

This category is designed to explore if A has a concept of mistakes (*CT enactment perhaps or the analytic filed as bidirectional*) and whether this is noticed or considered in session. The aim is to bring out underlying ideas and rationales. This category should not be used to supervise the analyst – the analysts must see the comment as a mistake in some way.

Example: “We need to understand this!” [An apparently 1 or 3 type remark but eventually judged by A and group to be 6 – because what had happened before had clearly disturbed the A and this was an enactment of his irritation.
Example: “That’s quite normal” – said in a moment of anxiety by A when there was an external noise, but then realised by A to prevented associations.

Several ideas come together in the sense A talks about things that have been observed together – not necessarily in one session. [An opportunity to explore why this helps or perhaps not – A’s theory of psychic change]
Example: “Maybe you set limits to me like you do to your mother. I am becoming like your nagging and oppressing “mother analyst”. While I nag you with more and more questions you become....”

Basic behaviour creating the setting in simple ways.
 For example: “You have forgotten your coat”, “My holiday begins on Friday”.

(There are circumstances where these comments might be 6 or even 3 – that’s for debate! *Such debate may help to see how this A thinks of the analytic situation.*)

Comments here are likely to be ambiguous, polysemic and brief – aiming (with a specific idea of ucs process) to encourage more association or linking but at **the unconscious** rather than conscious level. *So an opportunity to see what is meant by dynamic unconscious and psychoanalytic process.*

For instance – “Walls? “A mouth with teeth!” “A bedroom!” “Not feeling hateful?”

Note: No comment can escape the conscious or unconscious but some comments are more directed at one than the other. As one participant put it: “a certain type of wording, i.e. repeating a word that seemed to be central, is basically different from, let’s say, clarification, or designation of what is happening in the here and now”.

Such comments apparently make the patient conscious of some observations and so enable one to wonder why that matters to A.. You will recognise them compared to 2 because they are likely to be more saturated (i.e. to have a clear and unambiguous rather than more ambiguous meaning). Compared to a 4 when they concern the analytical relationship they will be more atemporal or apersonal. The discussion why an intervention might be not 4 or 3 etc. is more important than the outcome.

Examples: How do you think of a wall? “What are you thinking?” “What’s going on in your mind?” “Do you think there is a pattern in the way you are here and how you are with your wife?”. “You quite often seem to be irritated by your boss”. “I think you feel you don’t want to talk about that”. “It seems to me you get anxious when you think about coming to see me”. “There was a purpose but it collapsed”. “Tell me more about that feeling”. “Any associations?” “The process of cutting yourself is happening now” (*apersonal? But not atemporal so marginal to 4*)

These comments **must be specific to the emotional or phantasy meaning situation in the current session** –here and now. Distinguish from comments more generally about the analytic relationship. Usually this will mean that the analyst will specify “you” feel “x” about “me” now or vice versa. But precisely this is for group discussion.
Examples: “You feel I am far too interested in you”. “I just made made you anxious”. “You feel guilty t you have not paid me today” “I think you feel I have become grandiose and very pleased with myself” “You hate it that I said something just then and you think you should do the whole thing.”

