient who agrees with small interjections (“I suppose so yes”) and again we find that they are clearly not followed by a struggle whose turn is it. Tacitly both agree that their contributions are uttered in a frame of meta-level interpretation which gives the analyst the right to formulate an interpretation which is not reacted to as if it were an attack on the common self-understanding of the patient. We call this a *shared organization of producing and hearing an interpretation*. Thus, we find a quite unexpected observation: it is the patient who allows the analyst to make an interpretation;
- e) the therapist chooses to expand the scope of the topic: to make a “big hole” in the analyst’s head – but for what aim? He says that she wants to touch there with her hand, not only watch with her eyes and, thus, a closer sensual experience is addressed; we call this a *practice of expansion*;
- f) now the patient complements that “crazy topic” to make a “big hole”, to touch the analyst’s head and then to walk in there! This utterance comes as a forced turn-taking, she interrupts her analyst (“=I'd even like to be able to go for a walk in a err in your head =”) and is immediately confirmed by her analyst’s prosodic consent; we call this response a *confirmatory extension*;
- g) the consequence is a *mutually accepted reversal of roles*: it is now the patient who is initiative and leading and the analyst falls back to a follower; it is the same cascade-format generated by both as in our first example, only roles are reverted;

h) the patient's initiative is so strong that she adds another aspect: from "to go for a walk" in the analyst's head she is driven to her wish to sit on a bench in a park and she adds "what else I want" which is complemented now by the analyst adding: "Yes! More quiet, too..." and that she wants his calmness. Here it is the analyst who makes a *confirmatory extension*;

i) again, she agrees with "yes" and extends her park-bench-phantasy to a daring association: that she has thought of when the analyst might be dead. This utterance is followed by a *self-critical comment* ("Somehow funny"). And again, the analyst responds with a confirmatory extension ("With a view of the graveyard")

We see how both operate, they co-operate by taking up each other's ideas, expanding and complementing them and change roles of the leading-following type. When this cascade-dance comes to an end again we find a long pause of 27 seconds, the cascade run out, the topic seems exhausted.

Psychoanalytic empathy here operates as a co-production of both participants; we have tried to describe some of its components visible here. These components arrange around a commonly produced image-sequence leading from making a hole – to walk in the analyst's head – to sit on a bench – beside his grave – to enjoy calmness and silence.

The complete role reversal involved here can be comprehended when we now return to the beginning of Amalie's dream telling after the first cascade of meeting-appointments and a long pause of more than two minutes. It is now the patient sitting at the side of a lying analyst, while at the beginning of the session it was the lying patient with an analyst at her side.

### AMALIA'S DREAM

After this pause Amalia starts with a deep inhalation and then tells her dream hesitantly:

((3:33))

P: .hhhhh (7) °Ich habe heut nacht geträumt heut morgen (2) hat grad der Wecker (1) geschellt (1,4) ich sei ermordet worden° vom Dolch

P: .hhhhh (7) °Last night I dreamt this morning (2) the alarm clock had just (1) gone off (1,4) I'd been murdered° by a dagger

T: °hm°

T: °hm°

P: und zwar war es aber (0,7) °wie im Film (2,2) ich musste ganz lang liegen (..) aufm Bauch und hatte den Dolch im Rücken und (2,2) dann kamen ganz viele Leute (5) und (2) ich weiß nicht mehr wofür (-) die Hände ganz ruhig halten irgendwie wie tot

P: but it was (0,7) °like in a film (2,2) I had to lie quite straight (..) on my tummy and I had the dagger in my back and (2,2) then lots of people came (5) and (2) I don't know why anymore (-) keep my hands quite still as if I were dead somehow

T: °hm°  
T: °hm°

P: mir war's sehr peinlich dass der Rock so (h)hoch raufgerutscht war (.) hinten  
P: *I was very embarrassed that my skirt had slid up so (h)high (.) behind me*

T: °hm°  
T: °hm°

P: und dann kam (.) n Kollege (.) ga:nz deutlich sichtbar aus XY das war meine allererste Stelle (1) der hat mir dann den Dolch aus m Rücken gezogen und mitgenommen ähm (.) ich weiß nicht das war wie so'n Souvenir dann (2) und dann kam n junges Paar ich weiß nur dass er Neger war und die haben mir dann die Haar abgeschnitten und wollten daraus tatsächlich ne Perücke glaub ich machen (2) und das fand ich ganz schrecklich (2) und die ham dann auch anfangen zu schneiden (3) und (2) ich bin dann aufgestanden (2) und bin zu nem ((leichtes Lachen)) Friseur (3) ((schluckt)) ich mein da hat dann noch der Wecker (-) ((schluckt)) geschellt (3) °°und bin aufgewacht°°

(4)

P: *and then a colleague came along (.) quite clearly visible from XY that was my very first job (1) he pulled the dagger out of my back and took it with him erm (.) I don't know it was like a souvenir then (2) and then came a young couple I only know that he was a negro and they cut my hair off and really wanted to make a wig out of it I think (2) and I thought that was really awful (2) and they did begin to cut (3) and (2) I then got up (2) and went to a ((small laugh)) hairdresser (3) ((swallows)) I think that's when my alarm (-) ((swallows)) went off (3) °°and I woke up°°*

(4)

In dream-telling the patient accepts her actor's competence; she does not begin with a defensive phrase like that a dream came to her. She says "Last night I dreamt" in a calm voice. A dagger has made a hole into her. This is the impressive part of the dream. The analyst utters a calm *information-received-token* "°hm°" and the patient continues with disdramatizing her dream using a contrastive formulation: "but it was (0,7) °like in a film (2,2) I had to lie quite straight (..) on my tummy". The little word "but" builds up the contrast: in her first version it was "(dream)reality", she has been murdered. In this version it "but like in a movie". She gives the all-clear. More important than the dagger might be that she has to lie. The analyst responds to this aspect of the story told so far with an utterance of *empowerment*:

T: Sie konnten dann doch aufstehen [als Sie zum Friseur gehen wollten  
T: *You were able to get up [when you wanted to go to the hairdresser*

P: [jaja ich war ja die ganze Zeit auch (..) lebendig  
P: *[yeah, yeah also I was alive the whole (..) time*

T: ja mhm mhm mhm ja  
T: *yes mhm mhm mhm yes*

P: ich wusst ja  
P: *I did know*

T: ja  
(1)  
T: yes  
(1)



Although murdered by a dagger she confirms to have been alive all the time. This fits well to when the story oscillates between “reality” (within the dream) and “movie”. The analyst can draw on a common knowledge: this patient came to him because the stigmatizing experience of *hirsutismus*, a malady when the whole body has an unusual growth of hair influencing negatively her gender identity and self-esteem as a woman. So going to a hairdresser in the dream precisely reformulates her reason to go to analysis. In the dream it is a “young couple” cutting her hair trying to make a wig of it, but then she chooses to go to a hair dresser – he can remove her hair without making herself an object of mockery and transform it into a kind of souvenir of her pre-analytic life. So, the analyst is experienced as a kind of transformatory object (Bollas, 1979).

#### **METAPHOR: THE ANALYST AS HAIR-DRESSER, THE ANALYSIS AS VIVSECTION**

If this interpretation is right we can see an important dimension of dreaming: She can dream a relationship to her analyst that happened in the past and she dreams it with an imagery equipment generating a metaphor: “The analyst is a hair-dresser”. Seen in this way she tells her analytic story while dreaming to herself and, when telling the dream on the couch, to her analyst - but, of course, encoded.

Again, metaphors have found deep psychoanalytic interest (Aragno, 2009; Borbely, 2008; Levin, 2009) taking up topics from former psychoanalytic authors (Siegelman, 1990) and trying to integrate them with recent developments in linguistics, especially influenced by the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). What we sloppily term “imaginary equipment” can be more fully described as “metaphorical process” (Fiumara, 1995) producing a metaphor consisting of three parts: a) the metaphorical process and two components: b) a source domain (hair-dresser) and c) a target-domain (analyst). The metaphorical process is the entire unconscious creative act combining the other elements with the aim of satisfying logical and/or psychological needs. It is a process of deeply unconscious sense making. The metaphorical process can be observed in everyday language production as well as in dreaming. A metaphor created this way never “represents” a reality, it generates reality. This is never valid for physical realities, but for social, cultural, psychic worlds. The unconscious creative process can take up material of any kind. The metaphor created operates as a “hedge equation” (Borbely 2008). It opens a new perspective to see the world, but selectively pushes back other dimensions and meanings. Metaphors create categories (Glucksberg, 2008; Lepper, 2000) and omit others. A metaphor is a way of “seeing as”, metonymy in contrast operates in

the mode of “stands for”. Both, metaphor and metonymy, are indispensable cognitive and linguistic instruments of our orientation in the world. We will not come back to metonymy here.

In dreams one part of the three components is omitted making the metaphorical content invisible for the moment. This could be shown in a complete metaphor analysis of a 30-hour short therapy (MB, 2003) and in the analysis of a group therapy of sexual offenders (MB et al. 2008). The manifest dream presents the source domain, the sensual area from which the dream picture is taken and does not show the target area. An analytic interpretation tries to link, better perhaps: re-link, these components with the aim of creating meaning based on the details of the scenario (Lakoff, 1987). These details here are:

- a) The patient came to analysis with a hair problem
- b) She had to understand that bearing this problem has something to do with psychic experience
- c) She meanwhile made the experience that analysis helped her in a certain way.

So, to link hairdresser and analyst is not so unusual as one might think. The metaphorical process in everyday language operates in a similar way. Some people say: “This old bachelor in Rome” when they mock about the pope and they refer to an incomplete metaphor: “The pope is a bachelor” where “Pope” is the target-domain and “bachelor” is the source-domain. Not to mention the whole metaphor is a kind of abbreviation necessary because conversation is very slow as compared to thoughts. So, if speaker and listener can rely on drawing on the same resources of knowledge the abbreviated version of a metaphor is very often used. This is a feature of everyday conversational practice.

Another aspect of using a metaphor is when a conversation has taken place and is retold to another listener. The story itself must be comprised and one of the means used for this is the metaphor again: “He talked like a machine gun”, “my lawyer attacked like a shark”, “His words were a bunch of flowers” or, as is the standard example by Lakoff & Johnson (1980) for so called conceptual metaphors: Argument is war (She had to give in, the speaker was seriously attacked, he had to clear his positions etc.)

In dreams telling things is not so different from this. The metaphor “The analyst is a hair dresser” comprises the past experience of analysis for Amalie *and* creates a new meaning. This is the entire creativity of dreaming a metaphor. To let the target domain free, dreaming of a hair-dresser only, is in one move defense and creativity. Other target domains could be inserted.

But, this is only a part of understanding the dream by the method of metaphor analysis (Ahrens, 2012; MB, 2003; Cameron & Maslen, 2010).

If we rest for a moment with the manifest dream the patient tells we will detect other direct allusions to the analytic situation. “I had to lie quite straight” she tells and this has in German a double meaning: it means “a long time” and “outstretched”. The dagger comes from rear (to which the analyst later refers: that he sits in her back, too) and she had to keep her hands calm. We take this as an illustration that she begins to realize how much she felt as an “object” of the analyst’s interest. In the terms of metaphor analysis one could formulate the metaphor: “Analysis is a scientific investigation” with the corollary that investigation means: there is an object investigated and a subject doing the investigation. We want to stress here the point that the patient *realizes* this experience of being-investigated which made the dreaming possible. The dagger, understood within the *frame of scientific investigation* generated by such a metaphor, is not an instrument of attack, but an instrument of research like a surgeon’s scalpel. We can conclude that she fears a kind of research that might kill her, she demonstrates her unconscious phantasy that “analysis is a vivisection”. Hereby we have formulated another metaphor.

Metaphors create frames of new meaning and operate as hedge equations limiting other meanings and meaning frames. To experience analysis as vivisection means that she is the object of an operation done by a surgeon who can open her head guided by the interest what is in her mind. The limitation is that she cannot revert this relationship, she cannot make herself a research subject - as long as she is in the grasp of this metaphor. She is fixed to one of two positions created by the metaphor. Within this frame, created by the metaphor, her unconscious wish might be formulated as becoming a subject of research, to change her *position* within that frame. This determines what can be considered the analytic task for this aspect of the session’s material. We have been seeing *that* the therapist manages to open a reversion of this *positioning* of both participants. In the end the patient can with some pleasure talk about her interest to inspect the analyst’s mind.

We want to study now *how* the analyst achieves this end by presenting the continuation.

#### THE ANALYTIC OPERATION – DANCING TO CHANGE POSITIONING

The patient offers some associations:

P: ich muss da nur (0.7) >ich hab gestern diesen Don Juan gesehen! Von Max Frisch und da gab’s ja auch so einige (1,8) Tote, aber (.) es war (.) war wirklich wie auf m Theater (2) es=war auch sehr (..) peinlich und se:hr (..) dumm! Die ganzen Leute die da (2) dauernd ankamen. Und am Anfang hatte ich so das Gefühl, es sei echt! Aber (2) ich weiß gar nicht mehr (..) wie dann (-) ob das weh

getan hat oder (3) es könnte der Dolch im Rücken (1) und der steckte also ((smiley voice)) echt drin! °Es gab bloß überhaupt gar kein °°Vertun°! °Er zog ihn einfach raus

(13)

(Glockenläuten setzt ein)

P: *I only have to (0.7) >I saw this Don Juan yesterday! By Max Frisch and there were some (1,8) dead bodies as well but(.) it was (.) was really like in the theatre (2) it=was also very (..) embarrassing und ve:ry (..) stupid! All the people that (2) kept on turning up. And at the beginning I had the sort of feeling it was real! But (2) I don't know anymore (..) how then (-) whether it hurt or (3) it could be the dagger in my back (1) and it was ((smiley voice)) really stuck in! °That was °°for sure°! °He just pulled it out*

(13)

(Bells start to ring)

P: °Stehaufmännchen!°

(53 sec, Glockenläuten, Straßenlärm)

P: °Like a rolypoly toy!°

(53 secs, bell ringing, street noise)

P: hm!

(3)

P: hm!

(3)

Again, we find the difference between „reality“-experience and „theater“ resp. “movie”.

P: >>°Mir fällt halt noch ein paar Sachen ein° die Sie vielleicht von mir jetzt erwarten<<(..) ist mir alles auch Wurscht

P: >>°I remember a few other things° that you perhaps expect from me<<(..) *I don't care anyway*

T: hm!

(2,3)

T: hm!

(2,3)

T: Die ich erwarte zu dem Traum, [oder?

T: That I expect about the dream, [right?

P: [ja::hhhh. Plötzlich fiel mir das ein

P: [yes::hhhh. It suddenly occurred to me

T: ja!

(4)

T: yes!

(4)

The patient makes a well-known maneuver in her attempt to produce what she thinks the analyst wants to hear. And she utters a sign of resignation (“I don’t care anyway”), which can be referred to her not seeing how to change positions. Her next utterance informs the therapist that she has behaved like a scientific subject, she has read something – and in the next part of the sentence she wipes away her newly acquired knowledge (“I’m so muddled up”):

P: ich fürchte nur, °dass ich in letzter Zeit gar nicht weiß was ich [ da mach°

P: I'm just afraid, °that recently I just don't know what I 'm [ doing°

T: [ hm

T: [ hm

P: nicht zu dem Traum °hab ich gelesen! Überhaupt! ich bin so (.) durcheinander !°  
P: not about the dream °I 've read it! In general! I'm so (.) muddled up !°

T: Ja  
(2)  
T: Yes  
(2)

P: °Ich zieh zwar bewusst (1) das an, was ich sonst anzieh° (.) und >schmier mir die Lippen ein<  
P: °I consciously put on (1) the clothes, that I always wear° (.) and >smear my lips<

T: mhm  
T: mhm

P: um nicht aus der Gewohnheit zu kommen, aber vorerst saß ich am Tisch (2) und >des wird immer schlimmer und< (1) plötzlich dacht ich, jetzt verkaufst du dein Au=to (1) brauchst doch nicht mehr (3) und ins Theater brauchst du auch nicht mehr  
P: so as not to get out of the habit, but for the moment I was sitting at the table (2) and >it gets worse and< (1) suddenly I thought now you'll sell your ca=r (1) don't need it anymore (3) and you don't need to go to the theatre anymore either

T: mhm  
(2)  
T: mhm  
(2)

P: ist alles Teufelswerk (1,5) im Deutschunterricht gibst (=gibst Du) auch keine ganz richtige Überlegung (2) gibst (=gibst Du) Englisch und Erdkunde (2) hast möglichst nix mehr mit dem allem zu tun (-) 's ist haarklein wie vor 10 Jahrn (2) halt bis ins Detail (3) °° ich weiß nicht°° (3) °°((warum träum ich in der Zeit ??))°° ((3 sec, immer noch Glockenläuten)) °ist mir auch wurscht°° (20)  
P: it's all the devil's work (1,5) in German lessons you don't give any proper thoughts either (2) you teach English and Geography (2) try to have nothing more to do with all that (-) it's exactly like it was 10 years ago (2) right down to the last detail (3) °° I don't know°° (3) °°((why do I dream in that time ??))°° ((3 secs, bells are still ringing)) °I don't care anyway°° (20)

Addressing herself in a „you“-mode („now you'll sell your ca=r (1) don't need it anymore (3) and you don't need to go to the theatre anymore either“) makes her voice of forbiddings and prohibitions hearable culminating in the phantasy to enter a monastery. This part comes with rare utterances from the therapist, he takes the position of a silent, but attentive listener while the patient develops a third metaphor: “To behave like a reading and curious scientific subject is to have erotic and sexual interests”. To turn positions becomes still another meaning: showing interest for the analyst might be discovered as sexual curiosity. Thus, curiosity in general must be forbidden and she activates her voices of forbidding. All interests in higher education, visiting a theater or using a car or being a well educated teacher seems worthless. The best place to escape from the dangers of sexual curiosity is the monastery, by definition. And as background music to this defensive talk and program the tape has recorded the ringing of church bells. An alternative to the monastery is to perform one's job with a sense of duty, carefully and conscientiously:

(min 9:00)

P: >°wenn das so weitergeht tu ich sonst nichts!° Mich überhaupt nicht mehr fürchten

(3)

P: >°if it carries on like this I'll do nothing else!° Won't be scared anymore

(3)

T: Wie im Traum?

T: *Like in the dream?*

P: °ja!

(7)

P: °yes!

(7)

P: Ja ich muss irgendwie .hhhh psch::t (1) mir kommt das vor wie (1) na ist es schon soweit dass ich in Gedanken überlege, (1) .phh ((8:55)) °°>>ich mein<< was soll's sonst sein, ist schon ganz verrückt°°, dass ich manchmal wirklich überlege in den letzten Tagen (2) in welches Kloster ich gehe°°. Idiotisch! So idiotisch! Und es nützt überhaupt nichts wenn ich mir das selbst sage

P: *Yes, I must somehow .hhhh psch::t (1) it seems to me like (1) it's really so far gone that I'm thinking about (1) .phh ((8:55)) °°>>I mean<< what else can it be, it really is crazy°°, that in the last few days I've been thinking about (2) in which convent to go°°. Idiotic! So idiotic! And it doesn't help at all when I tell myself that*

T:

°°mm°°

(8)

T:

°°mm°°

(8)

P: bin richtig froh wenn ich morgens in der Schule sein kann (2) da hab ich gar keine Zeit für so'n Zeugs

(22)

P: *am really glad when I can be at school in the morning (2) I don't have time for stuff like this there*

(22)

P: ich wehr mich eigentlich nur mit Routine dagegen (4) >natürlich auch mit Nachdenken< aber sobald ich anfang nachzudenken (1) schmeiß ich alles durcheinander °°ich weiß nicht! Ich weiß es wirklich nicht°° (6) Manchmal denk ich, ich bin verrückt und dann denk ich, ich hab Schuldgefühle und dann denk ich°, °°ich hab hhhh. (1) die letzten (..) 6? Jahre (..) überhaupt nicht gelebt sondern? (3) ich weiß nicht schon so weit (8) ganz plötzlich°°°.

(3)

((10:23))

P: *I fight against it basically just with routine (4) >and with thinking about it too, of course< but as soon as I start mulling over it (1) I get everything mixed up °°I don't know! I really don't know°° (6) Sometimes I think I'm mad and then I think I have a guilty conscience and then I think°, °°I've hhhh. (1) the last (..) 6? years (..) not lived at all but instead? (3) I don't know that far (8) quite suddenly°°°.*

(3)

((10:23))

This enactment of her conflict between sexual aroused curiosity and defense is made completely hearable here. The analysis of the record shows that the analytic surface (Krejci, 2009; Levy & Inderbitzin, 1990; Spence, Mayes, & Dahl, 1994) entails precisely all the elements needed for analysis. The methodological step that could make psychoanalysis an observational science (Lepper, 2009) is not to look *behind* the surface but *onto* the surface. The patient's conflict shows up on the surface, her defense, too and the way how she suffers. But suffering is now ended by an utterance from the analyst who obviously sensed that she hides other associations:

T: Was ist Ihnen denn zu dem Traum vorhin eingefallen gewesen was Sie nicht  
*T: What did you remember about your dream just now that you didn't*

P: °°ahh.°° ((murmelt))  
*P: °°ahh.°° ((murmurs))*

T: sagen wollten?  
*T: wanted to say?*

P: °Shit!°  
*P: °Shit!°*

T: Bitte? Hm?  
*T: Pardon? Hm?*

P: phhhhh. °°irgendsowas weiß nicht mehr was vielleicht in so'm [Lehrbuch [steht°°  
*P: phhhhh. °°something or other I don't remember that's perhaps out of a [text [book °°*

T: °°mm°° [Von? [Von?  
*T: °°mm°° [By? [By?*

P: Irgendsowas was vielleicht in'm Lehrbuch drinne steht  
*P: Something or other out of a textbook maybe*

T: Ja was steht denn da?  
*T: Yes what does it say?*

It fits to the topic of changing positions that she has the idea of having read in a „textbook“. It fits to her fixation to the vivisection metaphor that she hides this idea from the analyst; only in this way can she conform to being *object* of what she thinks are his research interests. And it fits to the idea of the analytic task that the analyst puts the question he puts – here begins a very interesting “dance of changing positions”.

The analyst's question what came to her mind is very calmly but hearable responded with “shit!”. Her intention to hide her textbook-association is uncovered and she responds as if being nabbed.

But - the analyst did not understand this little four-letter word. Immediately the roles turn around. In the beginning of this segment the analyst is the detective-questioner, the patient is the suspected person. The type of his questioning changes, he has to regain acoustic understanding and by this operation the patient gains the power of information-withdrawal. The analyst is very curious who might be the author (“By? By?”), he plays his role of a researcher very interested in what other people read. His last question is presented in a funny tone of having caught her. In German it is “erwischen”, which means to catch somebody who did something not all right, somebody like a thief. But “erwischen” has another meaning, too. “Mich hat's erwischt” can mean to be fallen in love, which in English is that “somebody has got it badly”. In this tone all these meanings can be heard. This segment has an air of playfulness.

Amalia responds with laughter:

P: hehehehe! Das wissen Sie doch! Ganz [sicher! Sie wissen ja nicht was  
P: *hehehehe! You know! For [sure! You don't know what*

T: [Nein! nein! °°nein°°  
T: [No! No! °°no°°

P: ich für Lehrbücher lese ((nicht mehr lachend))  
P: *textbooks I read ((not laughing anymore))*

T: mph mph  
T: *mph mph*

P: Oh Gott! (2) °°nein! Ich hätt (.) ich fühl so'n (1,5) Dreck!°°  
P: *Oh God! (2) °°no! I would've (.) I feel such (1,5) filth!°°*

T: mhm  
((20))  
T: *mhm*  
((20))

Here, the culmination point of role reversal is achieved. Now, it is the analyst who is caught, he declares rhythmically inserts his utterance that he does not, cannot know what is in the patient's mind. He is dependent on the patient's knowledge and information. However, again the patient's negative voice of self-criticism comes in. But this role reversal turns out as the first turning point where the patient and the analyst together made clear that it is not the analyst alone "who knows".

#### A TYPICAL DIFFICULT SITUATION

But this is no steady and stable result. After the 20-seconds she takes up the turn:

((11:16))  
P: °tja glauben Sie das selbst, dass der Traum mir weiter hilft? °°((is so fremd jetzt doch noch ??))°°  
(4)  
P: °oh well, do you yourself believe that the dream will help me? °°((is still so strange ??))°°

T: Naja es ist ja eine=[eine (1) ähm (2,2) mhm (2) Reglosigkeit eine (2) Sie haben  
T: *Well, it is an=[an (1) erm (2,2) mhm (2) inertia a (2) you have*

P: [((°° ?? ?? °°))  
P: [((°° ?? ?? °°))

T: sich gerade beklagt, dass Sie nicht weiterkommen, dass Sie (5) ist ja im Traum dargestellt äh  
T: *just complained, that you're not getting anywhere, that you (5) it's represented in the dream um*

P: >>°aber da bin ich ja am Schluss aufgestand[en°<<  
P: >>°but I got up in the en[d°<<

T: [mja  
T: [myes

P: Ich [sagte Ihnen doch, Stehaufmännchen



P: As I [said to you like a rolypoly toy

T: [ich versteh aber (.) zum Friseur

T: [I do understand but (.) to the hairdresser

P: Wie so'n STEHAUFMÄNNCHEN das dann (.) alles abschüttelt und zum Friseur

P: Just like a ROLYPOLY TOY that (.) shakes everything off and goes to the hairdresser

T: °mhm°

T: °mhm°

P: geht nix besseres zum Tun weiß, weder zur Polizei. Bin aber nicht sicher ich glaub da war noch Polizei dabei. So einerseits ne Filmszenerie und

P: there's nothing better know what to do, nor to the police. But I'm not sure I think the police were there as well. Like on the one hand a film scene... and

T: JA

T: YES

P: andererseits so ganz (1) eigentlich wirkliche Straßenwirklichkeit Ich hör dann die Leute kommen und gaffen. °.hhhh hhhh.° HHHHHHH. mmmm.° Ich komm jetzt bloß nicht weiter, komm immer tiefer rein (1) °wie das ganze geschehen ist ° (3) und erst war's die Uhr und jetzt ist es das Auto, °geht gar nix mehr weiter°

(4,5)

P: on the other hand (1) actually a real life street Then I hear the people coming and gawping. °.hhhh hhhh.° HHHHHHH. mmmm.° Only I'm not getting any further now, getting deeper and deeper into it (1) °how everything happened ° (3) and first of all it was the clock and now it's the car, °nothing's getting any further at all°

(4,5)

Her question to ask the analyst if her dream helped her is disconcerting. This question, taken literally, could be answered by herself only. This is a type of questions creating difficult situations, a helpful analyst wants to answer and realizes that one can't. Thus he begins stuttering and stammering. His wish to be a helpful answerer brings him for a moment into the position to hold the idea that he is the one knowing. This is, in the analysis of metaphors, the position of the researcher subject. However, the patient's question shows her own interest to become a researcher (erotic) subject. She reiterates the idea of going to the hairdresser like a skipjack and not to go to the police – what happened in the dream is not a murder! Silently she remarks that she does not get further, nothing goes on. Except the analytic dialogue itself. What she could mean with her remark is that *changing positioning* does not go on. She presents now an active part of self analysis in the form of observing her permanent self-observation. This is a step to achieve a meta-level.

#### CHANGING POSITIONS – A NEW OPERATION IN PSYCHOANALYTIC PROCESS

((min 13:15))

T: Und dann im Traum werden Sie sogar noch (.) getroffen also öhh hab ge (-) also sind Sie tot oder nicht tot

(2)

T: And then in your dream you are even (.) hit so um (-) so you're dead or not dead

(2)

P: Das ist aber auch so [(..) momentan[ ! Mir macht überhaupt nix Spaß! (..) Ich  
P: *But that is the way it is [(..) for the moment[ ! I don't enjoy anything! (..) I*

T: [mhm mhm  
T: [mhm mhm

P: mach alles ganz mechanisch (4) auch die Schule macht nicht wirklich mit (1) alles mechanisch (4)  
oder wenn ich wo bin, benehm ich mich ziemlich aufgedreht (4) was heißt aufgedreht? °Das ist  
ein bißchen übertrieben aber zumindest recht lebhaft° (4) °und in mir beobachtet immer einer (2)  
und zensiert das (2) und sagt (..) Siehst was'n Unsinn (2) falsch! (3) alles war falsch!°

(13)

P: *do everything absolutely mechanically (4) and school doesn't take part either (1) everything  
mechanically (4) or when I am somewhere, I'm a bit hyper (4) what does hyper mean? °That's a  
bit exaggerated or at least very lively° (4) °and there's always somebody in me observing (2) and  
censoring (2) and saying (..) Do you see what nonsense (2) wrong! (3) everything was wrong!°*  
(13)

P: .hhhhhHH HHhh.

(31)

P: .hhhhhHH HHhh.

(31)

P: Ich würd momentan alles Unsinnige glauben (1) Eher als dass zwei und zwei vier ist

P: *At the moment I would believe any rubbish (1) Before two and two make four*

T: mhm und (.) und auch dann dass ich auch hinter Ihnen sitze und sage (.) Falsch

T: *mhm and (.) and when I sit behind you and say (.) Wrong*

P: ((° ?? ?? ??°° hhhhh. ))

P: ((° ?? ?? ??°° hhhhh. ))

T: Falsch !

T: *Wrong !*

P: °ach, wissen Sie manchmal (1) hab ich das Gefühl (1) ich müsste auf Sie zustürzen (.) Sie am Hals  
packen und ganz festhalten und dann? Dann

P: *°oh, do you know that sometimes (1) I feel as if (1) I have to throw myself at you (.) Grab your neck  
and hold on tight and then? Then*

T: mhm

T: *mhm*

P: denke ich (.) das schafft der gar nicht, das hält der gar nicht aus

P: *I think (.) he won't cope, he won't be able to stand it*

T: mhm

T: *mhm*

P: dann seh ich wie Sie auch irgendwie (2,4) brennen oder=oder öh ich könnt das gar nicht richtig  
sagen ich weiß es nicht (2,5) was ich dann seh oder empfinde

P: *then I see how you're (2,4) burning somehow, too, or=or mh I couldn't really say I don't know (2,5)  
what I see or feel then*

T: Dass ich's nicht aushalte dass ich [äh (1) nicht ertragen kann Sie nicht

T: *That I couldn't stand it that I [äh (1) couldn't bear it you don't*

P: [ja

P: [yes

T: ertragen kann und:=

T: *bear it and:=*

P: = ja dass ich Sie festhalte  
P: = *yeah that I am holding you*

T: mhm  
(2)  
T: *mhm*  
(2)

P: das überfordert Sie dann irgendwie=  
P: *that's asking too much of you somehow=*

T: =mhm  
T: =*mhm*

P: .hhhh eher so, (.) [ ist hhhhh.  
P: .hhhh *rather, (.) [ is hhhhh.*

T: [mhm  
(4)  
T: [mhm  
(4)

P: und dass (.) das (2,5) dass °Sie dann auch anfangen irgendwie zu wackeln und zu schwanken oder so (3) oder ich frag mich dann manchmal ganz echt (2) isser dann so ruhig und für sich momentan (2) wie das auf mich wirkt°  
P: *and that (.) that (2,5) that °you somehow start to stagger and sway or so (3) or I sometimes really ask myself (2) is he so calm and detached at the moment (2) what effect that has on me°*

T: °mhm°  
T: °*mhm*°

P: weil ich eben momentan  
(1,2)  
P: *because at the moment*  
(1,2)

T: also es ist schon [ so ein Kampf bis aufs Messer  
T: *well it really is [ kind of a fight to the finish*

In this segment she repeats the loss of pleasure and adds, how intensively her critical self-observation is. Her self-observation is a step upwards on the metaphorical ladder in constituting the full three-level analytic process and is now what the analyst takes up: that he sits behind her criticizing. He accepts being positioned in the role the master-scientist who knows what is right and wrong. Although the analytic process now has achieved the meta-level of conversation the interaction engine still operates with influence. Within the meta-level operation the fight for changing position is expressed. And it is a “fight to the finish” as the analyst formulates knotting together the lines of the dream and the actual situation within the treatment room. Again cascades of turn-taking, the small but so important sighs and how the patient takes the initiative turn after short pauses. The analyst accepts the patient’s definition of him as someone not being able to bear the patient’s attacks, being pushed too

hard, to be out of his depth. We repeat the last line of the analyst's utterance as there is a very interesting continuation:

T: also es ist schon [ so ein Kampf bis aufs Messer äh (2) um (2) äh dann (1) da  
T: well it really is [ kind of a fight to the finish er (2) um (2) er then (1) so

P: [ >> °überhaupt nicht << K(r?)a::mpf °  
P: [ >> °not at all << a st(r?)a::in °

T: °den Kram °=Traum so aufzuzeigen  
(4)  
T: to demonstrate °the stuff °=dream like that

P: Wahrscheinlich, ja  
(9)  
P: Probably, yeah  
(9)

Very calmly, fast spoken with rhythmic synchrony, the patients accompagnies the analyst's strong formulation of „fight to the finish” by a clear contradiction. In German this “strain” and “fight” are words very similar. It may be this similarity leading the analyst to a parapraxis when he talks, calmly too, of “stuff=dream” with an immediate self-correction. This Freudian slip is clearly to hear on the tape but has never been mentioned in former analyses of this session! The wording goes from “st(r)ain” (*Kram(pf)*) to a similar phonem-particle “dream” (*Traum*) indicating the self-correction by the accent (underlined). After 4 seconds of pause the patient agrees to the analyst's manifest metaphor of “fight to the finish” which he uses as described before in order to selectively comprise what was going on. After again 9 sec silence the patient again takes the turn initiative:

P: und zwar deshalb so (1) so schlimm weil (5) ja warum eigentlich? Weil ich ihn ziemlich ähnlich  
eben schon mal erlebt hab (1,5) und ähm (6) und die Konsequenz war dann eben dass ich (5)  
gegangen bin (5) und ich hab in all den Jahren fertig (( ?? )) aus'm Kloster rausging=  
P: and that is so (1) so bad because (5) yes why exactly? Because I have already seen him more or less  
like that (1,5) und erm (6) and the consequence was just that then I (5) left (5) and in all those  
years I've ready (( ?? )) left the convent=

T: mhm  
T: mhm

P: =nie nie ernsthaft mehr gezweifelt dass es richtig war irgendwie (1) und jetzt nach  
P: =never never earnestly doubted that it was right somehow (1) and now after

T: mhm  
T: mhm

P: so langer Zeit °relativ langer Zeit kommt das ° (( ?? )) wirklich nie ernsthaft  
P: such a long time °a relatively long time comes that ° (( ?? )) really never in earnest

T: °mhm °  
(1)  
T: °mhm °  
(1)

P: °>zu[erst° (°° ???°° ))  
P: °>to[first° (°° ???°° ))

T: [statt des Kampfes bis aufs Messer ins Kloster  
T: *[instead of the fight to the finish into the convent*

P: Bitte?  
P: *Pardon?*

T: ((deutlicher und jede Silbe betonend)) statt des Kampfes bis aufs Messer=  
T: *((more clearly and emphasizing every syllable)) instead of the fight to the finish=*

P: =Ja=  
P: =Yes=

T: = ins Kloster=  
T: = *into a convent*=

P: =Ja! Exakt! Nervenaufreibend  
P: =*Yes! Exactly! Nerve racking*

She reflects about former experiences of fighting and that she has left and never seriously doubted her decision. The “fight to the finish” is interpreted as something to be replaced by her decision to join a monastery. Now we see how on the base of this new meaning the analyst begins the operation of *extending the metaphor* again: to join the monastery ensure the survival of the analyst. The implicit supposition is unspoken that it is the patient having a dagger in her hand. The *change of positioning* goes on in a very silent way, the new position making the patient an active part is introduced by implication.

((16:38))  
T: und dann wäre auch gesichert dass Si:e dann wüssten Sie wenigstens dass äh ich äh >wie soll ich  
sagn< über=überdAUert habe dass äh ichs err ausgehalt'n habe dass Sie dass Sie äh (2) mh (.) dass  
ich erhalten geblieben bin (.) sehn Sie > irgendwo ist doch da ne Sorge< dass ichs nicht AUShalte.  
Isser wirklich so stabil dass er ä:h dass er [ hm  
T: *and then it would also be ensured that yo:u would at least know that um I um >how shall I put it<  
bear it that I could en=endURe it that you that you erm (2) mh (.) that I have survived(.) you see >  
somewhere there is the worry< that I couldn't TAKE it. Is he really so stable e:r that he[ hm*

P: °nei das hab ich nie gehofft  
P: °no I never hoped that

T: °Nicht° (-) dass nix passiert dass ähm (.) ni:ch=  
T: °Not° (-) *that nothing happens that erm (.) no:t=*

P: ==>>dass ich Sie nicht UMreise oder so<<  
P: ==>>*that I don't knock you OVER or so<<*

T: =äm Sie mich nicht mitreissen  
T: =*erm you don't knock me down*

P: =[wie so Bäume wenn man dann oder kracht was ab  
P: =*[like trees when you then or break something off*

T: mh mh ja ja mh mh  
T: *mh mh yes yes mh mh*

P: °ich weiß nich°

(4)

P: °I don't know°

(4)

T: ja ((17:18))

T: yes ((17:18))

P: aber Sie sagten da so'ne Wegbewegung oder so?

P: but you said a kind of backing off or so?

T: Jaja (-) aber was äh (.) Wegbewegung (.) aber eben erst mal wissen ist äh bricht was ab oder (.)  
können oder hält's hält's (2) ä:h >hält er's aus<

(1)

Yeah, yeah (-) but what umm (.) backing off (.) but first find out er whether something will break off or  
(..) able or bear it bear it (2) e:r >can he bear it<

(1)

T: oder reißt reißt ein Ast ab, nicht? Irgendwo is ja (-) vielleicht auch mit drin dass Sie dann was  
mitnehmen MÖCHTn dass Sie n Ast ab[reißen MÖCHTn=

T: or will a branch break break off? In some way (-) it is partly that you WANT to take something with  
you that you WANT to [tear a branch off=

P:

[JA!

P:

[YES!

T: =ei:n (.) Stück abbrechen

T: =break off a (.) piece

P: nJA! Ihr'n Hals!

P: nYES! Your neck!

T: Mein Hals (-) mh mh

(3)

T: My neck (-) mh mh

(3)

T: mh mh (3) den Kopf

T: mh mh (3) the head

P: mm! Mh mh!

P: mm! Mh mh!

T: mh

T: mh

P: °den mag ich sehr (?) Ihren Kopf°

P: °I really like it (?) your head°

The implication of being an active part who wants to make holes into other people in this segment has now changed from implicit to explicit. The patient takes over the idea to cut off something from a tree, to break off the analyst's head from the neck – und the erotic meaning is not lost in all this: She likes the analyst's head. In what follows she now behaves like a scientist: she measures the analyst's head, she surveys him when an appointment is to be made and she confesses to really love the analyst's head:

((18:30))

P: °den mag ich sehr (?) Ihren Kopf°

P: °I really like it (?) your head°

T: bleibt er drAUF

(2)

T: *will it stay ON*

T: [will mein Kopf noch mehrmals ja (?)=

T: *[does my head want a number of times yes (?)=*

P: [° bin ja mal sehr verkopft°

P: [° I am very cerebral at times°

T: Wie?

T: *What?*

P: ach! halt den, den vermess ich in alle RICHTungen=

P: *oh! hold it, I'll measure it in all DIRECTIONS=*

T= Ja [mh

T= *Yes [mh*

P: [gut

(2)

P: [good

(2)

P: u:und (1,5) ähm (1) is ganz eigenartig=

P: *a:and (1,5) erm (1) it's quite peculiar=*

T: =hm hm

T: *=hm hm*

P: manchmal wenn Sie dann so auf Ihrem Stuhl sitzen und ich wart hier bis Sie'n Termin machen=

P: *sometimes when you sit on your chair like that and I'm waiting for you till you make an appointment=*

T: =Ja

T: *=Yes*

P: .hhhhh (1,2) dann sieht er jedesmal völlig and[ers aus (1,2) hhhh.

*.hhhhh (1,2) then he looks completely diff[erent every time (1,2) hhhh.*

T: .hhh mhmh

T: *.hhh mhmh*

P: Manchmal hhhh.und das is jeds Mal n andrer gewesen=

P: *Sometimes hhhh. and it was a different one every time=*

T: =Ja

(2)

T: =Yes

(2)

P: obwohl ich jeden Zentimeter mit den Augen rumlauf

P: *although I walk over every centimeter with my eyes*

T: °mh°

T: *°mh°*

P: °°von hinten nach vorne und oben nach unten°° und echt manchmal durch die Stadt gelatscht (1)  
 Ihren Kopf so hoch=  
 P: °°from the back to the front and from the top to the bottom°° and sometimes really traipsed through  
 town (1) your head so high=

T: = mh  
 (3,8)  
 T: = mh  
 (3,8)

P: Ich glaub ich bleib ((dass ich den recht lieb g'habt ??))  
 P: I think I stay ((that I loved it a lot ??))

T: hm  
 T: hm

P: Ihren Kopf  
 (5,0)  
 P: Your head  
 (5,0)

P: Komisch dass °°(( [ ] ))°°  
 P: Funny that °°(( [ ] ))°°

T: [hm  
 (8)  
 T: [hm  
 (8)

P: Ich seh so schwer an Leuten zum Beispiel was die anhabn=  
 P: I find it difficult to see what people are wearing for example=

T:= Ja  
 T:= Yes

P: ohne dass ich die fixiern müsste  
 P: without staring at them

T: mm  
 T: mm

P: einfach sofort und bei Ihnen (2) frag ich mich manchmal hinterher (2) dass ich das nicht gesehn hab  
 P: just straightaway and with you (2) I sometimes ask myself afterwards (2) that I didn't see it

T: mh  
 T: mh

P: aber Ihr'n Kopf stütz ich °°manchmal°°  
 P: but I prop up your head °°sometimes°°

T: mh  
 (5)  
 T: mh  
 (5)

P: °°der interessiert mich am meisten (19:22) °°  
 (2)  
 P: °°that interests me the most (19:22) °°  
 (2)

P: °°den find ich auch faszinierend  
 P: °°I find it fascinating



T: Ja  
(8)  
*T: Yes*  
(8)

T: Wenn Si::e >ihn sich erhalten wenn er dableibt< und Si:e äh dann is > HAM Sie ihn nich und  
nehmen Sie ihn mit dann (.) ist äh=  
*T: When y::ou >you keep it it stays put< and y:ou um then it's > you don't HAVE it and take it with*  
*you then (.) it's er=*

P: =dann isser ab  
*P: =then it's come off*

T: isser ab, nicht? Und da is dann äh >das Kloster n AUSweg<, nicht?  
*T: it's off, isn't it? And then er >the convent is a way OUT<, isn't it?*

## CONCLUSION

~~~~~

We want to summarize our analysis of this session. We have described the analytic conversation as a three-level endeavour: the base is the “interaction engine”, the system of turn-taking, of reading short-term intentions and long-term plans. On this level interesting rhythmic features could be described. They use forms of utterance practice in the contributions of one of the participants, but also between participants. The practice of small role-plays can be observed in pre-language children and in subhuman animals (Tomasello, 2006; Waal, 2007) as well as repair activities. They continue into the sphere of language use. This basic level of interaction engine has been described by CA-authors so basically, that a psychoanalytic process analyses cannot leave it out. Psychoanalysis has to add something: there is a step from long-term plans that guide a subject’s actions to more complex *images* of mutual organization of interaction and these images have the format of metaphor. There is pre-language metaphor-creation that can be described (Tomasello, 2008).

Out of these complex mutual organized pre-language formats of protoconversation evolve higher levels: an object level of narrating and verbal exchange as we seen in the beginning of the session when the two participants make session appointments. Rhythmic structures organize the patterns of synchronization in the service of conversational acceleration. Talking is a serially organized format while thinking is operating in a format of simultaneity. The difference between seriality and simultaneity has to be worked off conversationally and rhythmicity supports the synchronicity of the two. Object-level conversation thus is based on the interaction engine.

The entire psychoanalytic level is built upon this object level as a meta-level of conversation producing the distinctive “sound” of psychoanalytic discourse: Talking “to” *and* talking “about”.

In this session the process evolves from rhythmic organized session appointment conversation to an object-level dream telling. Our analysis shows in detail the procedures the two participants do in order to achieve the meta-level of talking “about”. We could describe

- Mitigations as contributions for a “soft-conversational” environment
- Practices of joining the patient’s view
- Practices of empowerment
- Shared organization of producing and hearing an interpretation
- A practice of expanding a metaphor and a metaphorical frame
- A confirmatory extension of metaphor (by the patient) and
- Mutually accepted reversal of roles within the hedges created by the metaphor

The following metaphors could be observed as operative:

- The analyst = hairdresser (with the corollary as a professional who protect the patient from being mocked and who can regain her hair as a memory of her pre-analytic life)
- Analysis = scientific research (with the corollary of the patient as a lifeless *object* subjected to the researcher-subject’s interests)
- Curiosity = sexual interest (with the corollary of becoming a woman interested in men, e.g. the analyst and what is going on in a man’s mind)

The hedge equations of these metaphors selectively created a focus of common attention. Metaphorically speaking this focus can be seen as the airstrip after equally hovering attention has come down. We could show how the described practices again prepare and organize this landing place and how both participants contribute.

The former described practices from mitigation via joining (“hm hm”) and empowerment to expanding the frame and confirmatory extension operate again and how a “dance of changing position” is performed. This dance results in a change of positioning: in the beginning during dream telling we see the patient as being attacked from a murderer with a dagger, in the end it is the patient who comes out with her wish to study the analyst’s head=mind. Both have changed their positions, based on the “interaction engine” procedure of role reversal.

To apply conversation and metaphor analysis to psychoanalytic process analysis seems to be promising for the discovery of process properties undetected up to now. The application of these methods, effectively initiated by Peräkylä et al. (2008) and other authors will help a) to

more deeply understand what psychoanalytic process (as a form of conversation) is, b) how psychoanalysis can contribute with deep reaching examples to the treasure of examples conversation analysis has gathered and c) how the analysis of metaphor as based in cognitive linguistics can be brought into the analysis of conversation and psychoanalytic process. The tripartite level model of conversation we proposed can be complemented by a tripartite methodological approach of psych-, metaphor- and conversation analysis. The future will show how far we can come with this.

## References

- Ahrens K (2012). Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities. In: Cameron L, Maslen R, editors. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 27(3): 259–261. doi:10.1080/10926488.2012.691767.
- Akthar S (2007). Diversity without fanfare: Some reflections on contemporary psychoanalytic technique. *Psychoanal Inq* 27: 690-704.
- Allen J G, Fonagy P, editors (2006). *Handbook of mentalization-based treatment*. Chichester, England, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Antaki C (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In: Peräkylä A, Antaki C, Vehviläinen S, Leudar I, editors. *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy*, 26–43. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Aragno A (2009). Meaning's vessel: A metapsychological understanding of metaphor. *Psychoanal Inq* 29: 30–47.
- Balint M (1950). Changing therapeutical aims and techniques in psycho-analysis. *Int J Psychoanal* 31: 117–124.
- Bollas C (1979). The transformational object. *Int J Psychoanal* 60: 97–108.
- Borbely A F (2008). Metaphor and psychoanalysis. In: Gibbs RW, Jr. editor. *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, 412–424. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Braten S (2009). *The intersubjective mirror in infant learning and evolution of speech. Advances in consciousness research: v. 76*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.
- Cameron L, Maslen R, editors. (2010). *Metaphor analysis. Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities*. Oakville, Conn: Equinox Pub.
- Dausendschön-Gay U, Krafft U (2002). Text und Körpergesten (Text and body gestures). *Psychother Soz* 4: 30–60.
- Erikson E H (1954). The dream specimen of psychoanalysis. *J Am Psychoanal Ass* 2: 5-56.
- Fiumara G C (1995). *The metaphoric process. Connections between language and life*. London: Routledge.
- Franke E (2008). Raum - Bewegung - Rhythmus. Zu den Grundlagen einer Erkenntnis durch den Körper. In Bockrath F, Boschert B, Franke F, editors. *Körperliche Erkenntnis. Formen reflexiver Erkenntnis*, 15–40. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Freud S (1900). *The interpretation of dreams*. SE 4-5.
- Freud S (1905). Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria. SE 7, 7-122.
- Freud, S. (1916). *Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis*. SE 15/16
- Glucksberg S (2008). How metaphors create categories - quickly. In: Gibbs RW, Jr., editor. *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, 67–83. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin C (2000). Gesture, aphasia and interaction. In: McNeill D, editor. *Language and gesture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin C, editor. (2003). *Conversation and brain damage*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goodwin, C (2011). Contextures of action. In: Streeck J, Goodwin C, LeBaron C D, editors. *Learning in doing: social, cognitive and computational perspectives. Embodied interaction. Language and body in the material world*, 182–193. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Hepburn A, Bolden G B (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In: Sidnell J, Stivers T, editors. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 57–77. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage J C (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In Atkinson JM, Heritage JC, editors. *Structures of social action*, 299–346. New York: Cambridge University Press (edition 1992).
- Jones EE (2000). *Therapeutic action: A guide to psychoanalytic therapy*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Kächele H, Albani C, Buchheim A, Hölzer M, Hohage R, Mergenthaler E, Jiménez JP, et al. (2006) The German specimen case Amalia X: Empirical studies. *Int J Psychoanal* **87**: 809–826.
- Korobov N, Bamberg M (2007). "Strip poker! They don't show nothing!": Positioning identities in adolescent male talk about a television game show. In: Bamberg MGW, de Fina A, Schiffrin D, editors. *Selves and identities in narrative and discourse*, 253–272. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.
- Krejić E (2009). Immersion in the surface. *Int J Psychoanal* **90**: 827–842.
- Lakoff G (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff G, Johnson M (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lepper G (2000). *Categories in text and talk. A practical introduction to categorization analysis*. London/Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Lepper G (2009). The pragmatics of therapeutic interaction: An empirical study. *Int J Psychoanal* **90**: 1075–1094.
- Levin F, editor. (2009). *Emotion and the psychodynamics of the cerebellum: A neuro-psychoanalytical analysis and synthesis*. London: Karnac.
- Levinson S C (2006). On the human "Interaction Engine". In: Levinson SC, Enfield NJ, editors. *Wenner-Gren Center International symposium series. Roots of human sociality. Culture, cognition and interaction*, 39–69. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Levy ST, Inderbitzin LB (1990). The analytic surface and the theory of technique. *J Am Psychoanal Assoc* **38**: 371–391.
- Levy R, Ablon J, Thomä H, Kächele H, Ackerman J, Erhardt I, Seybert C (2012). A session of psychoanalysis as analyzed by the Psychotherapy Process Q-set: Amalia X, session 152. In: Levy RA, Ablon JS, Kächele H, editors. *Psychodynamic Psychotherapy Research*, 509–528. New York: Humana.
- MB (2003). *Metaphern der 'Kur'. Qualitative Studien zum therapeutischen Prozeß {Metaphern of cure. Qualitative studies of the therapeutic process}(2. edition)*. Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- MB (2014). Patterns of empathy as embodied practice in clinical conversation - a musical dimension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5: doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00349.
- MB, FK, KM (2008). *Tat-Sachen. Narrative von Sexualstraftätern*. Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- MB & HK (2013). Conversation analysis – A powerful tool for psychoanalytic practice and psychotherapy research. *Language and Psychoanalysis* **2**: 4–30.
- Mazokopaki K, Kugiumutzakis G (2010). Infant rhythms: Expressions of musical companionship. In: Malloch S, Trevarthen C, editors. *Communicative musicality. Exploring the basis of human companionship*, 185–208. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meltzoff A N, Gopnik A, Repacholi B M (1999). Toddlers' understanding of intentions, desires and emotions: Explorations of the Dark Ages. In: Zelazo PD, Astington J. W.,

- Olson DR, editors. *Developing theories of intention. Social understanding and self-control*, 17–42. Mahwah, NJ/London: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Mondada L (2013). The conversation analytic approach to data collection. In: Sidnell J, Stivers T, editors. *The handbook of conversation analysis*, 32–57. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- O'Dell M L, Nieminen T, Lennes M (2012). Modeling turn-taking rhythms with oscillators. *Linguistica Uralica* **48**(3): 218–227.
- Osborne N (2010). Towards a chronobiology of musical rhythms. In: Malloch S, Trevarthen C, editors. *Communicative musicality. Exploring the basis of human companionship*, 545–565. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peräkylä A (2010). Shifting the perspective after the patient's response to an interpretation. *Int J Psychoanal* **91**: 1363–1384.
- Rycroft CS (1956). The nature and function of the analyst's communication to the patient. *Int J Psychoanal* **37**, 469–472.
- Sachs D (2005). Reflection on Freud's Dora case after 48 years. *Psychoanal Inq* **25**: 45–53.
- Salgado J, Cunha C, Bento T. (2013). Positioning microanalysis: Studying the self through the exploration of dialogical processes. *Integr Psych Behav* **47**: 143–161.
- Sidnell J, Stivers T, editors. (2013). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Siegelman E (1990). *Metaphor and meaning in psychotherapy*. New York/London: The Guilford Press.
- Spence DP, Mayes LC, Dahl H (1994). Monitoring the analytic surface. *J Am Psychoanal Ass* **42**, 43–64.
- Stein L I (1967). The doctor-nurse-game. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* **16**: 699–703.
- Stivers T, Enfield N J, Brown P, Englert C, Hayashi M, Heinemann T., . . . Levinson S C (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *PNAS* **106**, 10587–10592.
- Stolorow RD, Atwood GE (1999). Three realms of the unconscious (1992). In: Mitchell SA, Aron L, editors. *Relational psychoanalysis. The emergence of a tradition (vol. I)*. Vol. 14: 365–378. London: The Analytic Press.
- Tateo L (2014). The dialogical dance: Self, identity, construction, positioning and embodiment in Tango dancers. *Integr Psych Behav* **48**(1), 1–23.
- Tomasello M (1999). *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello M (2003). *Constructing a language. A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello M (2006). Why don't apes point? In: Levinson SC, Enfield JN, editors. *Wenner-Gren Center International symposium series. Roots of human sociality. Culture, cognition and interaction*, 506–524. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Tomasello M (2008). *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge/London: MIT-Press.
- Uhmans S (1996). On rhythm in everyday German conversation: beat clashes in assessment utterances. In: Couper-Kuhlen E, Selting M, editors. *Prosody in conversation. Interactional Studies*, 303–365. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vuust P, Wallentin M, Mouridsen K, Ostergard L, Roepstorff A (2011). Tapping polyrhythms in music activates language areas. *Neuroscience Letters*, **494**: 211–216.

- Waal F de (2007). The 'Russian Doll' model of empathy and imitation. In: Braten S editor. *Advances in consciousness research: vol. 68. On being moved. From mirror neurons to empathy*, 49–73. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.
- Weiste E, Peräkylä A (2014). Prosody and empathic communication in psychotherapy interaction. *Psychotherapy Research*, in press
- Wilson A (2004). Multiple approaches to a single case: Conclusions. *Int J Psychoanal* **85**: 1269-1271.
- Wootton A J (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wootton A J (2012). Distress in adult-child interaction. In: Peräkylä A, Sorjonen ML, editors. *Emotion in interaction*, 42–63. New York: Oxford University Press.