EROS IN ANALYSIS

Betsy Cohen

EROS IN ANALYSIS

A dissertation submitted to
The Sanville Institute
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Clinical Social Work

By

BETSY COHEN

September 30, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

I certify that I have read EROS IN ANALYSIS by Betsy Cohen, and that in my opinion this work meets the criteria for approving a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Social Work at The Sanville Institute.

Gareth S. Hill, MSW, PhD, Chair — Date 8/13/09

Cynthia A. O'Connell, PhD, Faculty Member — Date 6/20/09

John Conger, PhD. external member — Date 8/13/09

Whitney van Nouhuys, PhD, Dean — Date 9/21/09

ABSTRACT

EROS IN ANALYSIS

By

Betsy Cohen

Eros, a cosmic, transcendent force, has been omitted from most psychoanalytic literature, yet love and truth are necessary to heal the patient. The founder of our young art and science, Sigmund Freud, was fearful of an erotic countertransference. This theoretical dissertation uses ancient wisdom, particularly the *Song of Songs* from the Hebrew Bible and Plato's erotic dialogues, *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, to create a new template for Eros in psychoanalytic treatment—to incorporate the erotic into the experience of love between patient and analyst.

Through a thorough review of the history of Eros from Freud's thinking of transference love to contemporary psychoanalysis, this study uses the formulation that transference and countertransference are now considered a unit, the field mutually created by analysts and their analysands. Carl Jung and the erotic, particularly his relationship with Sabina Spielrein are explored. Also presented are some modern Jungian analysts, comfortable with Eros in the consulting room, encouraging their own and their patients' full presence in the relationship by not repressing Eros.

A meditative and deep immersion in the *Song of Songs* illustrates how the erotic between analyst and patient mirrors the two lovers in the *Song* and supports an exploration of desire, longing, absence, and imagined presence,

intense vulnerability (*et alia)* in both the *Song* and in analysis. Clinical examples illustrate how this biblical text might deepen analytic work with patients.

An exploration of Plato's theory of *Therapeia* reminds one how to resolve contradictory wills through the honest inquiry of Socratic dialogue, a foundation of analytic work. From the *Symposium,* Diotima's teaching to Socrates is postulated as being fundamental for those seeking a road deeper into the self and away from self-absorbed egos.

Through a detailed analysis of Socrates's palinode in *Phaedrus,* understanding Eros as an originary force larger than sexuality, a new paradigm for accepting our souls' warring nature—the tension between desire and control—is employed. Plato's thinking, including Eros Tyrannos, helps the modern psychotherapist discover a love of wisdom and reason over ignorance. Clinical examples explicate welcoming Eros into the analytic relationship as analyst and analysand fully participate in healing of souls.

DEDICATION

Harvey, Nathaniel, Dashiell,
Gareth, Paul, John, David

—7 card stud—

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the past decade in a Ph.D. program, my family and friends have been understanding, rooting for me, and selfless. My women friends have stood by my side while I have been unavailable for fun. Katherine Olivetti, Kathy Miller, Maggie Hochfelder, Patricia Hart, Lonnie Prince, Jennifer Cobb, Susan Rabens have all asked little but provided much. At the San Francisco Jung Institute, Bryan Wittine, Beth Barmack, Amy Weston, Mark and Barbara Sullivan, Marjorie Nathanson, and many others have also been encouraging. Gale Bailey, friend of 52 years and sister-in-law for 22 years, is always steadfast and loyal. The deep understanding of my sons, Dashiell and Nathaniel, from the sidelines, deserves my heartfelt praise and appreciation.

Cynthia O'Connell was gracious to be on my committee, positive in her comments. She provided little interference and much encouragement. Gail Stewart and Randall Alifano cared for my body and psyche.

Gareth Hill has been my mentor and friend since 1970 and I am in deep gratitude for his perserverence and love. Paul Caringella is my philosophy and theology teacher who has guided me through the thinking, feeling and meditative process of this dissertation, patiently waiting until I finished so we could return to our work on Emmanuel Levinas and scripture. John Conger, my external committee member and friend, has been a cheerleader for my work. His writings and wisdom are a gift to me. David Tresan's writing and friendship have provided a spinal column for my thinking and continuity.

In 1986 in the dedication to my book on envy and the fear of being envied, *The Snow White Syndrome,* I acknowledged the French Hotel for their late night

lattes. In 2009, I wish to acknowledge Harvey Bailey for his editing, his patience, his continued support in times of self doubt, and his reminders that it is important to sleep. I especially applaud his home delivery of soy cappucinos, still delicious, from the French Hotel on Saturday and Sunday mornings.

Thank you all, to all my patients, and to the many others I do not have the space to mention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

> The link between *amor* (love) and *caritas* (charity), or, in Platonic terms, of Eros being rooted in the sensual realm—the same Eros which seeks to carry us with the wings of birds to the abode of the gods—this thesis is far from being a mere theory of the nature of man. It is corroborated existentially in the experiences of treatment by depth psychology. For this modern branch of the art of healing demonstrates that any harsh repression of the capacity for erotic emotion which is rooted in the realm of the senses makes love altogether impossible. (Pieper, 1962, p. 95)

A significant problem regarding how healing occurs is embedded in current psychoanalytic thought. Most theorists and therapists following Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung have agreed that love is a necessary component in the healing process. But why have they left Eros and the erotic out of our definition of love? I hold that in the field of experience between therapists and their patients, the erotic aspect of love is often a necessary component for a deep psychotherapy relationship to be transformative. Yet therapists have been trained to repress, hide from, or fear the presence of Eros in the consulting room.

I investigate this inherent problem by first exploring what is meant by Eros, historically and currently. Drawing on the thoughts of Pope Benedict XVI, I next focus on Eros as it needs to be correctly understood in psychotherapy, followed by an examination of the psychoanalytic literature on the subject of Eros. Fear of Eros and the erotic countertransference is, in part, a fear of transgressing boundaries sexually, and it is the wish to preclude this concrete expression of Eros in the countertransference that has determined the legal and ethical importance of boundaries. However, I show how the failure to acknowledge Eros is more likely to lead to sexual boundary violations and how

passion is a fuel for motivation and movement in therapy within the parameters of the erotic countertransference.

A major purpose of this theoretical study is to enrich and deepen the field of psychotherapy. The art and science of psychotherapy began with Freud in the 1890s, and it is therefore a very young science, usually (and unfortunately) separated and distinct from the larger fields of philosophy and theology. In order to think about Eros in a more challenging way, I probe beyond transference and countertransference toward authentic relationship, drawing from ancient philosophical and religious wisdom traditions, and making more explicit the bridge that exists between these early traditions and modern psychoanalytic thinking.

Because both Freud and Jung were students of early wisdom traditions (Freud, 1905/1953, p. 136; 1925, p. 218; Jung, 1939/1958, p. 518; 1959, p. 79 or see Chapters Four, Five, Six in this dissertation) it is reasonable to assume that their knowledge of those traditions influenced their understanding of the human condition and, thus, the evolution of psychoanalytic thinking. Linking three important works that contain seminal ideas of ancient wisdom, *The Song of Songs* from the Hebrew Bible and Plato's *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, to the clinical model of depth psychotherapy, I demonstrate how these sources of wisdom inform the clinical model.

Why do I write about this when so much has already been written about love and psychotherapy? I undertook this study because little has been written about the importance and acceptance of Eros as a necessary part of therapy. Therapists have been diffident about the subject. I pay particular attention to the relevant overlap of agape and the erotic for both the therapist and the patient.

The erotic in psychotherapy may invite fear in the patient and in the therapist. I explore the symbolism of Eros in order to increase our consciousness of its broader ramifications by looking phenomenologically at what happens in the therapy relationship. I illuminate the transformative effect of Eros, beyond transference and countertransference, in creating a real relationship between patient and therapist. I infuse clinical theory with philosophical and theological searching to develop my argument.

I now offer a brief history of Eros as a background to the force of Eros in our lives. By exploring different creation myths of Eros, not just a set of definitions in a dictionary, I hope to bring out the power, the archetypal force, the variety of the roles Eros plays in imaginative, mythic expressions—that is, the many faces of Eros. My purpose is to illustrate the various meanings, feelings, and tones in therapy that are related to the variety and history of Eros.

Eros and Its Many Meanings

History of Eros: Hesiod

The god Cupid is a popular image of Eros today, the little boy with wings who, as the son of Aphrodite (love) and Mercury (transformation), flew around the world shooting arrows into the hearts of potential lovers, thereby infusing them with love and causing them to be besotted with passion. Our understanding has been limited to a narrow definition of Eros as all-consuming romantic love, where one is obsessed by the beloved, where desire is for a sexual union with the beloved. Part of my argument includes opening and extending our understanding of Eros beyond romantic love and sexual desire. I broaden the

range available to knowing the richness and depth of Eros, to include the depths of passion, lust, possession, aggression, and the higher aspect of Eros's divinity.

Let us go back in time to learn more about Eros. Let us go back three millennia to the 8th century BCE. According to Hesiod (1953), who lived ca. 700 BCE, in the beginning, while the Heliconian muses, the goddesses of speech, poetry, music, and arts, serenaded the poet and shepherd Hesiod, a rhythmic and gentle lyre played. The soft feet of the muses moved in lovely dances. The muses went forth at night, in a veiled mist, and enlivened Hesiod's imagination. They encouraged him to be the first to write and creatively reinterpret the stories he knew were important, stories he had been hearing, stories affecting his whole life, his family, his country, his city, his loved ones, and which affect our souls to this day.[1] He wanted to understand the origin from which everything came and in the middle of which he lived, including the experience of a variety of powers, gods, different shapes and forms and effects, and the interrelationships among them affecting all. Using the power of his own words, he speculated on where he and his world came from, how they came to be. He opened to the awesome mystery of his origins as he traced and codified the history of the family of gods, the interrelationship of the divine and physical cosmos, from stories that predated him, creating a dynamic picture of the heavenly cosmos.

The muses brought richness and life to Hesiod's imagination so that he could fashion the stories of his day into a poem that is still alive for us today, his *Theogony*, an evocative account of the genealogy of the gods. In the beginning,

---

[1] Hesiod's three main sources were Homeric epic poetry, unwritten Greek local and tribal lore, and mythological literature of Ancient Near East (Brown, 1953). Herodotus noted, in about 450 BC, that "Hesiod and Homer are the ones who provided the Greeks with a theogony, gave the gods their names, distinguished their attributes and functions, and defined the various types" (as cited in Brown, 1953, p. 37).

writes Hesiod (1953), was the physical cosmos, Chaos (the Void), Earth (Gaia) and Eros (Desire). From these three divine powers, these primal elements, everything else, including the human cosmos, was born. Yes, Eros, Love, was in the beginning, one of the three most important divine realities. The power and cosmic force of Eros became the source of all creativity and generativity. The strength of Eros and his energy is with us from the beginning of Western thinking. Hesiod said:

> First of all, the Void came into being, next broad-bosomed Earth, the solid and eternal home of all, and Eros [Desire], the most beautiful of the immortal gods, who in every man and every god softens the sinews and overpowers the prudent purpose of the mind. Out of Void came Darkness and black Night, and out of Night came Light and Day, her children conceived after union in love with Darkness. (p. 56)

The three primordial beings, Void, Earth, Desire, emanate from a mysterious divine reality, and all three are enduring and timeless. We see that Gaia "the solid and eternal home of all" (Hesiod, 1953, p. 56), the maternal home, is the first divine reality after the Void (Chaos or empty place). Darkness (Erebos) and Night (Nyx), created without Eros and therefore more like "becomings," were the children of the Void. Yet, Darkness (masculine) and his sister, Night (feminine), with the impetus of Eros (desire), created Light and Day. (Light came first in the Old Testament, as we see in Genesis 1:3 (New Revised Standard Edition Bible)—in the beginning, God proclaimed, let there be light—as the newborn baby first experiences light).

Hesiod (1953) continues with his narrative of Sky mysteriously emerged from Earth, a virgin birth. Earth also produced the barren waters and the raging sea, all without the passion of love. Earth produced Nature, including human beings; Earth clearly has its own generativity. The analogy we can make is that in

psychotherapy, Eros does not always have to be present; there are long periods of time when Eros is in the background. In some moments we find darkness, night, barrenness, or a raging sea. Hesiod goes on:

> Thereafter she lay with Sky and gave birth to . . . [along with other gods] Themia [Law] and Mnemosyne [Memory]. . . . After these came cunning Cronus, the youngest and boldest of her [Earth's] children; and he grew to hate the father who had begotten him. (p. 57)

Here we find hatred intruding itself into the works of Eros.

Eros was with Gaia (Earth) and her son Uranos (Sky) as they created the twelve Titans. We do not know from this text whether Eros was involved with every stage of emergence. But, it is suspected that Eros was present at perhaps the most important of the earliest generations, that of light and day. The text is specific in the birth of Aphrodite. Hesiod (1953) continues:

> As for the organs themselves, for a long time they drifted round the sea just as they were when Cronus cut them off with the steel edge and threw them from the land into the waves of the ocean; then white foam issued from the divine flesh, and in the foam a girl began to grow. First she came near to holy Cythera, and then reached Cyprus, the land surrounded by sea. There she stepped out, a goddess, tender and beautiful, and round her slender feet the green grass shot up. She is called Aphrodite by gods and men because she grew in the froth. . . Eros [Desire] and beautiful Passion were her attendants both at her birth and at her first going to join the family of the gods. (p. 59)

We see that Aphrodite was born through violence. Sky lost his sexual organs in the first castration when Cronos, encouraged by his mother, Earth, cut them off with the steel edge of a huge grey sickle with jagged teeth.

Eros and Passion are closely linked. Perhaps they are twins, as we often feel them to be, and they accompany Aphrodite as she joins the family of the gods. To distinguish Eros from the Roman god Cupid, we see that Eros is right there when Aphrodite is born.

> The rights and privileges assigned to her from the beginning and recognized by men and gods are these; to preside over the whispers and smiles and tricks which girls employ, and the sweet delight and tenderness of love. (Hesiod, 1953, p. 59)

We know that some of the tricks employed by girls become cunning, manipulative, teasing, and harmful.

Hesiod (1953) builds a dramatic story, a mythical poetic evocation rather than an academic textbook. His creation myth is one of Love (Eros) and Death (Thanatos), generational rivalry, blood, and gore. We learn that Great Father Sky called his children the Titans, and because of his feud with them, he said that they blindly had tightened the noose and had done a savage thing for which they would have to pay in time to come. Eros is also involved with this titanic struggle of destruction. You have to be careful with Eros, as you do with the Void, Chaos, Darkness, Mother Earth, and the power of the raging waters. The three primeval Divine realities are everlasting, immortal, eternal forces. In the Hebrew and Christian traditions that shape much of Western thought, the eternal belongs properly only to God.

Eros is of the first generation of gods. Eros is part of the force of creation and proliferation. "Creative energy is a fundamental attribute of power, and, in Hesiod's myth-language, is manifested in procreation" (Brown, 1953, p. 8). The creative energy of desire is involved in the generation and creation of almost everything including bloody generational rivalry of father and son.

These are the themes of deep psychotherapy: life (creation/Eros) and death (destruction/Thanatos). The reality of Eros, the most beautiful of the immortal gods, is powerful. You may not want to give into Eros, yet you cannot deny its presence. It causes weakening of the sinews, softening of the connective

tissues, and overpowers reason, the prudence of the mind. If Eros is more powerful than reason, is it a good and beneficent power? Should we not exercise prudence in its presence?

There are two forces in Eros, good and evil as well as the tension between them. Gods embody the opposites as do we mortals. Aristotle stated that Hesiod, inspired by his muses, realized the need for a moving cause in the universe, and Eros is that moving cause. Hesiod, like Parmenides, invoked Eros, love or desire, "on the ground that there must exist some cause which will move things and draw them together" (as cited in Cornford, 1952, p. 196). Empedocles, the pre-Socratic poet and physician, the inspired seer and minstrel, whose prototype was Orpheus, writes on the invisible cosmic, primal forces, such as Love and Strife, as holding opposite elements. According to Cornford, Empedocles saw Love (Eros) and Strife (Eris) as "conscious and moving forces animating our own bodies with the force which moves the cosmos . . . the invisible power we call love in ourselves is the same as the power which works in all Nature" (p. 152). Eros and Eris—this is what makes the world go round. We need both of these moving forces, as Empedocles suggested. Do you agree with him? I do, in that he invites us to contemplate love with thought, an invitation that should be embraced by the modern psychotherapist. Since Eros is often experienced through the senses, visually, emotionally, or bodily, if we experience Eros through thought and the examination of our soul and that of our patient, we are more likely to welcome it into our clinical hour in a thoughtful and meditative way.

Creation Myths of Eros: Orphic Mysteries

The Greeks had many gods to choose from in their worship. It was not a matter of either-or, but *when* to pay homage rather than devotion to one god over another. To look for a logical, religious consistency in 5th century Greece would be a mistake. According to W. K. C. Guthrie (1965), "If religion is anything, it is an experience which transcends thought" (p. 308). We will explore the scant evidence[2] we now have of Orphism, mindful of Guthrie's words: "employing it soberly, without pretending . . . the truth can never be known" (p. 309). Orphism was probably a mass of popular beliefs inherited by every 5th century Greek. Even with scant evidence and limited scholarly sources, information abounds on the Orphic Tradition, such as its beliefs, doctrine, literature, rituals, influence, class structure, and religion. Using secondary sources, I summarize primarily the cosmogony of the tradition as well as its patron, Orpheus, who was familiar to Plato and other Greek writers.

Orpheus, the titular of a religion shrouded in mystery, sacred *logoi*, was a generation older than Hesiod and Homer, a prehistoric dweller in Thrace[3] and is most noted for his inspirational musicality and connection with Apollo. We might remember the Grecian-dressed Orpheus from 5th century vase paintings, calming and charming men and nature with his lyrical song and consoling lyre.

---

[2] Evidence used to decipher the Orphic Tradition was based on "a common body of doctrine; largely eschatological, observed in certain passages of Empedocles, some of the great myths of Plato, certain passages of Pindar, and the gold plates from South Italian graves" (Guthrie, 1993, p. 309).

[3] To the ancient Greeks, Thrace was that part of the Balkans between the Danube River to the north and the Aegean Sea to the south, being bounded on the east by the Black Sea and the Sea of Marmara and on the west by the mountains east of the Vardar River. Modern Thrace includes parts of Turkey, Greece and the Balkans (Wikipedia, 2008b).

Though he worshipped Apollo, he was adopted as a god by men who followed Dionysus. Hence he is associated with Dionysiac or Orphic mystery rites that promised divine sacrament for a life of immortality through regeneration and reincarnation of the soul, a guarantee the soul would leave the body. (Pringle-Pattison, 1922)

But ecstatic rites, as practiced by Dionysus's followers, were by themselves insufficient to provide salvation for the Greeks who believed in the Orphic tradition, as the followers of Apollo sought a deeper purity of soul throughout life. The Orphic tradition, which influenced Plato, though he was not "an Orphic," fused both the formality and rules of Apollo and the enthusiasm, *ekstasis*, and spiritual hope of Dionysus (Guthrie, 1965, p. 318).

We must use caution also when examining the theogony and cosmogony of the Orphics, as our sources are post-Aristotelian and mostly Neo-Platonist (Guthrie, 1965, p. 319). The Orphic tradition says the puissant Eros was hatched from a large primal world egg (some say silver, some say gold), fashioned by Time (not found in the Hesiod cosmogony) in the *aether* (father or spirit), an ovarian account. Again, at the beginning, there is Eros, the first of the gods, for otherwise, no other gods could have been born. Embedded in the human mystery of birth, procreation, and death, Eros, the creative force of all future generations, sets the universe in motion. The Orphics named Eros "Phanes"—Light or the Bright One—from whence comes our word epiphany, the sudden knowledge of an essence, the recognition of a deity, a flash of insight or revelation. According to Guthrie, from this raw Orphic folk tale we find a god who both creates and rules the world, resonant of our Judeo-Christian belief in the Creator, the divine originator of humanity.

The Orphic mystery religion's allegory of Eros born from the World or Cosmic Egg reminds me of the common riddle: which came first, the chicken or the egg? Here we see that the egg came first, and from the egg was born Love, and with it, light emerged from darkness. In the Eleusinian Mysteries, Eros was worshiped as Protogonus, the first-born, or Phanes. Eros, Phanes, Light lifted the sky from the Earth and created Light when only darkness existed before.

A primary assumption of Ionian cosmogony, as we discovered in Hesiod, is that in the beginning there is a primary unity, a state of non-differentiation, from which pairs of opposites emerge.[4] The Orphics wrestled with the question of both union with and separation from the human and divine. They named the state of unity or nothingness Chaos and Night, black Erebus (the personification of deep darkness and shadow) and Tartarus (a deep abyss lower than the underworld of Hades) that existed before earth, air, and sky (heaven). Night is darkness, cold. Aristotle connects Night with Hesiod's Chaos. The Athenian comedic playwright, Aristophanes, in *The Birds*, parodies the Orphic myth of Eros's birth. Night mated with darkness (Erebus) and from this "sprang the graceful Eros with his glittering golden wings, swift as the whirlwinds of the tempest" (Aristophanes, 2007, p. 59). Aristophanes joked that Eros is a bird, because he is winged, soars like all other birds, and assists in love affairs between

[4] Guthrie (1993) in *Orpheus and Greek Religion* draws on the work of Otto Gruppe for information about the Orphic theogony. Gruppe summed up this central doctrine in words ascribed to Musaios, Orpheus's pupil: "Everything comes to be out of One and is resolved into One" (p. 75). Guthrie then explicates this statement: "At one time Phanes, at another Zeus contained the seeds of all being within his own body, and from this state of mixture in the One has emerged the whole of our manifold world, and all nature animate or inanimate . . . everything existed at first together in a confused mass, and . . . the process of creation was one of separation and division" (p. 75).

humans.[5]

From the Christian apologist and purported Platonist, Athenagoras (133-190 CE), we find another version of the tale. The initial void was Nyx, black-winged goddess of Night. With help from the wind, she laid a golden egg upon which she sat for ages. Centuries later, the egg began to stir and from it hatched Eros, the god of Love. One half of the shell ascended into the air and became Sky/Heaven and the lower half became Earth. Eros named the sky Uranos and the Earth Gaia and created Love between them. Eros reunited its parents in marriage, creating unity from separation (Cornford, 1952, p. 191). According to F. M. Cornford, there were no immortals or human kind before Eros united its parents in marriage, allowing the work of creation. Cornford reports that Euripides, in his fragments, describes the parched Earth's desire for rain:

> Love moves the pure heaven to wed the Earth; and Love takes hold on Earth to join in marriage. And the rain, dropping from the husband heaven, impregnates Earth, and she brings forth for men pasture for flocks and corn, the life of man. (p. 197)

Here Eros is substituted by its physical medium: the heat of the sun brings

---

[5] In *The Birds*, Aristophanes (2007) says: "At the beginning there was only Chaos, Night, dark Erebus, and deep Tartarus. Earth, the air and heaven had no existence. Firstly, black-winged Night laid a germless egg in the bosom of the infinite deeps of Erebus, and from this, after the revolution of long ages, sprang the graceful Eros with his glittering golden wings, swift as the whirlwinds of the tempest. He mated in deep Tartarus with dark Chaos, winged like himself, and thus hatched forth our race, which was the first to see the light. That of the Immortals did not exist until Eros had brought together all the ingredients of the world, and from their marriage Heaven, Ocean, Earth and the imperishable race of blessed gods sprang into being. Thus our origin is very much older than that of the dwellers in Olympus. We are the offspring of Eros; there are a thousand proofs to show it. We have wings and we lend assistance to lovers. How many handsome youths, who had sworn to remain insensible, have opened their thighs because of our power and have yielded themselves to their lovers when almost at the end of their youth, being led away by the gift of a quail, a waterfowl, a goose, or a cock" (p. 59).

moisture from the earth, moisture that returns as rain, like Eros, to fertilize and create living things.

Biblical Parallels

We will never know if Hesiod and others who described a cosmogony or creation of the universe were influenced by the Hebrew Old Testament. What we can imagine is that the whole Mediterranean, Aegean, Middle Eastern, and Asia Minor areas shared common notions about nature, history, and divine forces. There was a great deal of trade, as sailors traveled from port to port carrying with them the popular stories of the gods. We do not know for sure, but Hebrew creation accounts may have been part of the circulation of notions. Genesis may not have been a fully formed written document but Hesiod and the Israelites were working out of a common Mediterranean pool and melting pot of notions, ideas, sentiments, imaginings, but without enormous understanding.

What we find is a curious connection between Genesis and Hesiod's cosmological beginning.

From Genesis 1:1-5, we learn:

> In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. Now the earth was unformed and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God hovered over the face of the waters. And God said: "Let there be light." And there was light. And God saw the light, and it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness He called Night.

In Genesis 6, God created heaven, the firmament, and divided it from the waters. In Genesis 10, God created Earth, which he divided from the Seas. In Genesis 11, God created grass, seeds, herbs, fruit-bearing trees on the Earth. In Genesis 16, from the heavens God created the lights of the sun, moon, stars. In 20 and 21,

come the living creatures, below and above, fish and fowl; in 24, the living creatures of the Earth; and in 26, God created the opposites, male and female, in His own image. All this in six days, and "it was good" (Genesis 1:9).

In Hesiod as well as in Genesis, the beginning was the void, nothingness, eternal nothingness, a nothingness that Carl Jung says is both empty and full.[6] And from the void came Earth, darkness and light, Night and Day. Earth, Sky, Ocean were in the forefront. But in Genesis, God is the Creator, there is no Eros (or Phanes) at the outset to enable the world to be fruitful and multiply. That is God's job. In Hesiod, there is a monopoly of the forming powers. In Genesis, there is one God. There are no personifications or mythical figures in the first thirty-one sentences of the Genesis creation story, but there is the experience of dividing, separating, and differentiating the opposites.

The biblical issues that accompany the anthropogony, the stories, successes and failures of major individuals, the sin of Adam, the sins at the time of Noah, the call of Abraham to cease the primitive worship of idols, the narratives of Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joseph, all build toward the prophetic covenantal community between God and man. The *Song of Songs* binds God to his love of the people, his chosen. In Genesis, God does not have to slay monsters. He creates by the power of His word. He creates man, who is not faithful to his Creation, who has to learn to be faithful. This is not the story that Hesiod tells.

---

[6] "This nothingness or fullness we name PLEROMA. . . . Nothingness is both empty and full. . . . The pleroma is both beginning and end of created beings. . . . We are, however, the pleroma itself, for we are a part of the eternal and infinite. Even in the smallest point is the pleroma endless, eternal, and entire. It is that nothingness which is everywhere whole and continuous" (Jung, 1961, p. 379).

In both Hesiod's Theogony and the Hebrew Torah we find the separating of primal elements, because humans have a sense that earlier there was something more unified that became differentiated, a human way of imagining and attempting to understand his world. Believers in Genesis and the Theogony are looking for an understanding of the beginning, a basic human trait, just as we try to understand what happened early on in our personal history. These primal cosmological and theological powers mean a great deal. One asks, where did this overpowering movement of love, or earth, sky, stars, heaven come from? What is the ground? What is the cause? Why is it this way and not otherwise? Why is there pain or suffering? Common questioning—the experience of the question is more important than the answer. For example, what is this thing called love?

Let me say clearly that I do not believe the word Eros (Love) can be adequately limited or defined. But in an attempt to come to a better or deeper understanding, we will nevertheless fast forward to Rome, Christmas Day 2005, Pope Benedict XVI's first encyclical address to the world, "Deus Caritas Est," God is Love. Why study Pope Benedict as a way to move closer toward an understanding of love? He provides an historical search for how others have tried to define love and also offers a thorough analysis of "love" as I mean it in this argument. What we know is that there are many realities of the word "love" and many forms of experience, all similar, all different—love between man and woman, therapist and patient, love between friends, parent and child, love for one's country, one's embracing of life, love for one's God.

A Short History of How Others Have Expressed Love in the Past Four Thousand Years

The ancient Greeks used three different words to express the meaning of Love. The first is *Eros*, passionate love with sexual desire and longing, although for Plato it meant the love or appreciation of beauty and goodness within a person. Plato reminds us that lovers and philosophers (lovers of wisdom) seek truth, spiritual truth, and the knowledge of beauty and the soul through Eros.

The second meaning of Love in Greece was expressed in the word *philia*, loyalty, love between friends, family, or the enjoyment of the activities and blessings of life. It is the root of the word philosophy, philia (love) plus Sophia (wisdom).

The third meaning of Love in Greece was expressed in the verb *agapao*—to treat with affection, to caress, love, be fond of. The noun *agape* connotes desiring the true well-being for another, a generalized, unselfish love. God's love toward man was translated as agape. The New Testament avoided Eros and stressed Agape. Agape was not a frequent philosophical term, used neither by Plato nor Aristotle who did write about Philia and Eros.

In both the Old and later the New Testament, agape is understood as a self-surrender, as in giving of oneself. It is a self-sacrificing love for another or for God, or God's love for humanity—the covenant of God and man. God's love was compared by the prophets to the love of a mother—God who passionately loves his people. An agape type of love is found throughout the Old Testament—for example, in Psalm 23:6, "Kindness and faithful love (hesed) pursue me every day of my life. I make my home in the house of Yahweh for all time to come," or in Leviticus 19:18, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." In New Testament

literature, agape came to mean the relationship of Jesus and John, his beloved disciple, as well as a self-sacrificing love, the repeat of "love your neighbor as yourself" (Matthew 22:39).[7] In Paul's 1 Corinthians 13 we are reminded that "without love [agape], I am nothing," or that love is patient, kind, rejoices in truth and is eternal, never ending.

The Rabbis and the Fathers of the Church were aware that Eros for the Greeks was both a god and the passionate desire that the god represented. They therefore subordinated all such "divine" forces to the power, law, and gifts the One and Only God revealed to them. Both the Old and New Testaments in effect demoted Eros. The Old Testament in its first Commandment prohibited the worship of other gods, which I presume includes a deified Eros, as a sin against monotheism.

Those who believed in one God, the monotheistic Creator and Divine Presence, could demonize Eros for its potentially damaging, insatiable, lustful immorality. In the first century, the Jewish "wisdom poet" Pseudo-Phocylides was clear: "Do not deliver yourself wholly to unbridled Eros toward your wife [or a woman], for Eros is not a god but a passion destructive to all" (as cited in van der Horst, 2006, p. 63).

Pope Benedict (2005) asks if the meanings of the word "love" are a single reality, or if the same word is used for different realities? Are the love of God, love between man and woman, love between friends, for one's family, for one's country, profession, the same (p. 3)?

---

[7] "Caritas (agapē, αγαπη) is an unconditional love directed towards one's neighbor which is not dependent on any lovable qualities the object of love possesses. Agape is the love that brings forth caring regardless of circumstance. Lewis recognizes this as the greatest of loves, and sees it as a specifically Christian virtue" (Wikipedia, 2008a).

If we follow the history of the word Eros before and after Greek philosophy and cosmology into the Old and New Testament, we find that the Greek word does not appear in the New Testament but that erotic sexuality had not been abandoned in the Old Testament. Benedict (2005) explains that it is the destructive Eros that the Old Testament abandons because "this counterfeit divinization of Eros actually strips it of its dignity and de-humanizes it" (p. 4). But, the question is: By focusing primarily on the destructiveness of Eros, has the current understanding of the ethics of psychotherapy also stripped Eros of its humanity, creativity, and divine purpose?

What words are used for love in the Old Testament? *Hesed*, the Hebrew word for love, a noun, occurs 245 times in the Old Testament. It means kindness, mercy, used both in secular and religious contexts. *Hesed* is also a long-term covenant love, a relational concept—God's enduring, faithful, everlasting, steadfast love of Israel and mankind, often connected with compassion and justice. In Deuteronomy 6:4-5, it is Israel's faith/love, the covenant of love between His people and God. The monotheistic God is the God of love and faith. Faithfulness and love are interconnected in the Old Testament; the two words are as one (Genesis 20:13, 21:23, 40:14).

The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Botterweck, 1978) says that *hesed* is active, contains good acts, grace, goodness, and interestingly, it is an act "that preserves or promotes life" (p. 51). Hence, in the promoting of life, it is close to Eros. Secularly, *hesed* is between persons, between friends, between sovereign and subjects, in unusual acts of mutual kindness and goodness.

Another Hebrew word for love in the Old Testament is *AhaVaH*, love in the romantic sense and also the passionate love of God for man, used in the same

broad ways and contexts as the English term love—sexual love, love for a spouse or child, love of humanity by God, friendship, and so on. In the well-known "love your neighbor as yourself" (Leviticus 19:18) love, *AhaVaH*, is the true discovery of the other. In the New Testament, *AhaVaH* became agape. *AhaVaH* can be a verb, an action, actualizing *Hesed*. In modern Hebrew, *Hesed* and *AhaVaH* are used interchangeably.

The Hebrew word *YaDa'* means knowledge, both intellectual and spiritual, and also carnal knowledge, as in Adam knew (*YaDa'*) his wife Eve, and they conceived two sons. *DoDiM* means erotic love, passion, especially in the Song of Songs. Other words are *Cheshek*, yearning or desire, *Ta'aVaH*, lustful desire, and very importantly *RaTSoN*, which is desire in the sense of willing or wishing. *KaNa'*, formerly translated as jealous (as in "a jealous God" with respect to not worshiping/serving other gods), is better translated as "impassioned." What a rich vocabulary for love in the Hebrew Bible!

The presence of sexuality per se in the Hebrew Bible depends on the interpretation of love as human or divine. In Genesis we are made in God's image; we should be fruitful and multiply, and "they be of one flesh" (Genesis 2:24); the creation of man and woman, is "good." And Sarah at age 90 seems to remember having had sexual pleasure when she made love with Abraham. When the Lord promised her a child, Sarah laughed within herself, pondering, in anticipation: "After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord (Abraham) being old also?" (Genesis 18:12).

The passage where Sarah's son, Isaac, falls in love at first sight with his bride, Rebekah, is quite romantic. Rebekah's response to Isaac is also immediate. "And Rebekah lifted up her eyes, and when she saw Isaac, she alighted from the

camel" (Genesis 24:64). "Then Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent. He took Rebekah, and she became his wife; and he loved her. So Isaac was comforted after his mother's death" (Genesis 24:67).

Isaac was so enamored of his attractive wife Rebekah that he apparently could not resist fondling or "sporting" with her in public (Genesis 26:8). This intimate behavior alerted the king of Gerar to the couple's marital relationship, so that he was able to warn his male subjects not to seduce Rebekah (Genesis 26:9-11).

In turn, Isaac and Rebekah's son, Jacob, loved the beautiful Rachel and because of his deep erotic feelings found it an easy matter to work off her bride price for seven years. "So Jacob served seven years for Rachel, and they seemed to him but a few days because of the love he had for her" (Genesis 29:20).

After marrying Rachel's older sister, Leah, through his father-in-law's deceitful substitution of his elder daughter, Jacob is at last able to marry Rachel as well: "So Jacob went into also unto Rachel, and he loved Rachel more than Leah" (Genesis 29:30). The story of the favored younger and the older unattractive wife emphasizes the jealousy that can easily arise in matters of sexuality. By bargaining for bed time through a payment of some aphrodisiac mandrake plants that her son Reuben had found, Leah is entitled to meet Jacob when he returns home to tell him that he is sleeping with her. "'You must come in to me, for I have hired you with my son's mandrakes.' So he lay with her that night" (Genesis 30:16). Love and hate, manipulation and competition, sex as love or commerce—these may be part of marriage, as the Old Testament acknowledges with its sparkling realism.

In Torah we find the many faces of Love that in Greek belong to the realm of Eros. We experience the positive side, the desire to procreate, perhaps recreate oneself when one has an erotic attachment, but also the negative, such as the deceit and manipulation of Leah when she lied to Jacob and pretended to be his intended, his beloved Rachel. There are stories of rape and incest. The laws and legal prohibitions to protect man and woman from the dark side of Eros are stringent and binding. If a man meets a virgin who is not engaged and seizes her and lies with her and they are caught in the act, the man who lay with her shall give fifty shekels of silver to the young woman's father, and she shall become his wife. Because he violated her, he shall not be permitted to divorce her as long as he lives (Deuteronomy 22:28-29). "If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death" (Leviticus 20:10).

We move from the Old Testament, through the Septuagint, to the New Testament. The Septuagint is the Hebrew Bible translated into Greek by Hellenistic Jews, written in early 2nd century BCE Alexandria, Egypt under the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Legend tells us that seventy-two Jewish scholars were asked individually to translate the whole Hebrew Bible. The seventy-two translations, translated in seventy-two days, were identical in their expression. Why was that? Because the Torah was divinely given (New World Encyclopedia, 2007).

The word Eros is used twice in the Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint, and discarded completely in the New Testament.[8] Two places in the Septuagint where we find Eros are in reference to erotic desire in Proverbs. An adulterous woman says to a young man she is trying to seduce, "Come let us feast ourselves in pleasure until morning. Let us delight together in love (eroti)" also translated as "Let us drown ourselves in passion" (Proverbs 7:18). The second occurrence has a similar negative tone: "Three things are insatiable (never satisfied), four never say enough: Hades, feminine eros (*eros gynaikos*), the earth never saturated with water, and the fire that never says 'enough'" from Proverbs 30:16, which has no exact equivalent in the Hebrew Bible (van der Horst, 2006, p. 63).

The Septuagint version, used by Hellenistic Jews and Greek-speaking Christians, including St. Paul, became the Bible of the early Christian church and predicted the coming of the Christian Messiah. Therefore the Jews closed the Septuagint and returned to the Hebrew version which focused on the law of God more than the love of God.

Pope Benedict XVI's *Deus Caritas Est*

The New Testament has been widely criticized for abandoning Eros. Pope Benedict (2005) mentions the German philosopher, Frederich Nietzsche's question: "Doesn't the Church, with all her commandments and prohibitions, turn to bitterness the most precious thing in life" (Neitzsche, 2008, p. 168). Following through on Nietzsche's assertion, Pope Benedict questions if the Church, through its many prohibitions and poison, ruins Eros, makes Eros into a

[8] Agape, Eros, and Phileo were used in a less compartmentalized way then than they are now. Also, in the Septuagint, agape was mentioned 268 times next to twelve times for Phileo (Lambert, 1981, p. 39).

vice, sours what is precious to life, procreation, and creativity. "Doesn't she blow the whistle just when the joy which is the Creator's gift offers us a happiness which is itself a certain foretaste of the Divine" (p. 4)?

Is this accusation true? As we shall discover in Plato's *Phaedrus*, Eros can be a "divine madness," and when overwhelmed by this aspect of divinity, one can find truth, beauty, and utmost happiness.[9] But the early Greeks, as we have seen in Hesiod's cosmos, believed Eros was powerful enough a god to "overpower the prudent purpose of the mind" (Hesiod, 1953, p. 56).

We also find the aggrandizement of Eros in the fertility cult religions, such as the Orphic tradition mentioned above, where Eros was worshipped as divine power, and we understand why the Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, had to "blow the whistle" on the idols worshiped in these cults. The idols were false gods, and, as Abraham proved to his father, they could be easily broken. As we have learned, monotheism did not deny or negate Eros in its entirety; monotheism responded to the brokenness of false gods. Pope Benedict (2005) reminds us that the

> prostitutes in the temple, who had to bestow this divine intoxication, were not treated as human beings and persons, but simply used as a means of arousing "divine madness"; far from being goddesses, they were human persons being exploited. An intoxicated and undisciplined *eros*, then, is not an ascent in "ecstasy" towards the Divine, but a fall, a degradation of man. Evidently, *eros* needs to be disciplined and purified if it is to provide not just fleeting pleasure, but a certain foretaste of the pinnacle of our existence, of that beatitude for which our whole being yearns. (p. 5)

How does the New Testament find the beatitude of Eros when it excludes Eros, looks upon it as leading to non-monogamous carnal love? Pope Benedict (2005) notes the relationship between the Divine and Love and explains that Eros is also

---

[9] My summary of Plato's *Phaedrus* will be documented in Chapter Five.

the experience of God's presence, the delight and ecstasy one feels in God's presence. Man's wholeness of being results in the unity of his body and soul. The challenge of Eros is this unity, a unity achieved through growth, maturity, purification, and the healing renunciation of giving into one's instinct, thus leading us to Love in its promise of infinity and eternity (p. 6). Actually, the ascent towards the Divine revealed in the New Testament is similar to but more personal than the ascent toward Beauty as described by Plato in *Symposium*.

Eros can be a self-absorbed, self-satisfied, and self-seeking love, or it can lead us to a discovery, a concern and care of the other. (We will amplify this capacity of Eros later in the study). Of course we can also discover the other through sexuality, but, as Benedict (2005) reminds us, the body, as pure biology and material, when exploited and debased, is not part of the vital meaning of our whole being. This is Eros gone awry, as in boundary violations. When man (woman) loves, with both soul and flesh, Eros is victorious. As Pope Benedict says, Eros has "attained its authentic grandeur" (p. 4).

Since Eros is fundamental to the nature of man and the universe, perhaps it is the thwarted or disunited Eros that has an enormous destructive power, evoking rivalries among the gods, passions that can ruin lives and possessive obsessions that lead to greed, envy, and sometimes murder. The negative face of Eros is lust, possessiveness. Lust is more a part of the erotic when thwarted or rejected and not sublimated into one's sexual appetites or a mature love. Pope Benedict (2005) reminds us that Love provides a promise of infinity and eternity. As we shall explore later in this study, Love is stronger than Death. We do not achieve eternity by giving into instinct (body) but through purification and growth and renunciation (not giving in to bodily desire). In maturity, Eros

returns to its original meaning in both Plato and the Old Testament, an experience of the Divine's presence, delight, and ecstasy.

Eros is more than passion, more than the desire for sexual union. It is a way of being in the world, a cosmic force that moves and enlivens, a spirit and a bodily communion with the divine. Does Eros promote or hinder our capacity to pay attention to the Other as truly other in benevolence or agape? It is almost impossible to experience the Eros of sexual desire without desiring to possess, desiring sexual intimacy, and the intermingling of need and desire.

This theoretical study asks why in our theories of psychotherapy has there been vivisection of the divine out of Eros? Does the focus on reducing Eros to sexual desire lead to fear of boundary violations? In this search, we look at how today's psychotherapist struggles with the power of Eros in himself and his patient, at how Eros is integral to the actual therapeutic process, at the play of forces in the souls and bodies of the therapist and patient in the process.

Toward this end, we look at Eros in the analytic relationship, Eros as both personal and divine in the *Song of Songs* of the Old Testament and Plato's ascension of Eros in *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*. The Rabbinic and Christian caution about sexual desire parallels Plato's concern for the balance of the virtues ordered by wisdom. It also parallels Plato's attention in the *Republic*, Book 9, to destruction that occurs when the good in Eros is overpowered by Eros Tyrannos, which therapists do have good reason to fear. After Plato's understanding of Eros, we examine Carl Jung's knowledge of Plato and Martin Buber's exploration of the good and evil urges in morality. But first we begin with a literature review on Eros in the analytic relationship, concentrating on its manifestation in the countertransference.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

> Eros in the Countertransference: "the topic that dare not speak its name" (Judith Vida, personal communication, May 20, 2008)

My review of the literature is an exploration of Eros in psychoanalysis, particularly from the perspective of countertransference. In addition, I discuss why the concepts of transference and countertransference are now considered a unit rather than two distinct experiences. I begin by tracing the development of Freud's thinking about love and Eros, primarily in relation to psychoanalysis, and continuing with the history of how psychoanalysts following Freud have expanded his original ideas. I then turn to Carl Jung and his understanding of Eros and the erotic. Finally, I focus on what modern Jungians have written about the importance of Eros in Jungian analysis.

Freud

Freud's psychology of love matters greatly to our study. His foundation sets the stage for the psychological literature on love in the century that followed. Freud reminds us of the inherent conflicts about love in the human condition. He informs us that we are ruled by unconscious conflict, and his theory of love is no different. His theory of love, which develops and changes over time, is full of irreconcilable conflicts.

The following summary will focus on Freud's thinking about love in the transference and Eros in a larger-than-sexual sense. Early on, Freud stated that we find the underlying reality of adult love in infantile prototypes. "The finding

of an object is in fact a refinding of it" (1905/1953, p. 222). In other words, we fall in love with individuals who have qualities and aspects that are similar to a previous love object: mother or father. Why does this matter? Because it underscores Freud's thinking about transference love, how he and his followers taught us to think about the erotic in the clinical relationship.

Sexuality

In the late 1890s, Freud began his quest to understand sexuality. He theorized that sexual difficulties caused neurosis. By 1905, his view of sexuality was more encompassing, included the psychosexual, and moved passed infantile sexuality to all physical pleasure, affection, love, and tenderness.

Freud's early understanding of energy or libido (Latin for desire, lust) is love. Freud (1921/1951) wrote,

> Libido is an expression taken from the theory of the emotions. We call by that name the energy (regarded as a quantitative magnitude, though not at present actually measurable) of those instincts which have to do with all that may be comprised under the word "love." The nucleus of what we mean by love naturally consists (and this is what is commonly called love, and what the poets sing of) in sexual love with sexual union as its aim. (p. 37)

Sexuality as the aim of love was Freud's understanding until 1921, when he broadened his view and decided to "share in the name 'love'—on the one hand, self-love, and on the other, love for parents and children, friendship and love for humanity in general, and also devotion to concrete objects and to abstract ideas" (p. 37).

Evolution of Freud's Thinking on Love and Transference Love

Contrary to popular opinion, Freud did not invent the concept of transference. The term was known to hypnotists, such as Janet and Forel, a

century before Freud and was thought of as rapport with the hypnotist, the somnambulic influence (Ellenberger, 1970, p. 490). In the beginning of Freud's thoughts on transference, and eventually transference love, he and Josef Breuer published *Studies on Hysteria* (1895/1957) and established that the patient develops a "false connection" (p. 302) between the doctor and someone important from the patient's past. Transference was both "a compulsion and an *illusion*, which melted away with the conclusion of the analysis" (p. 304, italics added). That early conception of transference was a result of Breuer's experience with his patient, who resisted his cathartic method by transferring painful memories onto the doctor. When *Studies* was published in 1895, transference was then considered an unwanted distortion and impediment to the treatment (Ellenberger, 1970, p. 518).

With the publication of *Studies on Hysteria* (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957) came the first use of the word Eros in modern psychology.[10] *Studies* revealed the then unrecognized erotic transference and countertransference between the first analytic couple, Dr. Breuer and Anna O. Dr. Breuer developed an erotic countertransference to his twenty-one year-old female patient (whom he saw

---

[10] "There are natures of a refined organization who, though their sexual excitability is great, have an equally great moral purity and who feel that anything sexual is something incompatible with their ethical standards, something dirtying and smirching. They repress sexuality from their consciousness, and the affective ideas with a content of this kind which have caused the somatic phenomena are fended off and thus become unconscious.
"The tendency towards fending off what is sexual is further intensified by the fact that in young unmarried women sensual excitation has an admixture of anxiety, of fear of what is coming, what is unknown and half-suspected, whereas in normal and healthy young men it is an unmixed aggressive instinct. The girl senses in Eros the terrible power which governs and decides her destiny and she is frightened by it. All the greater, then, is her inclination to look away and to repress from her consciousness the thing that frightens her" (Breuer & Freud, 1895/1957, pp. 245-246). Are adolescent boys not scared?

twice a week for one and one-half years), and she to him. He talked about Anna endlessly to his wife, who became jealous and morose. Dr. Breuer was concerned about his wife's condition, told Anna she was better, and abruptly ended the treatment after she had developed an hysterical pregnancy. That night he was called back to Anna's home, and found her ill, in an "hysterical childbirth." Through hypnosis, he pulled her out of the childbirth delusion, vacationed with his wife the next day, and impregnated her (Mann, 1997, p. 12). We might say this first therapy, which Anna coined the "talking cure," was also the first sign of danger of the erotic in analysis and laid a foundation for future fears of the erotic leading to boundary violations.

By 1905, with Freud's famous Dora case, transference was no longer unwelcome and became a necessary part of the treatment method.[11] In *The Dynamics of Transference* (1912), Freud writes that transference toward the doctor, set up by both conscious and unconscious ideas, "exceeds, both in amount and nature, anything that could be justified or sensible on rational grounds" (p. 100). Throughout forty-two years of creating his psychoanalytic edifice, Freud alters and deepens his understanding of love, but here, in 1912, he offers an idea that impacted many of his followers: that transference love was neither sensible nor rational. He did not talk about an erotic transference or erotic countertransference, terms first used in the 1950s. What we now call erotic

[11] "What are transferences? They are the new editions or facsimiles of the impulses and phantasies which are aroused and made conscious during the progress of the analysis; but they have this peculiarity, which is characteristic for their species, that they replace some earlier person by the person of the physician. To put it another way: a whole series of psychological experiences are revived, not as belonging to the past, but as applying to the person of the physician at the present moment" (Freud, 1905/1953, p. 116).

transference is what Freud meant by transference love.[12]

In *Observations of Transference Love* (1915/1958), Freud worked to make sense of his own thinking on the subject. Transference love does not arise from the present situation of doctor and patient, but is "entirely composed of repetitions and copies of earlier reactions, including infantile ones" (p. 167). Furthermore, all states of love "reproduce infantile prototypes" (p. 168), and the difference between transference love and real love differ by degree. By the end of this often-reviewed 1915 article, Freud would come to the conclusion that both loves are essentially similar, both are real, "genuine," occur often, and are of theoretical interest.

But Freud, in his efforts to clarify transference and transference love, remained conflicted in his thinking. A year later (1916/1963), he reverts to a more narrow view of transference love:

> The whole readiness for these feelings is derived from elsewhere . . . they were already prepared in the patient, and, upon the opportunity offered by the analytic treatment, are transferred onto the person of the doctor. We overcome the transference by pointing out to the patient that his feelings do not arise from the present situation and do not apply to the person of the doctor, but that they are repeating something that has happened to him earlier. (p. 443)

Is all love derived from internal representations of early objects? I believe this concept is limited. Our experience of each other is more than a mechanical psychic structure, a structure that tells us so little about relationships with real

---

[12]After Freud, transference love became more associated with erotic transference, a term not used by Freud at all. In 1956, E. Rappoport, in "The management of an erotized transference" quoted N. Blitzstein who used the term to "indicate the desire of the patient to overplay the erotic component in the transference and to scream out that he wants his fantasy to be reality, a definition which emphasized the conscious aspects. The implication that patients could control this reaction if only they chose to, may reflect the analyst's annoyance, discomfort, and impatience" (as cited in Lasky & Silverman, 1988, p. 175).

people. In early psychoanalytic theory, we find little to help us explain immediate attachments, intuition, a deep knowing. These are explained away, as if our present experience is only a product of our past. If what we experience in love is a soul connection, it is out of our hands. The experiences of our childhood might not provide the full story. Perhaps something new is happening.

Freud's Theory on the Development of Love

Freud's theory focuses on duality.[13] There are usually two paths to follow or two forces that fight against one another and pull us into their field. In 1905, Freud discusses two types of love: narcissistic and anaclitic—that is, self love and object love. The extremes of these are, on the one hand, severe narcissism or self-love with the inability to attach to someone else, and, on the other hand, intense dependency on another.

In 1921, Freud contrasted identification and being in love. Identification is narcissistic love. It is a reflection of oneself. Being in love is object love, a projection of our ideal self—not who we actually are but who we want to be—onto the other, someone different from our self, what Freud calls an equation of the object with the ego-ideal (1921/1951, p. 60).[14]

---

[13] "Our views have from the very first been *dualistic*, and today they are even more definitely dualistic than before—now that we describe the opposition as being, not between ego instinct and sexual instincts but between life instincts and death instincts. Jung's libido theory is on the contrary *monistic*; the fact that he has called his one instinctual force 'libido' is bound to cause confusion, but need not affect us otherwise" (Freud, 1920, p. 47). Freud (1921/1951) also takes a jab at Jung when Freud postulates the death instinct and calls attention to "critics, who suspected from the first that psycho-analysis explains *everything* by sexuality, or with critics like Jung who, making a hasty judgment, have used the word 'libido' to mean instinctual force in general" (p. 46).

[14] Freud (1905) also wrote that we are capable of love when we reach the genital stage, when we fuse two aspects of libido, the affectionate or tender (which began in infancy) and the sensual, which emerges at puberty.

To restate this concept avoiding psychoanalytic jargon, one is either in love with one's image of oneself or in love with another whom one idealizes. What about love of a stranger, or thy neighbor ("Love thy neighbor as thyself"), or a universal love, love of God? We will examine this further when we look at David Tresan's (2004b) understanding of Jung's view of "real" transference as the template of Christ's love for man and man for Christ (p. 206).

Before 1920, in Freud's system of psychosexual drives, the individual was a closed unit, and the world was a proscenium on which he acted out his unconscious conflicts; all was intrapsychically generated, including the transference. In 1920, in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle,* Freud moved his concept of id instinct beyond sexual libido to include (a) a constructive Eros, (b) a deep unconscious influence on the mind, (c) a life generating desire to reproduce, and (d) Eros as the sexual drive in general. The sexual drive becomes Eros, the love or life drive.

Freud on Eros

In *The Ego and the Id* (1923/1961), Freud amplifies his concept of Eros. It becomes a "neutral displaceable energy . . . a desexualized Eros . . . a desexualized libido . . . sublimated energy . . . the main purpose of Eros—that of uniting and binding—which is particularly characteristic of the ego" (p. 63). He adds that it is also located in the id. Freud readjusts his focus on sexual energy as the sole instinct to include two major instincts, Eros and Thanatos, understanding Thanatos to be the death instinct that manifests clinically as aggression—that is, destructive wishes toward self and others. As Freud claims, "The aim of all life is death" (p. 137). The death instinct pulls us toward

dissolution, a return to the inanimate. Freud here considered the two inseparable, in polarity as well as a compromise. Even so, we shall see in Chapter Three in the *Song of Songs* that Eros is stronger than Thanatos, that Love is stronger than Death.

Wherever this desexualized Eros finds its home, it seems that Freud has refocused the locus of libido from the body to the psyche, although his idea does not seem particularly clear or worked through. His language, however, remains one of biology. "It can easily be assumed that this displaceable libido is employed in the service of the pleasure principle to obviate accumulations of energy and to facilitate discharge" (as cited in Fine, 1962, p. 223). Freud (1923/1961) says his ideas are "supported by biology" (p. 55), that Eros, as the "self-preservation instinct . . . brings about a more and more far-reaching coalescence of the particles into which living matter has been dispersed, thus, of course, aiming at the maintenance of life" (p. 55). Freud asserts that the life and death instincts are "active in every particle of living substance" (p. 56), and from his conclusion, I read that we need to humble ourselves before Eros and Thanatos, instinctual forces over which we have little control.

University of Chicago philosophy professor Jonathan Lear, in *Love and Its Place in Nature: A Philosophical Interpretation of Freudian Psychoanalysis* (1990), attributes to Freud more of a philosophical core than either Freud or his analytic followers acknowledge, and provides the following example from *The Ego and the Id*: "The problem of the origins of life would remain a cosmological one; and the problem of the goal and purpose of life would be answered dualistically" (Freud, (1923/1961) p. 56). With the all-subsuming force of Eros, the sexual drive had become "a manifestation within humans of a principle that permeated life. Sex

thus metamorphosed into love. . . . Human sexuality is an incarnation of life, a force for unification present wherever there is life" (Lear, p. 147).[15] Freud (1923/1961) incorporated "the libidinal, sexual or life instincts . . . under the name *love*; their purpose would be to form living substance into ever greater unities, so that life may be prolonged and brought to higher development" (p. 45).

Freud does not always bring us back to the need for mastery of infantile conflicts or childhood identifications. For example, "Love alone acts as the civilizing factor in the sense that it brings a change from egoism to altruism" (1921/1951, p. 57). But, he does not develop these ideas. His sentence continues, ". . . and this is true of the sexual love for women, with all the obligations which it involves of sparing what women are fond of" (p. 57). Perhaps he is saving the development of altruism for the philosophers and theologians.

Freud was a speculative thinker. He observed clinical phenomena and drew conclusions that became an internal metaphysics (Lear, 1990, p. 143). The problem is that his concepts, as with most theories, have become reified. We talk as if instincts or libido, for example, truly exist as entities. These metaphysical concepts represent human experience. Has psychoanalysis reduced our experience to less than what it is? Psychoanalysis has only so far and had not incorporated a larger language for human experience.

Freud believed that when we fall in love, we are longing for the idealized object—that is, it is a narcissistic wish to have union with our self or our idealized self. As I often tell my patients, when two people fall in love, their

---

[15] Freud (1923/1961) states: "The efforts of Eros to combine organic substances into ever larger unities probably provide a substitute for this 'instinct towards perfection' whose existence we cannot admit" (p. 37).

fantasies intersect, and they each fulfill the ideal of the other for the moment. Freud's (1930/1961) idea of human love is our longing to return to an original state of oneness, as with mother/baby, an oceanic feeling that Freud labels infantile, narcissistic, or later, an Oedipal longing (p. 64). Though it may be infantile, young, early love can be transformative. Freud means by "infantile" a pejorative.

My argument is that psychoanalysis has tended to make "erotic" a pejorative term as well, to envision erotic transference as regressive, a return to an earlier desire for the yummy oneness with mother, sexual desire for parent, a desire to recapture earlier states of bliss, whether these states actually happened or were fantasized. The oceanic experience, womb, that primal closeness in our first few years, the unity of mother/baby, is perhaps the closest experience we have of truly being held and trusting.[16] But it can also pull us not just back in time but to higher desires and deeper loves.

There is, however, promise or hope in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* entry on psychoanalysis that was written by Freud in 1926: "Eros is the instinct which strives for ever closer union" (as cited in Lear, 1990, p. 150). Had he not rejected his religion, had he believed in a religious instinct, he might have allowed himself to explore and incorporate this statement into his understanding of who we are. But instead, he stays back, holds back, keeps us focusing back, and lays the foundations for future analysts to fear where Eros might take us, since so many seem convinced Eros only intends a unity with the physical body of the other.

---

[16] Daniel Stern (1993) and Michael Fordham (1995) argue there is a separate experience of self and other from the beginning of the infant's life.

Freud, however, did not talk about a personal drive for unity; he especially avoided a unity with something larger than oneself, openness to the divine.[17] Freud claimed that the concept of universal love as a motivating force or realizable ideal was highly dubious. He thought that any culture that encourages the love instinct to operate without restraint is setting itself up for an unbridled reign of hate as well (Singer, 1966, p. 116). Freud (1921/1951) was suspicious of the person's drive for perfection (p. 37). Here Freud was perhaps returning to his belief that love is a regressive pull toward oceanic and infantile bliss.[18] "The universal [pervasive] love that Freud calls Eros does not progress toward stages of greater spirituality" (Singer, p. 112). That is for sure. Throughout this study, I will examine how reductive and regressive is the psychoanalytic vision of Eros. What does Freud's theory actually explain about personal relationships? We will remember that, for Freud, love was an attempt to restore the personal past, an attempt to regain an infantile past. What about the love envisioned and

---

[17] David Tresan (2004a) reminds us that in 1948 Jung, in "On Psychic Energy," wrote that excess libido always leads to the religious question, God, primal unity. Jung speaks to the energy of rites and symbols which preserve a state of expectancy, a staying open to the possibility of unity (p. 46).

[18] Romain Rolland, who drew the term from Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa's (1836–1886) account of a mystical experience associated with drowning, had written to Freud about the "oceanic feeling" in a letter of December 5, 1927, very soon after Freud's publication of *The Future of an Illusion* (1927/1981). Freud (1930/1961) wrote that the "true source of religious sentiments consists in a peculiar feeling, which he [Rolland] himself is never without . . . which he may suppose is present in millions of people. It is a feeling which he [Rolland] would like to call a sensation of 'eternity', a feeling as of something limitless, unbounded—as it were, 'oceanic' . . . it is a feeling of an indissoluble bond, of being one with the external world as a whole. . . . I [Freud] cannot discover this 'oceanic' feeling in myself. It is not easy to deal scientifically with feelings" (p. 12). Freud believed the oceanic feeling is from an early, undifferentiated ego state of the baby at the breast and later the need to preserve primary narcissism. If curious about Freud's disavowal of the oceanic experience as mystical, see The *Enigma of the Oceanic Feeling: Revisioning the Psychoanalytic Theory of Mysticism* by William Parsons (1999).

experienced by philosophers and saints, which Freud proudly eschewed? We will look at where else Eros might take us. As we progress through this literature review, let us keep in mind and repeat Hesiod's invocation of the muses for the evocation of the great originary, divine force, Eros.

Eros in the Countertransference

You might ask why I have focused on Freud's understanding of love in the transference rather than the countertransference, since the latter is the subject of my thesis. I believe transference and countertransference are inseparable. If you step into the waters of transference, you are in the ripples of countertransference. Psychoanalysts are slowly coming to this awareness, an understanding Jung wrote about in 1946. Today we recognize that, when in a deep analysis, we are intertwined with the patient, we are in a field of mutuality, a joint enterprise. The patient and analyst live inside one another. We carry our patients in and with us, and they carry us. Tom Ogden (2007) reminds us:

> Consciousness and unconsciousness are aspects of a single entity viewed from different vertices. The unconscious is always a dimension of consciousness whether or not it is easily perceptible, just as the stars are always in the sky whether or not they are obscured by the glare of the sun. (p. 367)

The same image holds true for the transference/countertransference paradigm. Freud's original reason for two distinct categories was to separate out the patient's experience from that of the analyst and to concentrate on the patient, not the analyst. Countertransference was considered undesirable. Transference experience was real for the patient, and the analyst needed to remember it was not real, only a projection. Both categories were used to locate and anchor the feelings and thoughts of the patient and the analyst.

The History of Countertransference and Countertransference Love

Sigmund Freud

Freud (1856-1939) initially was critical of and ambivalent about the countertransference. The regality Freud attributed to transference was not awarded to countertransference.[19] There was a mishmash of transference and countertransference relationships in Freud's early circle. We know that Freud analyzed his own daughter, Anna, as well as Ferenczi, but that Freud never analyzed Ferenczi's negative transference toward Freud. Groddeck and Ferenczi analyzed one another. Groddeck, more sympathetic and capable of unconditional love than Freud had been, had married a woman who had been his patient, and later his assistant, at the sanatorium at Baden-Baden (Rudnytsky, 2002, p. 121). Ferenczi had analyzed his mistress, Gizella. During this analysis, in 1911, Ferenczi fell in love with Gizella's daughter, Elma, who also became his patient. Ferenczi implored Freud to take over the analysis of Elma. Freud agreed. Freud kept Ferenczi updated on the analysis with Elma, particularly how Elma's love for Ferenczi would withstand her analysis with Freud. Ferenczi sent copies of his letters from Elma to Freud, and Freud wrote about Elma to Gizella "in confidence." Gizella showed these letters to Ferenczi. Freud broke off his analysis with Elma, who returned to analysis with Ferenczi. Ferenczi maintained

---

[19] In the *Perverse Subject of Analysis* (1995), when analyzing how his patient's compulsive erotization (an attempt at substituting an illusion of vitality for a psychological deadness) impacts both patient and analyst, Tom Ogden discusses the transference/countertransference as a unit. This unit is co-created jointly by analyst and analysand, develops throughout the analysis, and both participants pay attention to their own unconscious contributions and reveries in order to understand what they are mutually creating. "I do not conceive of transference and countertransference as separable psychological entities that arise independently of or in response to one another, but as aspects of a single intersubjective totality" (p. 1129).

abstinence toward Elma, and neither clarified their loving feelings for one another. Ferenczi broke off the analysis with Elma, and years later, in 1919, married Gizella (Haynal & Falzeder, 1991).

In Freud's inner circle, lack of boundaries abounded with Ferenczi and Ernest Jones as Freud analyzed Jones's common-law wife, Loe Kahn (Haynal & Falzeder, 1991, pp. 5-7). The beginning of psychoanalysis was wrought from triangular, three party relationships. Another is between Jung, his first patient at the Burgholzi Clinic, Sabina Spielrein, and Freud. We know of the love felt between Jung and Spielrein and that she subsequently went to Freud for consultation. In 1911, Freud warns his disciple, Jung, that he had failed in objectivity and been too involved with his patient, Sabina:

> Permit me, speaking as the venerable old master, to say that this technique is invariably ill-advised and that it is best to remain reserved and purely receptive. We must never let our poor neurotics drive us crazy. I believe an article on 'counter-transference' is sorely needed; of course we could not publish it, we should have to circulate copies among ourselves. (as cited in McGuire, 1974, p. 475-476)

Freud's method, on the one hand, required the analyst to be objective. On the other hand, we are familiar with his sentiment expressed to Jung in 1906 that "the cure is effected by love . . . transference provides the most cogent, indeed, the only unassailable proof that neuroses are determined by the individual's love life" (as cited in McGuire, 1974, p. 13). He reiterated this claim at a meeting of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society one month later, "Our cures are cures of love" (as cited in Haynal, 1994, p. xxvi). But, as stated previously, the love was unidirectional, from patient to analyst.

Freud's first mention of countertransference[20] in the scientific literature was in an essay, "The Future Prospects of Psycho-Analytic Therapy" (1910), which he delivered as an address at the opening of the Second Psycho-Analytical Congress:

> Other innovations in technique relate to the physician himself. We have become aware of the "counter-transference," which arises in him as a result of the patient's influence on his unconscious feelings, and we are almost inclined to insist that he shall recognize this counter-transference in himself and overcome it. (pp. 144-145)[21]

Though Freud did not delve further into countertransference as integral to analysis, historically there has been progress, albeit at a snail's pace. Countertransference became an object of study in analytic psychotherapy in the past fifty-five years. Few trained in psychoanalysis were brave enough to counter

---

[20] Freud first used the word "countertransference" privately when he wrote Jung (who experienced what we now call erotic countertransference toward his patient Sabina Spielrein) on June 7, 1909: "Such experiences, though painful, are necessary and hard to avoid. Without them we cannot really know life and what we are dealing with. I myself have never been taken in quite so badly, but I have come very close to it a number of times and had a *narrow escape* [italics in original]. I believe that only grim necessities weighing on my work, and the fact that I was ten years older than yourself when I came to A [analysis], have saved me from similar experiences. But no lasting harm is done. They help us to develop the thick skin we need and to dominate 'countertransference,' which is after all a permanent problem for us; they teach us to displace our own affects to best advantage. They are a *blessing in disguise* [italics in original]" (as cited in McGuire, 1974, pp. 230-231). (Freud never elaborated on this "blessing in disguise" position. In this letter, was he trying to reassure Jung and/or himself?)

[21] "Now that a considerable number of people are practicing psychoanalysis and exchanging their observations with one another, we have noticed that no psychoanalyst goes further than his own complexes and internal resistances permit; and we consequently require that he shall begin his activity with a self-analysis and continually carry it deeper while he is making his own observations on his patients. Anyone who fails to produce results in a self-analysis of this kind may at once give up any idea of being able to treat patients by analysis" (Freud, 1910, pp. 144-145). Later, of course, Freud also insisted analysts—other than himself—have a training analysis conducted by a suitable analyst.

Freud. Sandor Ferenczi, Michael Balint, Donald Winnicott, Paula Heineman, Heinrich Racker, Harold Searles and Jody Messler Davies are a few who come to mind. Because of these mavericks, countertransference is now a given in psychoanalysis, no longer an obstacle.

Sandor Ferenczi

Ferenzci (1873-1933), unlike Freud, believed being a well-analyzed analyst mattered to our effectiveness. However, from his own analysis with Freud and from his experimentation with his own Eros toward his patient, Elma, Ferenczi came to realize the problematic impact of the analyst's role in the therapy. Both as patient and analyst, Ferenczi grasped the deeper nature of our field—that psychoanalysis can not operate independently of the variable of the analyst's attitude toward the patient. Ferenczi lived in the confusion of real and transference feelings, of his roles as analyst, patient, lover, friend, and (Freud's) disciple (Haynal & Falzeder, 1991).

For Freud, as stated, analytic love was transference love, and for Ferenczi, love that cured was both in the patient and the analyst. Ferenczi did not believe an analytic relationship could be divided between verbalized and unverbalized, because the latter was self-evident (Haynal & Falzeder, 1991, p. 9). Ferenczi (1932/1988) thought that the truth should be spoken: "Only think what that would mean, if one could speak the truth to everyone: to one's father, one's teacher, one's neighbor and even the king" (p. 5).

The main editor of the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, psychoanalyst André Haynal (1991) synthesized a major difference between Freud and Ferenczi: for Freud, love equates with transference love, and for Ferenczi, love is

countertransference love. A student of Ferenczi's often spoke "of the therapist as a 'soul donor' (*Seelenspender*) or 'donor of blood' (*Blutspender*)" (as cited in Haynal, p. 18), one who gives life. Randall Sorenson (2004), an analyst who explores spirituality and analysis, wrote that Ferenczi struggled to establish an epistemology that asked for honest and candid involvement in the human sciences (p. 85). Ferenczi teaches us that we learn about and benefit the patient through the vitality and crucial core of countertransference. Ferenczi developed the "object-related" method, the person-as-object method, opening our field to two-person psychology rather than the one-person psychology originated by Freud.

Countertransference love, Ferenczi honors, is our way to empathically know a patient. It requires patient, truthful, and authentic personal involvement of the analyst in the relationship. Ferenczi understood the importance of the patient interacting with and affecting the analyst (and vice versa) and viewed the analyst as having a high degree of personal involvement with his analysand (Haynal, 1991, p. 17).

Ferenczi's emphasis on love as fundamental, an inalienable right of the child, was described by his patient, Clara Thompson (1943): Ferenczi "believed that the patient is ill because he has not been loved" (p. 64). In his final paper, Ferenczi (1933/1980) wrote that "[Children] cannot do without tenderness" (p. 164). Another analysand of Ferenczi, Izette DeForest (1954), commenting on Ferenczi's capacity for love as a true and meaningful instrument of the analyst's responsiveness as countertransference, thought his point of view to be a serious mistake because it perpetuates defining the analyst's experience in terms of the subjectivity of the patient. For Lewis Aron (1996), a modern relational analyst,

thinking of the analyst's experience as "counter" or responsive to the patient's transference encourages the belief that the analyst's experience is reactive rather than subjective and emanating from the center of the analyst's psychic self (pp. 76-77). The term *countertransference* obscures that the analyst often initiates the experience of the patient rather than merely countering it in return.

Throughout this thesis and in accord with Lewis Aron, I will be using the term *countertransference* loosely to indicate the thoughts, feelings, and physical sensations the analyst has in the relationship between the patient and himself, as opposed to the analyst's reactions as counter to the patient's. I will use the term for the sake of the literature review but do not find it useful as a category because, if we focus on our experience as emanating from, rather than being in connection with, the patient, we can impede an analysis. The Jungian analyst, Katherine Bradway (Bradway & McCoard, 1997), uses the term "co-transference" which emphasizes *with* (co-) rather than *against* (counter) and indicates the simultaneity and interplay in the relationship between patient and analyst (p. 31).

Michael Balint

The object relations therapist Balint (1896-1970), whom Ferenczi both mentored and analyzed, although frightened of Ferenczi's violations with his patients, wrote of a primary love that the patient wants the analyst to provide (1952). Balint, like Ferenczi and Ian Suttie, who in 1935, wrote *The Origins of Love and Hate*,[22] focused on the stage of primary love as the beginning of the child's

[22] Suttie saw the goal of psychoanalytic work as consisting of "the *overcoming of the barriers to loving and feeling oneself loved*, and not as the removal of fear-imposed

love, when mother and child need to live interdependently with blurred boundaries. Disturbance to this primary love creates later psychopathology. Analysands, Balint (1968) noticed, use their analysts to regress to the early stage of primary love in order to find a "new beginning," where

> the analyst . . . must allow his patients to relate to, or exist with, him as if he were one of the primary substances. This means that he should be willing to carry the patient, not actively but like water carries the swimmer or the earth carries the walker. . . . [H]e must be there, must always be there, and must be indestructible—as are water and earth. (p. 167)

For the British Object relations group, of which Balint was one of the first, it was acceptable for an analyst to love a patient because the analyst worked at the early or pre-oedipal level with the patient, and therefore the analysis simulated the early mother/child bond, where love is maternal, warm, nurturing. If the love is emanating from and limited to the mother/child paradigm, rather than the oedipal or sexual level, it is more comfortable to admit.

D. W. Winnicott

Winnicott (1896-1971) helped move the countertransference experience from one to be eliminated to one to be experienced, worked with, and developed. In his famous paper, "Hate in the Countertransference" (1947/1992), Winnicott encouraged us to experience hate when it is the patient's projection into the analyst. Failure to experience the hate, to live with it, bear it, be in it but not retaliate leads to failure of the analysis. Winnicott did not specifically discuss the erotic in the countertransference, but we know the same principle holds.

---

inhibitions to the expression of innate, anti-social, egoistic and sensual desires" (1935/1952, pp. 53-54, italics added).

Interestingly, much more has been written about hate than erotic love in our analytic literature.

Paula Heimann

Two years after Winnicott's courageous paper, Heimann (1899-1982) wrote from her experience that analytic candidates found countertransference a major source of difficulty (1949-1950/1990, p. 73). She took a step beyond Freud. "My thesis is that the analyst's emotional response to his patient within the analytic situation represents one of the most important tools for his work. The analyst's countertransference is an instrument of research into the patient's unconscious" (p. 74). In 1949 she claimed that "the analyst's countertransference is not only part and parcel of the analytic relationship, but it is the patient's creation, it is a part of the patient's personality" (p. 77). We see in the history of the countertransference that almost forty years after Freud's warning about the dangers of countertransference (1910), an analyst, one of the few to write about countertransference, was still disowning her responsibility for her own feelings, understanding them as projective identification.

Since Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, warned his children and his children's children and subsequently their children that, in essence, countertransference is a problem to be eliminated by the analyst, either by further analysis or self-analysis, analysts have been riddled with fears of admitting their love for their patients, either to themselves, to their colleagues and supervisors, or to their patients. Countertransference had a bad reputation as nothing more than the analyst's unconscious, problematic reactions to the patient's transference and to the patient in general.

Until recently, understanding erotic love in the analyst was limited to projective identification, the analyst identifying with the patient's projection. Transference was viewed as projection, countertransference as the patient placing the transference into the internal space of the psyche of the analyst, who might experience the feelings and images from the patient as his own (countertransference). However, since the analyst must have a place inside himself that accepts the patient's projection, the countertransference is a true experience of an aspect of the analyst's inner self, hence, real (sometimes called a "hook of reality" in the analyst on which the projection is "hung"). If the analyst experiences the countertransference as pure projective identification from the patient—that is, it is not me, it is he—the analyst is missing the point: owning the reality of his own feelings.

If the analyst feels what the patient is feeling, we might ask, Where is the distance between the analyst and patient, where is the observing ego of the analyst, his capacity to make sense of what is happening? The distance is in the analyst's capacity to hold her own experience as symbolic—that is, the distance is in thought processes, freedom of reverie, imagination, in fantasies of what we want to bring the patient to (e.g., the breast, soul, heart or mind). We sometimes fantasize merger, at other times a love affair, sometimes a turned back or a black night. If it gets murky between the two participants, the analyst steps back to re-establish her connection with symbolic understanding.

Heinrich Racker

Racker (1910-1961) shares a relevant parable: One day an old Chinese sage lost his pearls. He therefore sent his eyes to search for his pearls, but his eyes did

not find them. Next he sent his ears to search for the pearls, but his ears did not find them either. Then he sent his hands to search for the pearls, but neither did his hands find them. And so he sent all of his senses to search for his pearls, but none found them. Finally he sent his not-search to look for his pearls. And his not-search found them (1968, p. 17). When the analyst is not seeking to pigeonhole transference and countertransference, what lies in the patient, what lies in me, the analyst is freer to just be, to experience, to swim attentively in the erotic experience, regardless of who starts what.

Harold Searles

Searles, an independent, highly original American analyst, was one of the first analysts to live in the space of non-search. When he was finally able to publish his paper "Oedipal Love in the Countertransference" (1959), he blew open the concept of projective identification as emanating solely from the patient. One of the first papers to explore the awakening of Eros in the clinical space, not surprisingly, it was rejected by both psychoanalytic journals to which he sent it, and it was published only after Searles achieved success in analyzing patients with schizophrenia. In the paper, Searles daringly proposed that projections of the patient's transference are not illusion and

> have some real basis in the analyst's behavior . . . a degree of emotional participation by the analyst which is not adequately described by the classical view of him as manifesting sympathetic interest, and nothing else, toward the patient. . . . The analyst actually does feel, and manifests in various ways, a great variety of emotions during the analytic hour (p. 165).

Searles broke new ground. He examined the psychoanalytic literature to date and noted the veracity in Lucia E. Tower's 1956 conclusion that "virtually every writer on the subject of countertransference . . . states unequivocally that *no*

form of erotic reaction to a patient is to be tolerated" (as cited in Searles, 1959, p. 287, italics added).

Searles (1959) wrote of his falling in love with an attractive male paranoid schizophrenic patient and acknowledged, "that this man was dearer to me than anyone else in the world, including my wife" (p. 185). He also described his frequent gratitude toward the patient, as well as Searles's Eros. With one woman patient, he felt abundant desire to marry and husband her. He was open and forthright about his feelings of anxiety, guilt, and shame. He feared that his feelings were illegitimate because he had been taught not to have "particular emotions" [romantic and erotic wishes to marry the patient], that these would be met with attack from "external and internal analytic elders" (as cited in Ogden, 2007, p. 353).

Searles noticed he was more comfortable with the patient's infantile or childlike needs *for him* than *his own* oedipal wishes toward her. Ogden (2007) in "Reading Harold Searles" noted

> that to marry one's mother/patient is not so much a matter of having her as a sexual partner as it is a matter of having her all to oneself for one's entire life, having her as one's best friend and one's very beautiful, sexually exciting "wife," whom one deeply loves and one feels deeply loved by. (p. 355)

The question of oedipal love in the countertransference became more acceptable to Searles as he matured as an analyst. To heal the Oedipus complex for the patient, Searles claimed that, as analysts, we actually need to fall in love with our patient, while knowing the love will not be consummated, just as the parent of the oedipal child must fall deeply in love with his or her child (Ogden, 2007, p. 356).

Searles (1959) recognized that the patient's self-esteem improved if she was able to arouse desire in her analyst:

> There is a direct correlation between, on the one hand, the *affective intensity* with which the analyst experiences an awareness of such feelings—and the unrealizability of such feelings—in himself towards the patient, and on the other hand, the depth of maturation which the patient achieves in the analysis. (p. 183, italics in the original)

While Freud and his close disciples believed that any erotic feelings on the part of the analyst would gratify the patient and hence close off analytic exploration, Searles countered with his experience that falling in love with your patient is a precondition for therapeutic progress, and indeed a developmental need of the patient, a necessary recognition of who she is, a means to create a self that feels loved and is capable of loving. Searles, like Ferenczi and Suttie, implicitly promoted an inalienable, "developmental need [for each of us] to love and be loved" (Ogden, 2007, p. 357).

Searles (1965, 1979) takes a step deeper into truth. Analytic love, less a talion response than true feelings of the analyst for the patient, is personal to the analyst and not provoked by the patient. A man of courage, fifty years ago he wrote candidly about his love and lust for his patients, as well as his feelings of hatred and violence. He believed that one's countertransference responses gradually become our strongest therapeutic tool. Searles admitted, after detailing the grinding isolation he experienced in years of work with a hebephrenic man, "To my enormous relief I realized that I could not be related to him without having either to kill him or fuck him" (Searles, 1979, p. 431).

For Searles the analyst is not a passive recipient of the patient's love; rather the analyst, as a person, might initiate the love. The analyst is not only responding, identifying with the projection of love from the patient, but the

analyst might actually feel it first. Searles thought that the analyst's (parent's) sexual love for the child (patient) might precede the child's sexual love for the parent.

Throughout his prolific writing, Searles insists that the nature of countertransference is central, basic, omnipresent, utilitarian, and normal.[23] Today we would add that the relationship with patient and analyst is also interpenetrative and dialectical. Would we say it is the essence of our work? To learn, we often put something out into the field and observe what comes back. If we are honest about our feelings for our patient, we know the evocative nature of the phenomenon of an I-Thou relationship—not I-It, not subject observing object, as Freud recommended. We know what we know by what is evoked in us, and we seek to own our truth about it.

While Searles believed that we need to face head on the truth of our emotional experience with our patients, Wilfred Bion moved a step broader than Searles when he wrote, "The most fundamental principle of human motivation is the need to know the truth about one's lived emotional experience. . . an understanding of the human condition that placed the need for truth at its core" (as cited in Ogden, 2007, p. 360). Searles provided us the experience of "waking up" to our experiences with our patients. Ogden states: "It is when the therapist is not able to wake up to what is occurring that acting in and acting out (on the part of both patient and the analyst) tend to occur" (p. 358).

According to Racker (1968), the analyst who placed the importance of countertransference on the psychoanalytic map, the analyst's love is an everyday

---

[23] In Searles dialogue with Robert Langs (Langs & Searles, 1980), we learn that Langs, 70 years after Freud, agrees on the ubiquity of countertransference, though he believes it still needs to be mastered.

occurrence. "It comes from the blissful feeling of being loved and valued, and the glow is left and returned to those who generate it" (p. 207). But he employed the talionic principle in that he believed we respond in kind to the love of the patient toward us. Several generations of analysts have disagreed about whether we are merely responding to the love from the patient, or as Searles asserted, we often initiate it. Today, with the influence of the relational, interpersonal, and attachment models, most acknowledge the love as mutually intimate, shared, co-participated in and co-constructed. The analyst, subjective rather than neutral, is always feeling something about the patient. We are immersed in the world of our patients and they in ours.

Imagine the image of a childhood game with a rubber heart that pops up from a twelve inch wooden bench. The child bangs with a plastic hammer on the heart until it returns under the bench. Then the heart pops back up and the child bangs again until the heart retreats under the bench. This is what has happened to embracing erotic love in the analytic relationship. It was allowed, by a few great thinkers, but never allowed to remain above the bench, never fully accepted in the analytic community.

Harry Stack Sullivan

In the 1950s, Sullivan (1892-1949), in his "participation observation" understanding of the therapy relationship, observed that we exist in relationship more than we do as individuals, that the patient and analyst unwittingly influence the other (1953/1970, p. 96). Jung had written about this earlier, in 1946, but it was Sullivan's followers who brought back the discussion of analytic love. In the 1960s and 1970s it retreated under the bench and then came fully

forth with Kohut and the object relations theorists in the late 1970s and 1980s and the relational theorists in the late 1990s.

Heinz Kohut

Kohut (1913-1981) emphasized that mutual, idealizing romance between parent and child—hence, analyst and patient—needs to occur for the child to later find more appropriate love partners (1977). I think Kohut's (1984) empathy, vicarious introspection, felt over long periods of time often becomes love. In attempting to deeply know and understand the patient, we often come to love the patient (hate, too, but here we are focusing on love).

We might see patients many times a week over many years. During the expanse of hours and years, we enter and intimately share their inner worlds and lives, their partners and changes in partners, their dreams, pursuits, their illnesses, intimates, their loves, sexuality, fantasies, deepest fears and longings. Our patients grow to love us and we them. Being with the patient for prolonged periods of time, writes Irwin Hirsch (1988), "it is difficult not to experience either love accompanied by erotic feelings or love without sexual feelings" (p. 200). Yet, Stanley J. Coen (1994), a relational analyst who encourages analysts to feel and accept all their feelings, admits, "Even in the work reported by skilled colleagues, there often tends to be evidence of discomfort with the analyst feeling caring and loving with patients" (p. 1127). My hope is that in opening up Eros in the clinical setting as essential to a fertile analysis, we will experience less discomfort about love, both as a force of nature and what makes us more human.

Stefano Bolognini

In 1994, the Italian analyst Stefano Bolognini differentiated between an eroticized, an erotic, a loving, and an affectionate transference (or countertransference). Though he organizes by category for the sake of research, we know these categories are not reductive, that in real life they blend, merge, and intertwine. In the transference/countertransference paradigm the patient's Eros stirs the analyst's reaction and the analyst's reaction and feelings impact the patient, as if on a carousel or teeter-totter or in a mix master.

If the patient develops what Blitzsten (as cited in Rappoport, 1956), designates an "eroticized transference"—that is, when the patient remains caught in the complex of "you are my parent," rather than "you act *as if* you were my parent"—the analyst might be narcissistically gratified. Or perhaps the patient's eroticized belief that "we are not separate" might tempt the analyst to experience the patient's erotic feelings as annoying, frustrating, or quite harassing. The patient needs the analyst to be neither seduced nor turned off but to develop instead a positive maternal (or paternal) response (Bolognini, 1994, p. 74).

Bolognini (1994) asserts that for the patient in an "erotic transference," there is more capacity for symbolization than in a purely eroticized transference. Here, the patient falls in love with the forbidden object, the analyst. The impossibility, distance, perhaps generational difference of the analyst becomes erotic for the patient. The analyst is, hence, a stand in, a representation of, but not an actual oedipal parent. The patient "fixates" to the disappointment of the analyst's unwillingness to participate in an affair. Why? This could happen for various reasons: perhaps the patient earlier suffered an oedipal defeat; or

parental seduction (oedipal "victory"); or felt unconscious rage at the same sex parent; or remained a *puer* or *puella*; or became very seductive in an attempt to deny being excluded (p. 76). A positive outcome of an erotic transference, as Searles also underlined, is that the felt admiration from the analyst/father (as in the father, with a warm gleam and beaming smile of pride, dancing with his daughter at her wedding) is usually necessary for the female patient's development of femininity (Bolognini, p. 83).

According to Bolognini (1994), the loving transference has two parts, the first stemming from guilt and fear, defenses against and repression of the positive nature of the love object. In this typically psychoanalytic duality model, the resistant first part is in conflict with the second aspect, the healthy capacity to love. As the patient non-defensively discovers for the first time her first true love, "true love object," the healthy part gradually wins out. She is encouraged by her acceptance by the analyst (and I shall add, his love for her) as well as his understanding, trust, and emotional contact. Bolognini offers that the love in the analytic couple is not dissimilar to "the sensitivity and delicacy to that which may arise between two lovers, leading to good and genuine parental care" (p. 78). Psychoanalytic writers seem to write about "parental care" because leaving the metaphor as love between two lovers causes discomfort. Bolognini agrees with the Argentinean analyst, R. Horatio Etchegoyen (1992), the first Latin American analyst to head the International Psychoanalytic Association that Freud founded, who wrote: "In every analysis, there must be moments of love, of being in love, as the treatment reproduces the object relations of the oedipal triad, so that it is inevitable (and salutary) that this should happen" (p. 84).

Every analysis is a history in itself, and the analyst needs to honor and accept without prejudice the erotic and the loving feelings in herself and in the patient. Bolognini (1994), in his need to differentiate between the erotic, more sexualized transference and the loving transference, believes the erotic transference is both defensive and loving, and he advises that we interpret its defensive nature to the patient, while we welcome the loving aspect with joy and respect. I contend that the erotic is not always defensive. It can be defensive when it hides aggression, or when either participant, patient or analyst, does not acknowledge, cultivate as normal, and welcome as desirable the Eros in the room. Eros, when respected, both is and may further lead to passion, vitality, libido/energy, and joy.

If we treat the loving transference as only sexual, as some do, we mortify the patient's potential growing capacity to love. Patients are often ashamed of their love for their analyst, experience it as one-sided and risky, certain they will be hurt again. Bolognini (1994), in his desire to create categories, describes the affectionate transference, which is quieter than the erotic or loving ones. Here, the patient and analyst feel gratitude and appreciation, renunciation, sublimation, emotional fertility, growth, where patient (and I add, analyst) are supplied with love.

I contend that the history of ideas of countertransference exhibits a progressive closing of the relational and epistemological gap between therapist and patient (Young, 1990, p. 12). By the beginning of the 1990s, many analysts agreed that long-term, intense erotic transferences continue only if the analyst unconsciously colludes (Atwood, Stolorow, & Trop, 1989; Maroda, 1991). Does unconsciously colluding mean too much enjoyment and/or not fully analyzing

the patient's experience? I think it can also mean conceptualizing the erotic transference as merely pre-oedipal or oedipal and not elevating it to the level of surrender to trust and faith, having it remain at a physical level alone, not encouraging the passion engendered from the erotic experience to expand the patient and the analytic couple spiritually. We know that if the analyst and patient develop a full relationship, encompassing aggression, envy, inferiority, and achieving an experience of vitality and joy, the erotic is a part, not the whole. We also know that if the analyst becomes defensively stiff when the patient falls in love with him, the potential for transformation is diminished.

A major problem in psychoanalytic theory on the erotic is exemplified by the language in the work of Bolognini. It is difficult to feel, imagine, or experience the erotic when it is reduced to the pre-oedipal and oedipal child. The writing of most theorists is neither sexual nor passionate, is hard-edged rather than soft, off-putting rather than inviting. I struggle to find the truth of the human person behind the theory. Tom Ogden (2007), writing about Harold Searles, states:

> The effect of Searles' paring away of theory to its absolute minimum is the creation of an experience in reading that is akin to that of reading fine literature: emotional situations are presented in which the characters involved are allowed to speak for themselves. (p. 361)

Jody Messler Davies

Jody Messler Davies (1994) is one of the first psychoanalysts to confess her erotic attachment to a patient and expose their analytic dialogue. In the relational model of psychoanalysis, the analyst knows she is a symbolic parent to the patient, that she is a "full participant in the patient/child's romantic oedipal struggles" (p. 153). The analyst has her own physical reactions and experiences,

which are part of the unfolding, two-person, shared symbolic space. I will attempt to make my language sound similar to Searles', as sometimes Davies' language is insistent on remaining in the categories of oedipal, pre-oedipal, and post-oedipal. I'll attempt to find a level more earthbound and prosaic.

Herbert Rabin (2003) notes,

> I believe that the use of abstractions and technical terms such as erotic and libidinal, instead of experience-near terms such as loving feelings and falling in love, defends against the discomfort and anxiety that many of us experience in feeling and/or in publicly reporting that we feel deeply loving toward our patients. (p. 678)

Whichever words we choose, we will explore how analysts use their loving feelings to either further or inhibit the therapy. I contend that the more an analyst is aware of his or her feelings, the less likely these feelings will dominate the treatment.

One hundred thirteen years ago, at the beginning of psychoanalysis, Freud's wish was for the transference to be pure, for the patient to be frustrated, not-gratified by the analyst. The analyst was to be only a receptacle, an object of the patient's fantasies and desires. The analyst was required to be neutral and abstinent of desire. Today we depend on the analyst and patient becoming enmeshed in experiences reminiscent of early, unformulated experiences. Through our receiving and knowing the patient through our enmeshments, we learn about the patient's current difficulties. What was previously foreclosed for the patient is now reopened in the analytic relationship. While Freud believed the oedipal, incestuous wish needed to be renounced, today we invite the patient into the area of play, imagination, curiosity about these profound early life-alerting wishes, and we participate in the symbolic play.

The lived experience between patient and analyst becomes the living ground for mutually created new experiences. The relational analyst relies on her subjective encounter with the patient, her "countertransference," and self-examines how to know it, use it, when to disclose it. She learns to differentiate what is acting out and dangerous from what leads to further understanding for the patient, what opens up new spaces for the patient and what needs to be articulated, so the patient can develop a fuller acceptance of self and others. Davies (1994) says, "Within such a climate, the essential absence of any informed discussions of the analyst's sexual and erotic experiences becomes even more mystifying" (p. 157).

Davies believes that most psychoanalytic writers concentrate more on the mind than on the body or physical sensations of patient and analyst. The goal of the oedipal phase is no longer, as Freud postulated, a dissolution or resolution. Now we understand the child's need to experience the erotic toward both sexes. We encourage a lengthy transitional oedipal period where the growing child learns more of who she is, who she may become, and that her experiences are physiological as well as cognitive and verbal. Davies (1994) says:

> It is my belief that the early template for both the adult's potential to experience erotic passion as well as the particular difficulties inherent in achieving such states of physical intimacy and desire is formed during this phase of transitional oedipal experimentation. (p. 159)

Davies takes the "oedipal" out of its usual triangular familial formula in which the child, from ages of four to seven, is in competition for the opposite-sex parent. I believe the oedipal is not limited to a developmental age, that throughout our lifetime we dip in and out of triangular and sexually competitive relationships.

Davies (1994) reminds us that we need to understand the importance and centrality of the erotic in any individual's life and that the evocative feelings of "love, shame, idealization, envy and rage are not just words but *systems of physical sensation, elusive, ever-shifting, and rarely, if ever, verbalized in normal interpersonal discourse*" (p. 159, italics added). We have been taught to avoid discussion of our physicality or physical sensations with our patients, as these bodily experiences are thought to be primitive, overly arousing, or perhaps too gratifying to the patient. We want our patients to become aware of their own personal physical reactions. We are also taught that our silences might be considered neutral. Yet silences can be an erotic part of sexual foreplay. We have been taught that it is wrong to disclose our sexual experiences, but have we examined the impact of not doing so? Also, we are taught not to disclose erotic experiences, as they might be considered out of control. But, will this admonition lead us to dissociate from our feelings, or move toward their premature foreclosure, rather than increasing our capacity to contain and understand as normal what might be a prelude to the patient's capacity to experience erotic desire (p. 160)?

Many analysts do not acknowledge their bodily reactions to themselves or their patients, and perhaps this is why Davies believes that Eros has been left more to the mind than the body of the analyst. Whether located more in body or mind, the analyst has avoided using Eros to order to expand the potential space between him and his patient. One reason for such avoidance is, as Kumin (1985) reminds us, that being in an erotically experienced relationship with your patient or analyst often elicits horrific feelings, those of "intense dysphoria, frustration, shame, humiliation, and disgust" (p. 5). Horror and excitement sometimes

overlap. The fact that Eros creates horror in the analyst and in the patient seems all the more reason to address it rather than deny, avoid, or get stuck in it. Davies and her patient were getting stuck in it.

Davies (1994) admitted publicly that she had loving and sexual feelings, an erotic attraction, for her 27 year-old male patient, Mr. M. Davies is cautious, fully cognizant that hers is a maverick approach. She backs up her thinking by reference to analysts such as Searles (1959), to Kumin's (1985) "Erotic Horror: Desire and Resistance in the Psychoanalytic Situation," and to Wrye & Welles' (1998) "Erotic Terror: Male Patients' Horror of the Early Maternal Erotic Transference" (Davies, p. 153). As previously noted, Searles (1965) believed the patient, or child, moves through the oedipal conflict by "finding that the beloved parent reciprocates his love— responds to him as being a worthwhile and lovable individual and renounces him [sexually] only with an accompanying sense of loss on the parent's own part" (p. 301). Searles does not believe in letting the patient know of these loving feelings. Davies disagrees.

Let's look closely at Davies' (1994) contribution to the psychoanalytic literature on love in the countertransference. Mr. M. developed an intense erotic transference to Dr. Davies. He offered her poetic descriptions of his sexual fantasies about the two of them. His analyst became for him "the perfect woman, warm, sensual, perhaps the only person who could lead him out of his life of sexual inhibition and loneliness" (p. 163).

Mr. M. had great difficulty with sexuality toward woman. He became nauseated if a woman came on to him or showed interest in him. As a child, the patient and his mother, huddled closely together, spent much intimate time reading novels about the adventures of Odysseus and tales of King Arthur and

his Knights of the Round Table, the patient fantasizing himself as Lancelot and his mother as Guinevere. The patient remembered,

> If I sighed too deeply or longingly, my mother would change, virtually transform before my very eyes. She would look at me in horror and disgust, as if I was the most hideous person in the world. It was like she knew how I felt about her, and she was revolted by me . . . revolted by the thought I could have those feelings about her. I know that must be why I can't stand it when women respond to me sexually. I'm afraid that they will change suddenly and find me disgusting. And I can't take that risk. It's too humiliating. (p. 165)

Concurrently, Davies (1994) warned herself of enjoying his fantasies too much, yet she was also aware of a

> small thrill, that under the patient's deadened mathematically abstract persona, I had somehow stimulated the heart of a most truly poetic lover. How shocked I was one day, to find myself thinking rather jealously, of the real lover who would someday be the beneficiary of my patient's sensuality. Clearly I had left the real world behind and had entered with my patient a shared illusion of oedipal passion, victory, triumph, and remorse, as much a subject of my own resurrected struggles as I had become the object of his. I felt confused, not exactly sure what kind of state I was in, but all the while painfully clear that whatever state it was, it was a long way from the comfortable states of abstinence and neutrality. (p. 163)

Davies (1994) paid attention to how her own erotic excitement for the patient would quickly lead to fear and disgust, as apparently it had with the patient's mother. Davies tried for years to discuss in the abstract that Mr. M's mother was perhaps revolted by her own sexual desires toward her son. Mr. M. would in turn become enraged at Dr. Davies for suggesting that mothers have sexual feelings for their children. He insisted mothers are not allowed to feel sexual toward their children, that analysts are not allowed to feel sexual toward their patients.

With her highly attuned capacity for self-reflection, Davies (1994) realized her feelings for the patient were kept in check by shame and a dread of

professional misconduct just for having the feelings, that she had placed her theory between herself and her patient—her theory that countertransference feelings toward the patient were to be used only to understand the patient better, were to be worked through by herself alone, and that sharing them with the patient would be an act of symbolic incest (p. 165). Davies and Mr. M. remained at an impasse for years, foreclosing any real experience and understanding of the erotic desire between them.

Mr. M. remained wedded to his belief that he could never be the object of a woman's sexual desires. Multiple times, he remained the victim of unrequited love. After Davies tried as many interpretations as she could fathom, and "feeling there was no other honest alternative," she said to her patient one day, "But you know I have had sexual fantasies about you, many times, sometimes when we're together and sometimes when I'm alone. . . . We certainly will not act on those feelings, but you seem so intent on denying that a woman could feel that way, that your mother might have felt that way, I couldn't think of a more direct way of letting you know that this simply isn't true" (p. 166).

Mr. M., anxious, agitated, furious: "You're unethical; you're probably a sick and perverted mother. I might need to press professional charges since you're out of control." Mr. M. then could only mutter: "You make me sick. I'm going to be sick, God, I'm going to throw up" (p. 166).

Dr. Davies (in due time):

> I don't think there's anything sick and disgusting about the sexual feelings that either of us have had in here. . . . In seeing your revulsion and disgust with me, I think I'm understanding how your own sexuality made you feel sick whenever your mother withdrew from it with such horror. You felt perverse and criminal and fearful of retaliation. . . . Guinevere knew that her sexual feelings began inside of herself. She didn't hold anyone else responsible. (p. 166)

Mr. M. began to weep and kept punching his fist into his palm.

Dr Davies (later in the hour):

> You felt sickened by my sexuality, just like you want to throw up whenever a woman begins to respond to you in this way. You must have felt sickened by your mother's arousal and enraged by her rejection . . . so you become sickened and then reject the woman who is seducing you. . . . Perhaps you are also angry with me for allowing you to carry the responsibility for all the sexual feelings in here. (p. 167)

Dr. Davies (later in the therapy):

> I think you're just enraged, that you were forced to carry these feelings for your mother for so many years, her revulsion, disgust, and shame about her own erotic sensations, that she made you believe they rested with you. (p. 166)

In reading Davies (1994), we see how she worked through her fears of admitting Eros, let alone writing about it, how she worked through feelings of shame. After all, originally we were taught it is wrong to be sexually attracted to your patient, and many of us were taught it is wrong to love your patient and that if you are not feeling or being neutral, you are bad. Davies used her own physical reactions to serve as a map for exploring what had been felt as disassociated, repressed, confused, disoriented mutual experiences between herself and her patient. In so doing, she enabled both of them to open a fundamental area of inquiry that had previously been closed off between them. We are again reminded of the inevitability of enmeshments and enactments—that analysis often progresses because of enactments—the inevitability of passionate and loving feelings, which of course become confusing for both participants until they are further understood in the context of the analysis. Analysts, following Davies, now question and debate: (a) does Davies' telling the patient of her feelings open or close a potential space; (b) after Davies makes a

symbolic realm concrete, can she still play in that realm (Knoblauch, 1994, p. 151)?

Davies (1994) was guided by hers and her patient's non-verbal level of communication, and she paid particular attention to the emerging meanings of her experience, making the assumption, with which I agree, that the patient knows our desires without our being explicit. She uses as a guidepost the material in the room, she sees where the impasse is, and she is careful when she introduces her subjectivity. Fully cognizant of the difference between thought and action, she is measured rather than spontaneous, more thoughtful than impulsive, and throughout, her patient's needs are primary. Awareness allows the analyst to moderate his or her response, while suppression of the normal feeling process is more likely to lead to acting out.

Whatever your judgment about Davies' clinical choices, she waited six years to admit an erotic attraction, certainly not an impulsive action, and her patient improved from the analytic work. Also, Davies' temperament is her own, and we know her style would not fit everyone. There are no templates or rules, but her direct handling of the erotic material between them was sufficient to push through an impasse. She alerts us to what can happen between analyst and patient, and nowhere does she advise that this should happen. She also reminds us that managing, containing, and recognizing desire is implicit and does not need to be overt (Davies, 1998, p. 758).

In reading Davies, we become aware that if we avoid the meaning of experience, that experience can remain lodged in the unconscious of either patient or analyst. The analyst needs to embody what has been previously denied to the patient, what has remained disavowed, unacknowledged or non-

integrated. Sometimes the erotic begins in the analyst, especially if the patient has had an engulfing, overly rejecting, or traumatizing parent. By putting into words our previously walled-off experiences, the experiences can be openly shared between two people.

> It is only when such erotically charged material can be spoken of, changed, modified, withdrawn, renewed, when it can become the substance of all forms of symbolic and illusory play . . . the patient can revel in an experience of oedipal potency and desire, in an atmosphere free from any traumatic transgression of the incest barrier. He can learn to play with, and enjoy his sensuous, sexual desires without the threat of penetration, humiliation, or overstimulation . . . and to mourn successfully what cannot be, maintaining, at the same time, a hopeful investment in all that is yet possible. (Davies, 1994, p. 169)

After the oedipal stage, we move, in theory, to the post-oedipal, a stage analysts like to call mature love. I believe the transitional play space of the erotic does not stop with the oedipal stage, but instead, there is an interweaving, a synergistic interpenetration, a play, a going back and forth between all three stages, pre-oedipal, oedipal, and post-oedipal, throughout our lives. With regard to genital sexuality, I question the relevance of these oedipal stages. Genital sexuality has traditionally been linked with the oedipal phase, but Winnicott noted genital sexuality—that is, an orgasm—after the "pre-oedipal" baby sucks at his mother's breast. The baby experiences erotic excitement while sucking and Winnicott (1941/1971) calls this a baby's mouth orgasm.[24]

Davies' thinking reaches past the tiresome, worn, and convenient equation of analyst as the oedipal parent, who is consequently erotic and forbidden. She explores adult sexuality between patient and analyst as adult sexual beings. What is a healthy sexuality in an analytic relationship, when literal

---

[24] "There is a change in the inside of the mouth, which becomes flabby, while the tongue looks thick and soft, and saliva flows copiously" (Winnicott, 1941/1971, p. 54).

sexual and bodily intimacy is forbidden? It can be experienced as deep, close, profound, and it is more mythical and magical than a concrete relationship, held as it is in imagination and potential space. The patient, with the analyst's help, develops the capacity to distinguish between the real and the imaginary, while feeling a loss and relinquishing what will never be hers. That is, the patient mourns the loss of what was not realized in childhood—oedipal love is a dream never to be realized in reality—and mourns what cannot be concretized with the analyst, while awakening to a new potential in her life.

The analyst as oedipal parent must have the capacity to contain the erotic aspects of fantasies of romantic love, the enjoyment of participation in the fullness of idealization and imagination, and the willingness to surrender and mourn the intoxicating pleasures of being the beloved object of oedipal desire. And, she must allow herself to be seen, with her flaws, imperfections, and humanity.

Adult sexuality, which progresses from romantic passion in the tension between wanting and not possessing, involves the ability to balance the tensions between self-interest while supplying and receiving from the nurturing other, and the capability to tolerate one another's imperfections and vulnerabilities,

> to experience disappointment without the death of desire, to apprehend that true intimacy requires mutual vulnerability and psychic interpenetration . . . to be both subject and object of intense erotic desire and longing, while also acknowledging the experience of romantic loss, rejection, defeat. (Davies, 2003, pp. 6-7)[25]

Davies (1998) believes that the Oedipus complex is not capable of resolution but is only the beginning of what will be a lifelong, post-oedipal

---

[25] For the best utilitarian description of this form of mutuality, found in the "depressive position," see Tom Ogden (1990) "On the Structure of Experience."

process of recognizing, containing the feelings and experiences of erotic fantasy, the confidence of managing, enhancing, elaborating, enjoying one's sexual subjectivity in myriad situations—including between you and your patient (p. 758). Her conclusion is a hope that patient and analyst mutually revel in the oedipal romance, the patient receiving a symbolic form of the admiration, adoration, love she is seeking. The two participants then slowly, very slowly, relinquish seeking what they can never possess (Davies, 2003, p. 17).

If, during the oedipal phase, the child learns to manage desire in a way beneficial for all three participants (child, mother, father), that child has a leg up on developing mature adult sexuality, "where we can desire without the promise of satisfaction. . . . Perhaps this is the true legacy of Oedipus—the capacity to sustain desire for what we can never have" (Davies, 1998, p. 765). As we proceed into our understanding of the erotic in the therapy relationship, let us keep in mind that our goal is no longer a resolution of the triangular family drama, but the capacity to hold erotic fantasies, romantic passion and imagination with what, through truth and intimacy, becomes more knowable and real. These fantasies, along with the acceptance of our imperfections, create a ground to move higher into intimacy with our patient, our selves and to something greater than we.

We are discovering that there is nothing concise, trenchant, or laconic about the erotic in analysis. The former rigid boundaries between experiencing the erotic and forbidding it, the wall between disclosure of sexual feelings and non-disclosure is crumbling in our modern analyses of mutual vulnerability. The erotic has multiple realities, sacred and profane. The ambiguity of the erotic is becoming clearer in that it cannot be reduced or formulated. The contemporary

analyst and teacher, Muriel Dimen (1999), points out that, "Anxiety prevents analysts from addressing sex where it is and makes them see it where it isn't" (p. 420).

Muriel Dimen

Can we discuss the erotic with pleasure and humor? Do we have difficulty sustaining states of erotic desire in the consulting room? If we can tolerate the intensity without withholding or withdrawing, if we can play in this space with ideas and feelings, are we not more capable of creative discovery together? When Dimen (1999), had an "erotic countertransference" with a male patient, and she was able to maintain a state of shared experience and knowledge, she realized she did not have to *do* anything but *be* in that state. She commented that the patient had never received this experience of mutual desire from his parents or of being the adored other, especially necessary in the oedipal phase. "One could say that libido and lust together made Eros, the life force in its binding aspect, which has, at least for now, triumphed over Thanatos [in the analysis]" (p. 434). Dimen became a person, more than an analyst, to her patient, and he felt alive. Together, they were then able to deal with the exigencies of life: anger, fear, anxiety, terror, sadness, and loss (p. 434). She and her patient opened up to the erotic as a driving force and a relationship. She discusses lust as confusing, ambiguous, and complicated, for it is sometimes desire and sometimes satisfaction of desire. We might aim to hold both because the need, the moment before the state of excitation, might be experienced as satisfying. Living in the erotic while doing analysis has always been an inner struggle, and we know much energy can be drawn from it.

David Mann

In 1997, Mann, a British psychoanalytic psychotherapist published the well-received *Psychotherapy: An Erotic Relationship: Transference and Countertransference Passions.* His primary thesis is "Psychotherapy is an erotic relationship between the analyst and patient: a transaction between two psyches that have the erotic at their centre" (p. 12). He backs up such a sweeping statement with numerous case examples and infant research. We all draw our own metaphors and analogies to the erotic in therapy, and for Mann, in analysis, as in the heart of love, we seek the most intimate experience we can find with another, we want to know the details of the other's life, we wish to be as fully known (at least to the border of what Winnicott calls the hidden self), and we wish to become more loveable for our beloved (p. 8). We remember from Winnicott that falling in love is "the fantasy of finding someone who has the time and inclination to know what is needed and fulfill it" (as cited in Mann, p. 35), or in other words, the loving analyst we all seek and hope to be. Or, as Jonathan Lear (1990) reminded us, "Love runs through human nature and it is through the transactions of human love as incarnated in humans that individuals come to be" (p. 186). Mann substitutes the word "erotic" for "love" in Lear's quote and, hence, Mann's conclusion that the erotic is essential to the human condition and the "source of its individuation" (p. 54).

Mann (1997) convincingly views the erotic as paradoxical, double-edged. "Probably more than any other subject, the erotic takes both the patient and the therapist into unmapped territory, the hinterland, where something new may be discovered or occur" (p. 185). He believes the erotic is primarily positive and transformational because it deals with the deepest layers of the psyche. It might

be pleasurable *or* painful to discover something new about yourself, to find yourself in a place never before known, to relinquish the familiar. The erotic, says Mann, is a "mixture of cure and ailment" (p. 49). Mann discovered in his workshops and conferences throughout Europe that therapists, as I have stated, tend to avoid the erotic and therefore truncate play and curiosity.

In explicating his thesis, Mann (1997) prefers the word "erotic" to loving or sexual and uses the term loosely. The erotic, like passion, implies sex and love, intensity, enthusiasm. The erotic is highly subjective, usually fails objectivity, but requires negative capability to avoid its reduction to facts and reason, to continue its mystery and uncertainty. Erotic includes fascination, incestuous desire, genital, pregenital and physical arousal, all sexual and sensual feelings and fantasies, plus anxiety or excitement about what might be dreaded or revolting. People in all societies have an erotic fantasy life, and Mann places the erotic "at the heart of the psychoanalytic metaphor . . . of the analytic couple as mother and infant dyad . . . which produce an analytic baby and child" (p. 7). The erotic pushes us into the past, as Freud asserted, to restore the lost unity of the earliest bond, but it also pulls us forward to greater individuation and differentiation, to hope for the future, and to heal disappointments and failures of past unfulfilled erotic desire.

What has David Mann included in his very comprehensive study that I have not already addressed? I discovered three additional points of focus: (a) how embedded in therapists, at an almost "cellular" level, and in the first one hundred years of psychoanalytic theory, is the idea that the erotic is resistance; (b) the erotic in infant observation; and (c) sexual intercourse as a metaphor for psychological change.

The Erotic as Resistance

I think Mann stresses the transformational aspect of the erotic in order to overcome the one hundred year-old psychoanalytic belief that the erotic—which has been distanced, dreaded, kept in disrepute and boxed into the negative transference—is resistance in the patient (and analyst), resulting in the tendency for analysts to deny their own erotic desires. If the patient senses the analyst is threatened by either the patient's or the analyst's sexuality, the patient (or analyst's) desire is less likely to emerge or be addressed.

As we actively seek to form healthy erotic attachments in intimate adult love relationships, the analyst, as transformational object (Bollas, 1987, p. 23), often becomes a conduit to genuinely new experiences, healing old wounds, finding new ways of being and becoming. One way to love is through love, and we know that psychic birth and growth occurs through genuine, authentic experience.

Freud's theory stressed a universal and sexual nature of the mind, yet he strove for a technique which would not sexually excite the analyst or patient and would minimize the inherently erotic nature of the analytic encounter. When we minimize what is essentially true, does it not hinder our work of seeking truth? The formula for psychoanalysis and the erotic is that the latter became a disguise for something else, such as an oedipal seduction or a mother's frightening sexual desire for her son, exemplified by Jocasta's sexuality with Oedipus that led to her death, the death of the mother, or a mother's voracious desire for her child, a desire which might kill the child's sense of separate self. Why would a patient and analyst not prefer to avoid repeats of these psychic deaths?

Ethel Person (1985) has written that male analysts in particular tend to fear the erotic, because they fear dependency as connected to sexuality. Person states that the erotic in analysis is both a "goldmine and minefield" (p. 163).

In *On Freud's " Observations on Transference Love* "(Person, Hagelin & Fonagy, 1993), all of the ten well-known analyst contributors, Robert Wallerstein, Roy Shafer, Merton Gill, and Betty Joseph to name a few, still focus on the erotic as resistance, while granting that transference love is indistinguishable from normal love. The erotic is just too hot to handle, as in Freud's (1915/1958) analogy between analytic transference love and a chemist working with "highly explosives forces" (p. 170), or when he quotes Hippocrates: "those [diseases] which fire cannot cure are to be reckoned wholly incurable" (p. 171). Passion is dangerous but curative, while, at the same time, it is considered to be resistance to the curative process.

To amplify further, let us harken back to a poem by John Donne (1572-1631), "The Good-Morrow," which stirs my erotic fantasies to less than cozy places:

> I wonder by my troth, what thou and I
> Did, till we lov'd? Were we not wean'd till then,
> But suck'd on country pleasures, childishly?
> Or snorted we in the seven sleepers' den?
> 'Twas so; but this, all pleasures fancies be.
> If ever any beauty I did see,
> Which I desir'd, and got, 'twas but a dream of thee.
>
> And now good morrow to our waking souls,
> Which watch not one another out of fear;
> For love, all love of other sights controls,
> And makes one little room, an everywhere.
> Let sea-discoverers to new worlds have gone,
> Let maps to other, worlds on worlds have shown,
> Let us possess one world, each hath one, and is one.
>
> My face in thine eye, thine in mine appears,

> And true plain hearts do in the faces rest;
> Where can we find two better hemispheres,
> Without sharp north, without declining west?
> Whatever dies, was not mix'd equally;
> If our two loves be one, or, thou and I
> Love so alike, that none do slacken, none can die.
> (Donne & Bell, 2006, p. 3)

Note that the erotic love experienced by these lovers, who leave behind their unconscious childhoods, describes what Mann (1997) means by "new transformational object" (p. 193). The life these lovers live is in the walls of their room, as in the container of analysis, in the here and now, where the outside world no longer matters. Through the gaze in their eyes, they see the self in the other, the world in the other. They know they love one another equally, and thus their love, like their souls, is mystical, heavenly, enduring.

The Erotic in Infant Observation

The erotic of the mother/child relationship, embedded in their interaction, is the paradigm for the adult lovers we embrace in Donne's poem and sometimes realize just for moments in our own lives. Daniel Stern (1993), one of the important reporters of infant observation, states that physical, affectionate love is learned by the infant by the fourth or fifth month of life. What happens to us as adults falling in love has, if we are lucky, already happened in our infancy:

> gazing into each other's eyes without talking; maintaining very close proximity, faces inches away and part of the body always touching; alteration in vocal patterns, performing special gestures such as kissing, hugging, touching, and holding the other's face and hands. (p. 176)

He also posits that "passion in the sense of the temporal flow of excitation, of dramatic crescendo and . . . decrescendo . . . is involved" (p. 178). Infants, says Stern, fall in love, and in so doing develop the capacity for later falling, and

falling, and more falling, deeper in love. The envelope is established in infancy, and the contents pour in throughout life and, of course, throughout analysis.

The baby, by the end of its first year, according to Stern, also develops the capacity for a "theory of separate minds" and hence, an intersubjective capability, shared states of mind, the possibility for psychic intimacy. Stern believes that the "I know that you know that I know" process of mutual discovery, as depicted in the poem, becomes a foundation, a "potent feature of love," a powerful attraction for the adolescent and adult falling-in-lovers (p. 179). We experience the analyst's knowing through his empathy and attunement, and the patient knows the analyst well through her acceptance of his empathy and from the continuity and intimate depth of shared time, space, and interaction. Psychic intimacy accentuates the nonverbal aspects of love.

By the end of the second year, the baby has acquired another precondition and path for falling in love: the sharing of meanings. Patient and analyst learn in a similar fashion over time, how to discuss the common concepts and codes used to ascribe the previously unnamed experiences that result from their mutual unconscious exploration. They negotiate previously unnamed experiences that require agreed-upon meanings.

Also, the specialness and exclusive focus of the persistent attachment between mother and baby become alive in the analytic couple. In turn the absence of the one you are attached to, mother or baby, lover or analyst, is felt in flashing neon. The baby learns how to fall in love through the language of motor activity, and this language of love is revived in the analytic relationship, which will mirror the joys and pains, presence and absence of the early mother/infant couple (Stern, 1993, pp. 179-180). We appreciate how love, the best state of being

human, becomes the ground, the foundation, the adhesive of a successful analysis.

Sexual Intercourse as a Metaphor for Psychological Change

Andrea Celenza (2007) points out that the desire for closeness in the analytic relationship, intimate both psychically and emotionally,

> carries with it the desire to possess and to transgress, i.e., to be inside the other or to take in, devour, and have the other inside you. . . . The psychoanalytic work on the part of the analyst is both penetrating and enveloping, incisive and holding, a firm receptivity that retains, envelops, and holds the other in one's mind. (p. 296)

Sixty years earlier Carl Jung used an alchemical model to illustrate the metaphor of sexual intercourse that Celenza is describing. Celenza, Glen Gabbard (1996), and many others have written extensively about the destructiveness in acting out these wishes to possess.

Carl Jung: Jung's Relation to the Erotic

> The transference, however, alters the psychological stature of the doctor, though this is at first imperceptible to him. He too becomes affected, and has as much difficulty in distinguishing between the patient and what has taken possession of him as has the patient himself. This leads both of them to a direct confrontation with the daemonic forces lurking in the darkness. (Jung, 1946/1954, p. 182)

In 1946, at age 71, Jung (1875-1961) put forth this thinking about analysis in the *Psychology of the Transference*. It was his most explicit writing on clinical work other than his *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (1943/1953). In the transference, there is the potential for all of human experience, and Jung gave himself full permission to explore every imaginable fantasy the patient might have had. But in the cases he wrote about, the countertransference seemed to remain an inconvenience for him.

I will discuss six uses of Eros that Jung suggests. But Jung's use of Eros was not purely intellectual. Perhaps to a rather extravagant degree, Jung lived Eros in his relationship with Sabina Sprielrein, a relationship that deeply affected his future work and understanding. This section of the literature review addresses that relationship and the denial and fulfillment of Eros in Jung's theory and work.

Jung had a broad and varied spectrum for his use of the word Eros. For instance, in 1943/1953, "The Eros Theory" in *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, he equates Eros with sexuality or eroticism (pp. 19-29). But, he then points out how Freud tried to contain the "unconfinable Eros with the crude terminology of sex" (p. 28). We remember, however, that Freud, as his thinking on Eros matured, did not limit Eros to genital sexuality or even to sexuality. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920), Freud put forth that libido is "the Eros of the poets and philosophers which holds all living things together" (p. 20). And, again in 1921, Freud stated that libido is not only the genital sexual drives but Eros.[26] Here we see that Jung's criticism is too literal—that his limiting of Freud's thinking to Eros as bodily sexuality is mistaken. My contention is that Freud and Jung have an overlap in their thinking that Eros, the life instinct, encompasses but is not

---

[26] "Anyone who considers sex as something mortifying and humiliating to human nature is at liberty to make use of the more genteel expressions "Eros" and "erotic". I might have done so myself from the first and thus have spared myself much opposition. But I did not want to, for I like to avoid concession to faintheartedness. One can never tell where the road may lead one; one gives way first in words, and then little by little in substance too. I cannot see any merit in being ashamed of sex; the Greek word "Eros", which is to soften the affront, is in the end nothing more than a translation to our German word Liebe [love]; and finally, he who knows how to wait need make no concessions" (Freud, 1921/1951, p. 91).

limited to sexuality, and, hence, they find a similar unconscious force in Eros.

Jung (1943/1953) acknowledged that in Freud's posthumously published writings (1938/1940), he credits Jung's "pupil" Sabina Spielrein for her contribution to his [Freud's] thinking, having drawn from her manuscript, "Destruction as a Cause of Coming into Being." Freud acknowledged Sabina's concept of two basic instincts: Eros, which binds and preserves; and the destructive instinct, which undoes connections and destroys—that is, the death instinct (p. 28).

In an Eranos lecture in 1948 and published in Aion (1950/1959) as "The Syzygy: Anima and Animus," Jung said he sees Eros as characteristic of female consciousness.

> The animus corresponds to the paternal Logos just as the anima corresponds to the maternal Eros. But I do not wish or intend to give these two intuitive concepts too specific a definition. I use Eros and Logos merely as conceptual aids to describe the fact that woman's consciousness is characterized more by the connective quality of Eros than by the discrimination and cognition associated by Logos. In men, Eros, the function of relationship, is usually less developed than Logos. In women, on the other hand, Eros is an expression of their true nature while their Logos is often only a regrettable accident. (p. 14)

For Jung, Eros is psychic relatedness, interconnectedness, what binds us together, and, rather than Eros and Logos being in opposition, he thought they coexisted within the individual and balanced each other within the psyche (Samuels, 1985). Furthermore, "It is the function of Eros to unite what Logos has sundered" (Jung, 1927/1964, p. 133).

In Carl Jung's attempt to understand the phenomenon of Eros in the countertransference, he does not discuss his personal experience but rather Eros as kinship libido, a vital archetypal force that propels the simple yearning for

human connection—an instinct for relationship that is at the center of the transference relationship. Kinship libido is the archetypal desire for human connection in the transference, what Jung called a *conjunctio,* a connection, a blurring of boundaries (Jung, 1946/1954, p. 72). He also discusses the symbolic union between patient and analyst as incest. This symbolic incest is not lived out or enacted. It is pure metaphor for the analytic experience in which kinship libido impels the intensity of longing in the therapy relationship for union with another, for the closeness of relationship with kin.

Jung was prescient in emphasizing the countertransference dimension of therapy, the inevitability of a psychological intermingling of patient and analyst at an unconscious level and the primary therapeutic importance, therefore, of "the doctor's personality" and vulnerability—thus, the need for analysts themselves to be analyzed. Jung (1946/1954) stated that transference is "the crux, or at any rate the crucial experience, in any thoroughgoing analysis" (p. vii). Jung meant by transference a mutual, psychological interpenetration in depth—i.e., transference and countertransference in complex conjunction—a *conjunctio* of deep mutual interpenetration.

In alchemy, the mystic, royal or divine marriage was called a *conjunctio,* "an alchemical symbol of a union of unlike substances; a marrying of the opposites in an intercourse which has as its fruition the birth of a new element" (Samuels, 1985, p. 35). The *conjunctio* acts as a guideline for the analyst and patient, and, as an archetype, it is never fully realizable.

How does a chemical combining relate to Eros and psychotherapy? What is combined? Combined are unlike parts, such as masculine and feminine, thinking and feeling, of the analyst and patient. In Jung's thinking, the patient

and the analyst are combined, as are "warring elements within the patient's (and analyst's) psyches" (Samuels, 1985, p. 203). Personal relatedness and intrapsychic processes might be combined as might different internal parts of the patient's psyche (or the different parts of the analyst's psyche). There is also a hoped-for *conjunctio* of the sensual and spiritual worlds. It remains important for the analyst and patient to discern, to attend to what is being combined, because otherwise it remains unconscious. Analysis is a differentiating process, taking unconscious material and bringing it to awareness. The energy enabling these different aspects to combine is affinity, Eros, what Jung called relatedness.

In *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, Jung (1943/1953) discussed how the tension of opposites is what propels psychic energy, how the tension of opposites helps define different theories of neurosis. For Jung, the logical opposite of Eros is Phobos (fear), but "psychologically it is the will to power" (p. 53). Where there is the will to power, said Jung, love is lacking. We know of the relationship of Eros and Phobos when we experience our own panic about the erotic in the consulting room, fear of erotic intensity, fear of boundary violations.

In the Greek imagination, Eros and Phobos were brothers, closely related, sons of Aphrodite and Ares, which explains much about the archetypal ground of the fear of Eros. Phobos embodies fear and horror. Phobos' twin brother was Deimos, god of fear, dread, and terror, while Phobos represented panic fear.

"Eros is a kosmogonos, a creator and father-mother of all consciousness" (Jung, 1961, p. 353). As we saw in Chapter One, Eros is the first principle of Hesiod's cosmogony. Eros guides the patient's capacity to go deeply into the erotic. Eros is a force for transformation and union with the divine.

Jung (1961) is careful to admit he does not have a language for love:

> I have again and again been faced with the mystery of love and have never been able to explain what it is. . . . Whatever one can say, no words express the whole. . . . To speak of partial aspects is always too much or too little, for only the whole is meaningful. . . . For we are, in the deepest sense the victims and the instruments of cosmogonic "love." I put the word in quotation marks to indicate that I do not use it in its connotations of desiring, preferring, favoring, wishing and similar feelings, but as something superior to the individual, a unified and undivided whole. Being a part, man cannot grasp the whole. He is at its mercy. . . . He is dependent upon it and is sustained by it. . . . Man can try to name love, showering upon it all the names at his command, and still will involve himself in endless self-deceptions. If he possesses a grain of wisdom, he will lay down his arms and name the unknown by the more unknown, *ignotum per ignotius*—that it, by the name of God. That is a confession of his subjection, his imperfection, and his dependence; but at the same time a testimony to his freedom to choose between truth and error. (p. 354)

We see that the inexplicable Eros is multi-level, deeply aesthetic, spiritual and transcendent, certainly more encompassing than genital sexuality. Jung alludes to the ubiquity of Eros in a deep, life-altering analysis. He discusses the phenomenology of heterosexual Eros/anima through the "four stages of eroticism": first stage—Eve, earth, purely biological, a mother to be fertilized; second stage—Helen of Troy, the sexual Eros, on an aesthetic and romantic level where the woman has value as an individual; third stage—Virgin Mary where Eros is raised and spiritualized to a religious devotion, a spiritual motherhood. Jung (1946/1954) writes:

> The fourth stage (Sapientia) illustrates something which unexpectedly goes beyond the almost unsurpassable third stage: *Sapientia*. How can wisdom transcend the most holy and the most pure?—presumably only by virtue of the truth that the less sometimes means the more. This stage represents a spiritualization of Helen and consequently of Eros as such. That is why *Sapientia* was regarded as a parallel to the Shulamite in the Song of Songs. (p. 174)

Clinical Cases

In the 244 cases discussed in the 18 volumes of his Collected Works, Jung makes scant reference to the erotic in a patient or in a countertransference

relation to a patient, or to his experience of Eros. But he was able non-defensively to use erotic love in his therapy without making specific reference to it. Two cases of his relation to Eros do stand out for me, however.

"A Simple Girl of the Hills"

The first case is called by a biographer of Jung, Laurens van der Post (1975), "a simple girl of the hills" (p. 57). Jung responded to a plea from a doctor in a distant mountain region of Switzerland to treat a young girl who was going insane. She came to visit Jung, who quickly realized this young girl had neither the intelligence nor the sophistication for an analytic therapy. He met her in his study and soon understood that this girl's community, which was trying to become modern, had contempt for her beliefs, customs, natural propensities, and ideas. "Her own natural state . . . primitive self, had lost such honour with herself and others that her heart wilted because of a lack of incentive in the kind of prospect life held out for her" (van der Post, p. 57).

Jung encouraged this young girl to talk, to talk about what mattered in her life, what she loved and enjoyed, and he immediately noticed a "flicker of intense glow in what had appeared to be burnt-out ashes of herself" (van der Post, 1975, p. 57). Jung was so enlivened to observe her spirit returning to life from the state of a despised self that he accompanied her in the singing of her nursery songs and mountain ballads. He danced with her in his study and would place her on his knee and rock her in his arms, "undeterred by any thought of how ridiculous if not preposterous would be the picture of him in the eyes of the orthodox medical and psychiatric practitioners when told of what he described" (p. 57).

Ever quick to defend his science to the scientists of his day, Jung reported to van der Post that this time, "I had to point over and over again to pompous asses that I obviously drew a firm line between psychology as a science and psychology as a technique" (van der Post, 1975, p. 58). In the case of the young peasant girl, the treatment was short—three days—and he sent her on her way honoring herself in full spirit. Jung allowed himself the erotic of the parent, dancing with joy, rocking, and bouncing her on his knee without hesitation, what he felt she needed in order to counter what she had lost. Here we see Jung as physical, intimate, nurturing, and maternal.

Sabina Spielrein: The Dark Side of Eros

How then did Jung's understanding of Eros find expression in his relationship with Sabina Spielrein (1885-1942)? His relationship with Sabina and the complexity he encountered professionally, reflected in letters to Freud, provide us with the material for our investigation.

Whether Jung distances himself from the erotic potential of analytic treatment or pulls us closer to the experience through analogy depends upon how one reads Jung. One can look at many places in his writings, and it is still hard to extract Jung's visceral experience of Eros. With Sabina, we see how Eros explodes in a relationship. In Jung's theory of how analysis works, how alchemical drawings relate to it, it is hard to find his experience of Eros. The real place to understand Jung and Eros is in the experience-near, his analytic relationship with Sabina, which scared Freud more than it scared Jung.

We sense Jung knows the erotic quite well. A young man at the time, 29 years old, four years into his first psychiatric position and an inexperienced

psychiatrist, he fell in love with and was deeply attached to a patient, the beautiful and brilliant Russian Jew, a true other, part of his fantasy anima, Sabina Spielrein. Sabina was deeply disturbed when she entered the Burgholzli, a psychiatric hospital, and she left improved from her therapy with Jung and went on to become a medical student (1905-1911) at the University of Zurich and a medical doctor (1911), a theorist, and writer of many important theoretical papers.[27]

Sabina arrived in Zurich in 1904 as a student at the university's medical school. Women in the medical school were disrespected, marginalized, and harassed (Bair, 2003, p. 91). She left abruptly a few days later after suffering attacks of acute hysteria and was admitted to the hospital where Jung was on staff, the Burgholzli public mental asylum, which is now the University of Zurich psychiatric hospital.

Sabina was 19 when she and Jung met. She was a highly intelligent, outspoken, intense, outgoing, sultry, dark-haired Russian Jew with a predisposition for hysteria; both of her parents suffered from it as well. She was well travelled, fluent in Russian, Polish, French, German, and also knew English, Latin, and Greek.

Though her behavior as a patient was erratic, Dr. Bleuler, the chief of the asylum, treated her as the doctor she wanted to become, allowing her to take morning rounds with the doctors, and, with prescience, encouraged her to work

---

[27] ". . . Concerning the Psychological Content of a Case of Schizophrenia (Dementia Praecox)" (1912); published "Destruction as the Cause of Coming to Be" in the *Jarbuch* and is accepted into the Viennese Psychoanalytic Society (1912); "On Transformation" (1911)" (McGuire, 1974, p. 644). McGuire also tells us that in 1919, she published a history of the Russian psychoanalytic movement and in 1920, she published five more papers.

in the laboratories of Franz Rilkin and Carl Jung with their word association experiments. She collated Rilkin's results and watched Jung conduct tests. She began to idealize Jung and would suffer and regress when he was absent from the hospital.

Jung was the supervisor of Sabina's therapy for 10 months, until she was discharged in June, 1905; at which point she moved into her own apartment near the medical school. Both Jung and Bleuler wrote letters of recommendation on her behalf, and she returned to the University.

Jung's and Sabina's professional and personal lives were interconnected until her graduation from medical school in 1911 (Bair, 2003, p. 86). Her discharge did not end her therapy with Jung. She saw him several times during the summer of 1905 as an outpatient and continued to help Jung and Rilkin with their word association experiments. The boundaries were so blurred that Jung asked Sabina to analyze the results of Emma, his wife, three years older than Sabina, when she was a subject in the association experiment.

Sabina was still seeing Jung privately as a patient in 1906 but did not pay for the treatment. Sabina, open about her erotic attachment to Jung, called what they created together "poetry" and was upset that Jung refused to father her fantasy child, whom she named "Siegfried." Her mother forbade Sabina from being sexual, yet Sabina taunted her mother by declaring the intensity of her love for Jung. Sabina's mother had fired Jung, but Sabina continued her therapy several times a week for six to eight months, visiting Jung at the Burgholzli for "confidential talks" and private walks that might have constituted "therapy" had she paid (Bair, 2003, p. 108).

Jung told Freud that

> during the treatment, the patient had the misfortune of falling in love with me [and that] knowing she would relapse [if he withdrew] I prolonged the relationship over the years and in the end found myself morally obliged, as it were, to devote a large measure of friendship to her. (as cited in McGuire, 1974, pp. 228-229)

Actually, Jung was "very emotionally embroiled with her. Jung's Eros was engaged in all of the excruciating ways we well know and still hear about even forty years later in "'The Psychology of the Transference'" (Tresan, 1992, p. 87).

Though Sabina had a great mind, and Jung indeed loved her, she was a victim of her culture. I believe Jung's love and attachment was healing for her, though later in their relationship, since neither understood the magnetic power of Eros in a therapy relationship, Eros went hay-wire.

Perhaps Jung is alluding to his sexual attraction for Sabina when in 1906, he analyzes his dream for Freud, saying that being satisfied with his "rich" wife, Emma, did not "hide an illegitimate sexual wish that had better not see the light of day" (McGuire, 1974, p. 15).

I will present additional excerpts from Jung's letters to Freud because they represent a living background of the erotic in the history of psychoanalysis in general and of Jung's understanding of the transference in particular. We can understand why later analysts have become frightened by Eros when we learn how Jung and Sabina were damaged from not knowing how to handle it. We know that Jung fell in love with his patient, just as we know Breuer fell in love with Anna O. Freud was privy to both, and Sabina and Anna are perhaps the linchpins of Freud's theory on transference and countertransference and of his

injunction: stay away from too much love and involvement because danger follows.[28]

In Jung's second letter to Freud, October 23, 1906, he discussed "a difficult case, a 20-year-old Russian girl student, ill for six years" (McGuire, 1974, p. 6). In 1906, Sabina had been discharged from the hospital for 16 months and was attending medical school. Jung was treating her as a private patient, though not getting paid. At a meeting in Amsterdam, 1907, Jung described Sabina's case in a paper "The Freudian Theory of Hysteria" (Jung, 1908/1961, pp. 20-21).

Sabina, with her fantasy about Siegfried and knowing Jung delivered a paper about her in Amsterdam, became more and more humiliated in relation to Jung. And, Jung felt tortured by her. Jung's and Sabina's attempt at psychoanalysis ended abruptly by mutual decision in spring, 1908. Jung broke off communication with her during the years 1908 to 1909.

During this time when they, Sabina and Jung, were not talking, on March 7, 1909, Jung, clearly troubled about the relationship, wrote Freud about Sabina, but did not mention her by name.

> I have always acted the gentleman towards her but . . . I nevertheless don't feel clean, and that is what hurts the most because my intentions were always honorable. But you know how it is—the devil can use even the best of things for the fabrication of filth . . . for until now I had a totally inadequate idea of my polygamous components despite all my self-analysis. Now I know where and how the devil can be laid by the heels. (McGuire, 1974, p. 207)

On June 4, 1909, Jung wrote more to Freud about his difficulties with Sabina.

---

[28] We have earlier looked at another letter of Freud's from 1911 (as cited in McGuire, 1974, pp. 475-476) to Jung about Sabina, warning Jung of an erotic countertransference.

> She was, so to speak, my test case, for which reason I remembered her with special gratitude and affection. . . . I saw that an unintended wheel had started turning, whereupon I finally broke up with her. She was, of course, systematically planning my seduction, which I considered inopportune. Now she is seeking revenge. Lately she has been spreading a rumour that I shall soon get a divorce from my wife and marry a certain girl student. . . . I was trying to cure her *gratissime*(!) [italics in original] with untold tons of patience, even abusing our friendship for that purpose. On top of that, naturally, an amiable complex had to throw an outsize monkey-wrench into the works. (McGuire, 1974, p. 229)

In footnote 11 of this chapter, we saw that Freud replied three days later with reassurance to Jung. On June 21, 1909, Jung apologized to Freud for having attributed to Sabina the rumors of Sabina's fantasy child (a heroic Christ-like child named Siegfried she wanted to have with Jung), saying that the rumors did not emanate from her, but because of Jung's "ideas of reference," he had blamed Sabina. Fortunately for Jung, Sabina

> has freed herself from the transference in the best and nicest way and has suffered no relapse (apart from a paroxysm of weeping after the separation). . . . Although not succumbing to helpless remorse, I nevertheless deplore the sins I have committed, for I am largely to blame for the high-flying hopes of my former patient. So, in accordance with my original principle of taking everyone seriously to the uttermost limit, I discussed with her the problem of the child, imagining that I was talking theoretically, but naturally Eros was lurking in the background. *Thus I imputed all other wishes and hopes entirely to my patient without seeing the same thing in myself* [italics mine]. When the situation had become so tense that the continued perseveration of the relationship could be rounded out only by sexual acts, I defended myself in manner that cannot be justified morally. Caught in my delusion that I was the victim of the sexual wiles of my patient, I wrote to her mother that I was not the gratifier of her daughter's sexual desires but merely her doctor, and that she should free me from her. In view of the fact that the patient had shortly before been my friend and enjoyed my full confidence, my action was a piece of knavery which I very reluctantly confess to you as my father. (McGuire, 1974, p. 236)

Neither Jung nor Sabina wanted to end their relationship. In 1910, he became her advisor for her dissertation, "On the Psychological Content of a Case of Schizophrenia," which was published in Jahrbuch in 1912. While writing in

her diary about the meeting when she asked him to be her advisor, Sabina confessed in August, 1910,

> The most important outcome of our discussion was that we both loved each other fervently again. My friend [Jung] said we would always have to be careful not to fall in love again; we would always be dangerous to each other. He admitted to me that so far he knew no other female who could replace me. . . . At the beginning he was annoyed that I had not sent my paper to him long before, that I did not trust him, etc. Then he became more and more intense. At the end he pressed my hands to his heart several times and said this should mark the beginning of a new era. (Kerr, 1993, p. 295)

Jung was initially upset by her dissertation, but by the time he wrote her on September 21/22, 1910, he "took responsibility" for why he had been upset:

> I allow myself to write to you so openly and frankly since after long reflection about myself I have resolved all the bitterness that still existed in my heart toward you. In truth this bitterness did not emanate from your dissertation—there is nothing there that is unpleasant for me—but from the inner anguish I suffered because of you—and you because of me. I truly wish you happiness from the bottom of my heart and will always think of you with such a feeling. (Kerr, 1993, p. 349)

Sabina left Zurich in January, 1911.[28] Jung was "at a loss for decent intellectual companionship" (Kerr, 1993, p. 334) and was also at a loss emotionally (Kerr). Jung and Sabina, however, continued writing, until perhaps 1919, 15 years after they met (Carotenuto, 1982, p. 128). Sabina studied art history in Munich and then moved to Vienna to study psychoanalysis and, in 1912, became a member of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. In 1923, with her husband and two daughters, Sabina returned to Russia. In 1942, she, her daughters, and all the townspeople were killed at gunpoint by Nazi soldiers in a synagogue (her husband had already died of a heart attack).

Tresan (1992) writes, "No one had a deeper potential to touch Jung emotionally, for in her was the convergence of Jung's probably most incendiary

---

[28] Toward the end of 1910, Jung began his analysis with Toni Wolff.

encounter with eros through a woman and his equally enormous encounter with it in his difficulties with Freud" (p. 88). In his memoir, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1961), Jung describes the anima figure ("a dangerous and autonomous anima" (Tresan, p. 89)) who, in 1916, spoke to Jung in fantasy, chiding that he was doing art rather than science (Jung). Our best guess is that this anima figure was Sabina.

Many of his biographers believe Sabina was the anima figure in his 1916 fantasy. John Kerr (1993) wrote that Jung left few clues as to who this anima figure was other than he said he had broken off correspondence with her after the war. Furthermore, in Sabina's medical dissertation, she wrote that "Poetry=Love, that Art=Poetry," and Jung and Sabina had a secret communication that poetry=sex (Kerr, p. 507). Jung, in his elder years, loved stone-carving at his Bollingen retreat. Remaining there is a stone triptych with a bear bending down, its nose nudging a ball, and the inscription, "Russia gets the ball rolling" (Kerr, p. 507).

As Jung wrote in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1961), "Eros makes just as great demands upon the power drive as the latter upon the former" (p. 153). Jung reminds us that "numinous experience elevates and humiliates simultaneously . . . sexuality is numinous—both a god and a devil" (p. 154). Was Jung speaking about himself when he wrote that for Freud sexuality was numinous, though Freud did not realize this was true for himself? We see how both Jung and Sabina were humiliated by the untamed and unnamed Eros.

Jung was swept away by Sabina and in denial at the same time. An analyst in a deep erotic countertransference is in a de-integrated state, just as the patient is. He makes a fragile effort to stay one step ahead of the process, to have

a little more objectivity than the patient has. The drawings from the *Rosarium Philosophorum* found Jung.

Rosarium Drawings: Understanding Sabina.

Perhaps Jung revisited his own erotic experiences through the drawings of the *Rosarium Philosophorum*. I make the assumption he is talking about his relationship with Sabina Spielrein, though not explicitly. Jung (1946/1954) interpreted a series of wood-cut illustrations, boldly reasoning that the stages of transformation in the series of pictures in the alchemical text, *Rosarium Philosophorum*, symbolically illustrate the *opus alchymicum* and features of archetypal transference phenomena in psychoanalysis. The pictures in Jung's *Psychology of the Transference* are from this famous series of 20 woodcuts that were first printed in the second volume of *De Alchimia Opuscula Complura Veterum Philosophorum* in Frankfurt in 1550 (Fabricius, 1994).

> In the *opus alchymicum* the erotic, sexual and incestuous features of the relationship between the king and the queen (or the sun and the moon) are outstanding characteristics which are only thinly veiled by the allegorical language of the adepts. In the transference, the erotic, sexual and incestuous elements never escape the attention of the analyst. (Fabricius, p. 32)

The scholar and historian of alchemy, Johannes Fabricius, notes that Jung did not explore the erotic in the drawings fully, as in drawing 8a, which Jung omitted, the feminine figure is indeed pregnant (Fabricius, 1994, p. 37)—that is, explicitly about the physical and sexual body, and Jung does not acknowledge it. Fabricius points out that Jung did not elucidate all 20 drawings of the Rosarium and their variants, but stayed only with the first 10. Jung's interpretation of the drawings was actually distorted because, for example, he combined the 11th and the 5th drawings and the 19th and the 9th drawings.

Nevertheless, Jung tried to make an analogy between the healing power of the transference and the alchemical drawings, reasoning that if the analyst is not an obstacle to the process, if the patient, for example, is allowed full range of dreams and fantasies, the patient is more likely to develop an integrated personality. Jung believed that both the transference and the structure of the *opus alchymicum* reflected the process of individuation. Jung discusses the symbolic content of the drawings as "this equals that" but never fully questions what he is describing. He decided that he discovered exact similarities in both the transference and the alchemical process but failed to put the discovery to the test of critical examination.

If a person considering Jungian analysis were to look at the erotic drawings in Jung's *Psychology of the Transference,* this person would see Jung's image of a symbolic individuation process in the series of ten illustrations, six of which are clearly erotic woodblocks of male and female, the King and Queen, becoming nude together, sinking into the depth of a bath, intertwined in embrace in the fifth drawing called "Coitus." The King and Queen play in the bath, unite, create, produce something new together, whether a child, soul, or homunculus. "Hmmm," a prospective patient might muse, "what in the world will happen to me when I enter that office"?

Do we not have merger, spiritual sex, the deepest of intimacies? In the last woodblock, the King/Queen become one figure, one body with the wholeness of two heads, male and female, a unity. Jung deepens the concept of an analytic relationship by his attention to the King and Queen as analogous to analyst and patient, here, as equals in an erotic embrace and connection.

The pictures, sexual and erotic, are an expression of the intensity of such feelings in the analytic relationship, but Jung blunts the raw erotic nature of these feelings by calling them, as stated earlier, "kinship libido." He discusses these drawings as metaphor and uses them to deepen our understanding of the potential for transformation in an analytic relationship. But, his omission of "erotic" in his description is curious since the drawings clearly are erotic.

Jung understood that a concrete physical connection was not the transformative factor, but he avoided an exploration of his experiences or feelings in the analytic relationship. In his thinking about the drawings, he moves to sublimation, quick to announce the spiritual and the transcendent in the analytic encounter. Perhaps he tries to make sense of his own notion of transcendence, but I believe he was afraid to play with the full range of his experience and fantasy.

While we note Jung's sexual reserve, the drawings remain an avenue for erotic aliveness in the psyche. The symbols may capture for us the actual experience of being with another human being. Jung says the symbol comes from the body. In the *Psychology of the Transference* (1946/1954), Jung holds what might be considered opposites—the erotic, intimate body and the aloneness of the mind and soul. It is not clear whether Jung has fully contained these "opposites" in a way that seems true for someone fully in transference/countertransference experiences. Everyone reading his *Psychology of the Transference* experiences Jung's symbolic description of analysis in his or her own particular way. For some readers, he is heady and intellectual. For others, he is steamy and alive.

Andrew Samuels (1985) reminds us that, to understand the sexual alchemical symbolism "sexuality has to be present for its symbolic meaning to be

interpreted. In order for psychological transformation to result from analytical interaction, that interaction must acquire and radiate something of an erotic nature" (p. 207).

Jung publicly expressed embarrassment when he showed that his anima got under his skin, or "danced on his forehead."[29] Jung rarely speaks from the personal. He becomes ashamed when he is not scientific and objective, so he stays at the objective level. He was an avowed scientist, professor, and psychologist who tended to rise above the "he said, she said" of clinical descriptions, writing at a more general, universal level.

He stays one or two abstractions above the personal. In his use of universal patterns and generalizations, we discern in Jung a man of deep passion. Not all of one's experience is conveyed in words, and just because Jung usually does not include in his writings his direct experience, we cannot assume that Jung, as an analyst, has not experienced the heat expressed in the drawings. In fact, I think we can assume he has.

Jung's understanding of transference-countertransference is at a psychological and spiritual level, and the erotic is only implicit. The essence of his core work on transference, *Psychology of the Transference* (1946/1954) is about transcendence, a union with the analyst whose ultimate outcome is an integration of the patient with the Divine, within and without. We know that the failure of the patient and analyst to attain oneness is the true subject of an analysis and yet the longing for oneness with the mother/father/analyst can be met briefly in a symbolic meeting or in a momentary sharing between analyst

---

[29] This is well described by David Tresan (1992) in his article on Anima in which he describes Barbara Hanna's explanation of Jung's negotiations with his anima.

and patient that establishes the ground for healing. We know that seeking oneness with one another, as in the patient and analyst seeking oneness, is a desired state. Finding it is unrealizable. The erotic exchange between analyst and patient can find containment and acceptance as a part of an alchemical transformation that Jung recognized as the essential internal structure of the *Rosarium.*

Jung's Eros flamed into desire with Sabina, and in alchemy, he found a metaphor to stir, to contain and describe his experience. It is said that all writing is essentially autobiographical, and Jung (1933) claimed his writing was a subjective confession (p. 220). In his alchemical model we see that the symbol comes out of his gut. In relation to Sabina, Jung confessed the depths of his erotic preoccupations, but as problematical and potentially destructive to him and to her.

Jung, a victim of himself, was internally embattled and confused by their relationship. He acknowledges his painful alchemical journey when he writes, in his second to last extant letter to Sabina on September 1, 1919:

> The love of S. for J. made the latter aware of something he had previously only vaguely suspected, that is, of a power in the unconscious that shapes one's destiny, power which later led him to things of the greatest importance. The relationship had to be "sublimated" because otherwise it would have led him to delusion and madness (the concretization of the unconscious). Occasionally one must be unworthy, simply in order to continue living. (as cited in Kerr, 1993, p. 491)

The tone suggests sadness, gratitude, a sense of a theory that incorporates personal failure. Sabina's having met Jung as a patient in a mental hospital provided a frame to their relationship that could not be overlooked or overcome. Without the wisdom of what it is to be in the grip of Eros, both were damaged by their lack of theory yet neither was ultimately destroyed by it. Jung is humiliated

and also humbled by the experience. Occasionally one must know one's unworthiness, "simply in order to continue living" (as cited in Kerr, 1993, p. 491.)

Their story supports my thesis of bringing the erotic, the understood, known, mutually acknowledged erotic, with its creative potential for ultimate transformation of both analyst and patient, fully into the light.

Eros in Clinical Jungian Analytical Psychology

In this section, I will frame the exploration of Jungian psychology and the erotic in the consulting room, with a quote from Carl Jung, written in 1920. I will provide a summary review of Jung's relation to the erotic and analysis. Then I will examine what modern Jungians have written on the topic. In the following quote, we find the foundation for what, 80 years later, we call the "field" and we remember what I previously espoused: that the transference and countertransference are a unit of mutuality and reciprocity.

> For twist and turn the matter as we may, the relation between doctor and patient remains a personal one within the impersonal framework of professional treatment. . . . For two personalities to meet is like mixing two different chemical substances: if there is any combination at all, both are transformed. In any effective psychological treatment the doctor is bound to influence the patient; but this influence can only take place if the patient has a reciprocal influence on the doctor. You can exert no influence if you are not susceptible to influence. It is futile for the doctor to shield himself with a smoke-screen of fatherly and professional authority. By so doing he only denies himself the use of a highly important organ of information. (Jung, 1946/1954, p. 71)

Ellen Siegelman

In reviewing the literature by Jungian analysts on the erotic, let me first acknowledge the comprehensive and illuminating article by Ellen Siegelman (2002) "The Analyst's Love: An Exploration." She includes a personal communication with Tom Ogden in 2000 in which he concurs with his mentor

Bryce Boyer, that "If it (counter-transference love) doesn't ever occur in an analytic treatment, there's something badly missing" (Siegelman, p. 23). Siegelman reviews the thinking on love and analysis by London Jungians Kenneth Lambert (1981) and Rosemary Gordon (1993), Betty Meador's (1984) important paper, "Transference/countertransference between woman analyst and the wounded child," and David Sedgwick's (1994) *The Wounded Healer; Countertransference From a Jungian Perspective* and notes that the "sacred" is missing from the psychoanalytic literature on the analytic relationship. "If 'love' is almost unpronounceable for many psychoanalysts, then 'sacred' is like a huge bone that sticks in the craw" (p. 23). Siegelman cites examples of her love for patients and provides some guidelines to elucidate the experience of analytic love.

She attempts to differentiate between analytic love and sentimentality and piety and rightfully states that, to protect against sentimentality, we need the freedom to experience love's opposite, hate. And, Siegelman's love for a particular patient was not dependent in any way on the patient's performance in life or success in therapy. Siegelman (2002) realized her love was for the whole of the patient, that the

> essence of analytic love is that it hooks into some connectedness, even at moments some merger, between my patient and me. Perhaps it is because I feel I have glimpsed what Winnicott calls "the true self" or what Jung calls the Self of this person. And that self, as we know, is not all pretty. Completedness means embracing the dark side of oneself and the other. When anyone presents to me from his or her depths, beyond the persona, whatever they are giving me—or sometimes hurling at me—inspires a kind of awe. (p. 25)

With one male patient, she concentrated on her erotic attachment to his physical attractiveness as a protection against his hurling aggression toward her. She also

notes that as a particular male patient brought more of himself into the room, the more erotically attracted to him she became and adds that Boston Jungian analyst, John Haule, author of *The Love Cure* (1996), like David Mann, believes the analytic relationship is quintessentially erotic (p. 28).

Siegelman (2002) observed that Rosemary Gordon also acknowledges the inevitability of Eros in the analytic hour, Eros as the passionate part of analysis, a vitality and deep mutual involvement. One of Gordon's criteria for accepting a patient is that the person be someone Gordon could imagine literally being touched by or touching.

Siegelman (2002) raises an important but unanswerable question: how much of analytic love is maternal, like the mother's love for her unique and special infant? Obviously, parent and analyst share a common base between, but she reminds us that the mother/child metaphor is only partially applicable. The analyst hopes to be an adult to the adult or child in the patient, while at other times, the same analyst might feel like a child nurtured by a parental analysand.

> Analytic love at its best is not sentimental because it is differentiated and because it is not blind. Constant idealized admiration does no service to an analysand. . . . It is a knowing love that knows how difficult, envious, despairing, crotchety, colicky the patient can be. (p. 26)

Furthermore, the faith and hope in analytic love is not only for the patient's potential, but towards the patient in the present.

We know that grandiose or narcissistic analysts convince themselves of the need to rescue, save, or redeem, done in the name of love. Siegelman (2002) again reminds us that, although healing occurs in the presence of love, the analyst's love to which she refers emanates from beyond the ego, is not used to further the analyst's ego, and does not depend on an anticipated outcome (p. 26).

Siegelman (2002) tells us that the analytic relationship has aspects of mother/child, father/child, teacher/ pupil, confessor/congregant, friendship or "lovership," but that none of these relationships is an exact metaphor. Why? Because the analytic relationship, in its mutuality, is a symbolic[30] relationship, in which the analyst has the experience of the fullness of his or her feelings, while at the same time maintaining sufficient distance and restraint from full participation to be able to monitor conscious and unconscious meanings. If the analytic relationship is considered to be only symbolic, it becomes rarified, and at the same time, if it loses its "as-if" nature, it remains too concrete and literal, and much meaning is lost. Siegelman asserts that this paradox is the essence of the uniqueness and special quality of analysis.

David Tresan

In a more recent journal article, Jungian analyst David Tresan (2007) discusses the freedom, potentiality, and multiplicity of relationships in the analytic hour. He invites the fullness and Eros of both participants in the analytic couple.

> The common base of analysis, as I see it, is the coming together of two human beings in a setting structured to facilitate the most decent, the most helpful, the most edifying and ethical engagement that human beings can imagine. Its ground rules include the highest, most tenacious, and most salutary degree of honesty, truth-telling, caring and loving, healing, and existential grounding that humans can hope for. At best, it aims to include the total person, including his or her emotions, cognitive processes, bodily experiences, and sexual and spiritual urges.
>
> Consider that there is nothing like analysis in the canon of human engagement. There is no other such institution in the world whose potential is as extensive and comprehensive and honoring of the individual, nor has there ever been. At one time or another the conduct of

[30] Compare this to Schaverien's (1996) discussion of the problem of sustaining the symbolic nature of the relationship and the difficulty for particular patients in not concretizing the erotic experience.

> analysis resembles friendship, mentoring, doctoring, parenting, priesting, but it itself is potentially all and none of these. (p. 48)

Tresan (2004b) speaks to analytic love and, as Searles confessed, a love which might become a love as intimate as marriage.

> The long term analytic situation with the security of its carefully monitored boundaries can exceed intimacies known otherwise only in marriage and lifelong friendships. In the analytic involvement, there is inevitably love also, not blind love [as Siegelman concurs] but one born of truly knowing one another. One knows one is known; one knows one is loved. It may be spoken or not. The container is as trustworthy as any that humans can build. (p. 387)

Nathan Field

Nathan Field (1999) writes specifically about how his unconscious fear of Eros in the countertransference and his not truly knowing himself destroyed a positive and developing therapy relationship with his patient, Mrs. K. His article is titled, after W. H. Auden's poem, "O Tell Me the Truth about Love," which Field attempts to do, particularly under the subheading, "A Treatment that Failed." Here Field comments on Mrs. K's fear of the power of her own seductiveness while she tells him she is becoming more bonded and falling in love. Field reassured himself her feelings were "purely transferential," while at the same time, he found himself

> under some kind of spell . . . I found myself increasingly captivated by the way she looked, the way she thought and especially the way she spoke. I sometimes had the distinct fantasy that her words palpably enveloped me in a shower of kisses. . . . I found myself entertaining fantasies [like Searles] of being happily married. My fantasies were deeply tender, romantic, and protective rather than lustful. It is possible that much of this idealized and innocent tenderness was introjected from her own unconscious [and his?] . . . it was no struggle to resist breaking boundaries. I did not need to: I had all the gratification I wanted just being in her company . . . the therapy felt like a joyful lovemaking. Given the rapport between us, Mrs. K. herself had by now reached a state of well-being such as she had never known before. . . . She appeared radiant,

> alive, confident, purposeful and looked increasingly beautiful, month after month. (p. 101)

Field (1999) rejoiced in and envied her well-being while at the same time he knew "it was too good to be true. As her attachment grew, so did my anxiety" (p.101). And, because of his fear and anxiety, he hurt Mrs. K. He believed it was his duty to "bring her [and him] back to earth. I told her that being in love with me was really a form of transference resistance against insight" (p. 101), although she had been responding to his interpretations with her own continuing self-reflection.

Not surprisingly, within weeks, the spell was broken. The carriage had turned back into a pumpkin. Mrs. K. "became manifestly depressed, mortified at having fallen victim to the illusion that I had ever really cared about her. Our relationship rapidly began to deteriorate" (p. 102). She got married during Field's Easter break, and the marriage also quickly began to deteriorate. She told Field her new husband was physically repulsive, and Field asked, "So why did you marry him?" She countered with, "And why did you go away?"(1999, p. 103).

At a surface meaning, Mrs. K. meant why did her therapist go away on vacation, but most profoundly she meant why did he retreat so abruptly from the loving connection, why did he forsake her? Field (1999) provides a sound analysis of his own failure. First, he acknowledges that patients, like infants [and analysts] thrive on love, "since it promotes healthy self-regard" and, along with understanding, confrontation, and safe boundaries, love is the basic healing factor of psychotherapy. Love has dangers, but primary dangers are when the analyst can not love the patient or else fears that love, as Field did. Samuels (1985), has the same advice but in Jung's language: "Numerous problems met

with clinically stem from an insufficiency of kinship libido or incest fantasy, not an excess of it" (p. 82). Field (1999) forthrightly admits that his failure was not in responding emotionally to her love, but in "lacking the confidence to let the love live out its full development within the boundaries of a professional relationship, I took it on myself to abort it prematurely" (p. 105). Of special note is Field's willingness, unusual in psychoanalytic literature, to share openly about a failure.

What does it mean to let the love blossom to its fullest capacity? Field (1999) emphasizes the transformational potential of the erotic in that it allows the analyst and patient each to find the capacity for greater love and loving, intimacy and truth, in what he calls a "four dimensional relationship" (p. 109), a profound sense of unity with the other while holding onto a strong sense of self. He borrows the four-dimensional idea from Einstein's four-dimensional union of time and space, a concept that becomes experience, like Bion's O, that grasps us more than we grasp it. The four dimensional relationship includes the paradoxical "union and separation of self and other... where we are not lost in one another but found" (Field, p. 109). The ego transcends itself in order to achieve the paradoxical state of communion/separation that we find in mystical experience, prayer, nature, art, music, and psychoanalysis—all of which are sometimes experienced in stillness and intense mutuality. This four dimensional potential comes from mutual acceptance of the other as he or she is, from mutual trust, from letting go of expectations, from entering a new space together, repeatedly over years. Field surrenders himself to a healing process of its own that he and the patient have initiated. "Each breakthrough seemed to come only after I allowed something in me to break down" (p. 109).

Warren Colman

Warren Colman (1994), the European editor of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, wrote an article titled "Love, Desire and Infatuation: Encountering the Erotic Spirit," which is in line with my thesis. He describes the universal spirit of erotic passion as akin to what the Greeks considered a "visitation from Eros" (p. 498), a visitation that is both sexual and spiritual, and that erotic love "contains within the possibility of uniting the sexual and the spiritual" (p. 499)—in my words, the body and God. Colman reminds us that, for Jung, the erotic spirit is an archetype in the collective unconscious—that is, an instinct expressed in an affectively charged image.

For Jung, when an archetype is activated or enlivened in the person, it contains a *numinosum*, an excited state filled with power, awe, and spirit that awakens and enchants the person. Jung (1947/1960) says

> There is mystical aura about the numinosity of the archetype and it has a corresponding effect upon the emotions. It mobilizes philosophical and religious convictions . . . it drives with unexampled passion and remorseless logic towards it goal and draws the subject under its spell, from which despite the most desperate resistance he is unable . . . to break free, *because the experience brings with it a depth and fullness of meaning that was unthinkable before* [italics added]. (pp. 205-206)

This experience of fullness is what Field in the above example was describing with his patient, Mrs. K, before the fall. This experience of the numinous Eros is what is compelling me to write this dissertation. I have been touched by Eros in the container of my analytic work and I seek and search for the philosophical and religious meanings beyond the power of Eros in my therapy relationships. Colman (1994) concisely conveys what I am trying to say: Indeed, for many people, erotic love "may be their closest brush with the divine" (p. 513).

Colman explains further that aspects of the erotic spirit are yearning for oneness with the other—illusion, idealization, and longing. We know the longing for oneness with another (person/object) is unrealizable and painful, that passionate love creates joy/pain, gain/loss, ecstasy/pierced hearts, rapture/anguish. Colman (1994) reminds us that Jung (1926/1954) writes that there is no birth of consciousness without pain, "that wisdom results from being devastated or damaged by a full-on assault from, and then a mediation with, the archetype, in this case, Eros" (p. 510).

The psychoanalytic view of passionate love contains the fear that love threatens ego boundaries and is problematic, for it views the longing for the other—the analyst by the patient or sometimes the patient by the analyst—as a repetition of significant developmental events in the past. Colman (1994), like Jung, considers the erotic spirit as forward moving, teleological, and a developmental task in its own right. The adolescent, thrown into the fiery cauldron of erotic longing and wish for sexual union on the cusp of adulthood, is initiated into adult sexual erotic love (p. 511). The separation and loss at the finale of the first love affair does echo separation from mother's womb, breast, lap, but in a more conscious way, just as the patient and analyst have to experience the end of the analytic hour or the entire analysis with unfulfilled desire. Colman contends that the wholeness lovers seek through union with one another can only be found through loss and separation (p. 512).

While I applaud his understanding of the erotic spirit, Colman (1994) makes two points I question. First, when discussing how a lover projects his or her ideal onto the beloved and then longs to be united with this perfect other, Colman posits that "What is sought without can only be found within" (p. 508).

If one is seeking God through the transcendent experience of Eros, my sense is that God is both immanent and transcendent, within and without. Jung (1926/1954) says, "It is, in truth, a genuine and incontestable experience of the Divine, whose transcendent force obliterates and consumes everything individual; a real communion with life and the impersonal power of fate" (p. 192). For Jung, the force of the divine is not in the individual psyche alone but in the collective unconscious and therefore, it transcends the individual.

Furthermore, Colman (1994) says, "The paradox of erotic love is that although it always speaks the language of the eternal and the infinite, it is in reality always temporal and limited" (p. 512). I question his use of "always," and I do not agree that erotic love is confined to the temporal. At the end of *Song of Songs*, the lover confesses, "Love is stronger than death. . . . Great seas cannot extinguish love, no river can sweep it away" (8:6-7, C. Bloch & A. Bloch, 2006, p. 111). One might lose the object of erotic desire but, in so doing, find God within. The death of the beloved might not extinguish one's desire. Sometimes our love for our beloved, now deceased, is only extinguished by our own death, even though love remains. The *Song of Songs* brings us to the heart of the erotic in analysis and we will explore this connection in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE: EXPLORATION OF DESIRE IN *THE SONG OF SONGS* AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I use an ancient text, *The Song of Songs*, to support the development of an argument intended to correct an enormous overcompensation in our field. Because of my respect for the text, I will express only my own opinion, except where I bring in other interpreters who share my thinking. Fear of ethical violation leads many therapists to believe that the erotic in countertransference is detrimental and to be avoided. Exactly to the contrary, I hope to deepen the value of the erotic in the clinical space, so that we can live more comfortably with, learn to understand, tolerate, and appropriate the erotic tensions in order to bring transformation to the work. In this chapter, we see how the Biblical *Song of Songs*, as it sings the praises of innocent and divine love, desire and faith, might, in fact, help us to welcome the erotic into our offices from the waiting room.[31]

During the past four decades, I have learned much about life from my patients. I learn particulary from the therapeutic work we do together. Sometimes the learning is through books they inspire me to read, or from their

---

[31] I have read many texts of commentary on the *Song of Songs* which include Robert Alter's commentary in Chana and Ariel Bloch's translation of the the poem, *The Song of Songs: The World's First Great Love Poem*, 2006; Debra Band's *The Song of Songs: The Honeybee in the Garden*, 2005; John Davidson's The Song of Songs: The Soul and the Divine Beloved, 2004, and Rabbi Nosson Scherman's translation of *Shir haShirim (Song of Songs) / An Allegorical Translation Based upon Rashi, with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources*, 1977. All these texts have contributed to my understanding of *The Song of Songs*. However, because none of the above interpretations incorporate psychoanalytic thinking, I have chosen to present my own commentary in this dissertation.

dissertations and manuscripts, and sometimes through our dialogue, or hearing their literary and academic passions, or discussing content from their book groups. I have been blessed to study Torah with my patient, whom I shall call Diane. Diane bought me a copy of the *Song of Songs* because she felt it was analogous to the work she and I do together.

I attempt to explain a connection between psychoanalysis, desire, love, faith, and the erotic poetry of the Biblical *Song of Songs*, as well as the connection between the *Song* and therapeutic work. I apply my own analysis when there is a fierce erotic connection. I realize that the *Song* encourages a deepening of our work even when we are not in an erotic field. The *Song* blesses all of life itself, every sentient moment of experience, everywhere, but especially in the therapeutic hour.

About the *Song of Songs*

Estimations of the dates of its composition extend from 950 to 200 BCE (Falk, 1973, p. xiv). *The Song of Songs, Canticle of Canticles* (from the Latin), *Song of Solomon, Sheer haShirim*—scholars simply call it *The Song*. Despite its antiquity, whether it originated in hymns of fertility cults, or was written by King Solomon, or is a compilation of oral love poetry, it sings of our own desires and how we experience them today. Rabbi Akiba (ca. 50–135 CE), the Head of all the Sages and the founder of Rabbinic Judaism, defended the *Song*'s inclusion in the canon. Rabbi Akiba found erotic desire Holy—that is, as a metaphor of desire for the Divine. He exclaimed in Mishnah 6, Yadaim 3:5, "All the world is not worth the day on which the *Song of Songs* was given to the people of Israel, for all Writings are holy, but the *Song of Songs* is the holiest of the holies" (Davidson, 2004, p. 61).

In the Hebrew way of using the superlative, this means the best of all songs. The Hebrew Bible is remarkable for its inclusion of this straightforward celebration of physical love. The *Song* sings of the erotic as holiness. If we allow ourselves, we can apprehend its physical and spiritual opening.

About Desire

The ancient text of the *Song of Songs* is an exploration of the power of desire. In Hebrew, there is no one term for desire. Instead, many verbs reveal its range: ask for, seek, delight (Hebrew: *haphes*), want, yearn, long for. In the *Song*, the object of desire is not the satisfaction of a longing. Instead, the lovers in the Song seek to relish and delight *in the longing itself.*

The embodiment of desire is the theme and the focus of the *Song's* eight chapters, 117 verses. It is about trust and faith in innocent, unblemished love. The lovers have found the love of their life and move toward it. The reader of the *Song* sees their coming and going, moving forward, away, their attempts at independence, so that they can come together, so they will not cling. We follow the force of life that needs to be bodily, not just psychologically or cognitively, awakened. The lovers in the Song are nameless. The heroine is referred to once and only as "the Shulamite woman."[32] Their venue is always changing, as in a kaleidoscopic, blurry dreamlike state—the sequences are confusing and jump

---

[32] Appearing only once in the Bible, in this verse, "the Shulamite" has four possible meanings:
(1) "the Shunammite"—from the village Shunem. Matthew Fox disagrees with this interpretation because "the Shulamite" lives in the city, Jerusalem, a walled city with streets and squares, as indicated in the *Song*. "I must rise and go about the city, the narrow streets and squares, till I find my only love" (3:2) or "the watchmen found me as they went about the city" (3:3). Or, her name could be derived from salem, a poetic term for Jerusalem, she could be "the Jerusalemite," feminine for the one from Jerusalem;
(2) "the peaceable one," or "complete, perfect one";
(3) a formal blend of the Mesopotamian war goddess Shulmanitu and "Shunammite";
(4) a feminine name for Solomon (C. Bloch & A. Bloch, 2006, p. 198).

from their home, to the street, alone, together, in a pasture, atop a mountain, talking with themselves, with others, in Jerusalem, in a vineyard, in a blur. In desire, we, as therapists, sometimes lose our bearings. Where are we? Time stands still or moves too fast.

The various desires in the Hebrew Bible circle around three vital aspects of life: plentiful harvests, human love, and the yearning for God. In this dissertation, especiallly in my interpretation of this Biblical text, I will be using the word, God. But, I do not wish to preach or proselytize. God can be metaphor for a connection to the spiritual, or as they say in AA, "a power greater than ourselves" (Hamilton, 1995, p. 27), or Bion's (1965) "O"—however one chooses to define it.

Desire has the capacity to take us out of ourselves, beyond ourselves. I shall call this transcendence. Professor Paul Gifford of the University of St. Andrews, UK, (2005) explains that the word Eros actually integrates the three distinct experiences of love, desire, and transcendence in a "single, complex human reality" (p. 5). Gifford posits the necessity to integrate love, desire, and transcendence, since in the 20th century, partly because it is a metaphysical concept, transcendence has been left out of literature. Desire is about appetite, trying to get what one wants, and is realized through the body, mind, and spirit. Love is energy in relational form, which in Gifford's hierarchy transcends desire. There is more to love than desire, an added value of human potential. From the Latin *transcendere*: to rise above, pass over and beyond, ascend, to be lifted beyond, exceed, to be lifted beyond a given state of being, transcendence allows us to reach out beyond desire and love (Gifford). Desire is for an object, while love can transform desire by bringing two people together. All three experiences

or concepts interact, lead back and forth to one another, and complete the human reality of Eros in that the three create a whole.

Desire pulls us beyond what we depend on as comfortable, past our usual limits, just beyond our grasp. Experiences of getting out of oneself are so varied. Some are personally transforming and others socially transforming. Desire, through prayer or mystical union, leads us out of our self-imposed prisons of hiding. It pulls us off balance, off our natural routine, leads us to the unknown, to another, to something larger, perhaps even to God, or, as in analysis, to a place we know not where we are going. Many therapists are uncomfortable with not knowing and try to close off desire. That is because they confuse the *experience* of desire with *action*—that is, acting out the desire. For a few, it *is* a tantalizing slippery slope.

In the *Song*, in life, in analysis, sexual attraction is everywhere and cannot be contained by theory. This idea is underscored by the book *Sexuality and the Sacred* (Nelson & Longfellow, 1994), which provides a broadened view of sexuality as "the basic eros of our humanness that urges, invites and lures us out of our loneliness into intimate communication and communion with God and the world" (p. xiv). The *Song* provides a renewal of our spiritual sexuality, which is internal, forceful, and timeless in the potency of desire. Time, place, plot, names are all unimportant in the *Song*.

At times, therapists are inhibited by the profession's safeguards and barriers. They have been taught to fear sexuality, longing, intimacy, and spirituality, as well as arousal, which is considered an erotic underpinning of excitement and pleasure. From want and desire comes excitement and fear. When fear enters, therapists should pay attention to it and ask themselves, "Is

this the patient's fear I'm picking up and experiencing as my own? Or, is it mine alone?" Most often it comes from both patient and therapist.

Have we experienced desire as hazardous? Have we protected ourselves from it? We often resist the truth of being aroused by the patient in the room, eschew either the pain or pleasure that might accompany intense desire, rather than moving toward the opening allowed by that moment.

There might be shame in being attracted to a patient, whether or not the patient shows any attraction in return. "He's hot, and I still have to be his therapist." What do I do? I might ask God for guidance. While I might want to deny it, shut it down, or interpret it away, I sit with the erotic experience, tentatively welcome it, see where the feeling leads, what follows, what images emerge. Besides shame, the feeling might lead to helplessness, or even self-contempt. Despite moral and ethical restraints on the therapist's action, we hope the desire might open up to further truth. For example, when I experience an insecure attachment to God, I try to accept the insecurity while opening to my deeper longings, to what is around me, and to gratitude.

What Does the *Song* Have To Do With Psychoanalysis?

Why does a canonical book, part of the Bible's wisdom literature chosen by the Rabbis and received by the Christians, matter to me and my work as an analyst? Careful reading of and immersion in the *Song* has helped to form me as an analyst. It has called me to be open to and live more comfortably with desire in myself and in the patient. How? Interacting with the ancient text of the *Song of Songs* helps mine the mystery of my own desire. The *Song* speaks to and offers insight into love, the wanting of the other, the boundary of language, the ache of

waiting, its ecstasy and vulnerability. What might we learn about the process of therapy from a Biblical text? In this chapter, I will quote from and amplify the *Song* and imagine how it speaks to eroticism in the work of therapists—the erotic as sensual, spiritual, potentially transcendent, vital. In the hope that my imaginings will be illuminating, I will illustrate the following connections between the *Song* and psychoanalysis: the mother's house, shared meanings, longing, absence and imagined presence, intense vulnerability, lack of consummation, the psyche as a garden, curiosity about the body, strength in tending to one's own vineyard, love as fierce as death, and, in particular, how my patient's dream image connects to the *Song of Songs*.

In My Mother's House

Diane offered me this holy text, with its stamp of intimacy, as an example of the work we do together—"Bind me as a seal upon your heart, a sign upon your arm" (8:6).[33] When she offered it, she reminded me again, as she frequently did, that our—her and my—analytic home is the mother's house. I said to Diane, "Let's look at some of these verses together, be with them and find a moment without words as we sink into them," and we read some of the *Song* together.

Analyst and patient know the image of mother, the generativity and holding from the mother in analysis. At times we offer the container of mother. For our patients, we are the mother's house.

From the *Song*:

---

[33] I rely on C. Bloch and A. Bloch's (2006) translation of the *Song* as my primary source unless noted otherwise. Citations to their translation will follow their text and include only chapter: verse. Because Falk (1973) does not use chapter: verse in her translation, citations to her text are indicated as follows: (Falk, 1973, p. number).

> Have you seen him? Have you seen the one I love? (3:3)
>
> I had just passed them [the watchmen of the city] when I found
> my only love.
> I held him, I would not let him go
> until I brought him to my mother's house,
> into my mother's room. (3:4)

A further image:

> O, if you were my brother,
> Nursed at my mother's breast.
> I'd kiss you in the street
>
> And never suffer a scorn.
> I'd bring you to my mother's home
> (My mother teaches me). (Falk, 1973, p. 12)

Also,

> There, beneath the apricot tree,
> Your mother conceived you,
> there you were born.
> In that very place, I awakened you. (8:5)

Or, as the mother/analyst delights in, beams at her patient:

> One alone is my dove,
> my perfect, my only one,
> love of her mother, light
> of her mother's eyes. (6:9)

Our patients offer us their profound injuries in love, desire, passion. And, there is a critical part of the mother/child bond that is erotic. Winnicott reminds us that if the parent responds to the baby's need with only care, feeding, and holding, and leaves out the erotic, a fundamental damage occurs for the infant (John Conger, personal communication, August 25, 2008).

Shared Meanings

Over time, we grow to share meanings with our patients. Like the shared meanings of sounds and expression between mother and baby, patient and

analyst develop their own shared, private vocabularies, verbal and non-verbal. In a desire to share and a sharing of desires, the sharing of sharings, the *Song of Songs'* lovers discover their own language of love.

Longing

The *Song* sings of sustained longing, of vulnerability in desire. As St. John of the Cross (1542-1591) tells us, all we have is our longing, a transformation through yearning; we find God in the longing.

Desire is more about longing than receiving.[34] We have all known the pining, longing, yearning for a lover—inaccessible, just out of reach. The woman in the *Song* is a garden of delights, an aroused woman, fragrant, alive, inviting. The man cannot gain entry, and his yearning is both strengthened and frustrated by her inaccesibility (Walsh, 2000).

"Desire is the discipline to live on that edge between wanting and satisfaction. . . . It is the hunger that highlights the food; the patience that highlights the faith; the arousal that anticipates sex" (Walsh, 2000, p. 22). It underlies the therapy relationship, hopefully, from both chairs in the room.

Desire might carry pain, the acutely felt knowledge of what is missing, or the pain of thwarted desire from the past or present—not just pain—but a search in the presence of fullness and in divine longing for something new. Desire pulls me inside, into what is missing, what might complete or add, what more I could give to the other, often not through direct giving, but holding in mind. The *Song*, with its searching and seeking, stimulates us to think of other searches, the pleasure of other loves and the limits of these searches and loves (Walsh, 2000).

---

[34] According to the philosopher, Alexander Kojeve (1980), desire is for the desire of the other to desire you, the other's recognition. I hope we are able to go beyond that.

In a deep erotic countertransference, I have yearned to be with my patient, just as Searles (1959) and others have attested to. With some patients, there is a spark I do not feel elsewhere. With others, their admiration of me is like a salve. Although I am conscious of not depending on or overvaluing their affection, knowing it is temporary, knowing it is only part of the whole, that rage may follow, it would be a lie to deny my pleasure in it.

We are always operating in a field. It does not matter who loves whom. The field is infused with love. If it is nourishing for me, it is nourishing for the other. Intense love is healthy. We try to let the love into the room, live with it, guilt free, or if we do feel guilty, we try to question why that is.

Absence and Imagined Presence

We also know of the longing we feel as patients, between sessions, in absences, even during sessions. Years ago, I imagined my analyst was watching me play tennis and clapping at certain shots, my own personal cheerleader. When I would look to the nearby bench to smile at the received praise, I was utterly surprised to find no one there. Perhaps my desire for his presence sustained me, provided pleasure, helped me play better. He was not really absent; he was totally alive in my mind, and that held me. There is disappointment in non-concretized desire, which is what the patient and therapist have to suffer through.

The people of the Bible, as all of us, contended with long absences, periods of deep suffering, wandering without a home, hanging on promises. We have learned to live with desire in the face of absence, a major theme of psychotherapy, and our goal is to hold the desire and see where it takes us.

Intense Vulnerability

It is likely that many therapists, in our roles as patients, have been deeply into an erotic transference. We know of idealization, our felt need for the therapist, sometimes bathed in sexual imagery. We often do not have the words to express our want. We know our experience of being wounded and having wounded. As one later reads the text of the *Song*, one can try to imagine oneself as the lover or the beloved, just as you imagine your vulnerable longing for your therapist, or you, as therapist, for those silent and, I hope not shameful, moments of longing for your patient. In the *Song*, the lover's vulnerability about her wants and desires reminds us of our own most vulnerable moments in the therapy relationship. When the beloved tells his lover,

> You have ravished my heart,
> my sister, my bride,
> ravished me with one glance of your eyes,
> one link of your necklace (4:9)

Initially the lovers are replete with flattery for one another. Flattery is an initial stage of intimacy. Is flattery a manipulative pumping up of the other's self-esteem or an honest observation and perception of the other person, or somewhere in between? In my early training, I was taught not to flatter or compliment a patient, for doing so would be seductive. But that dictum became an emotional imprisonment, and I have chosen to disregard it in favor of authenticity and genuine, sincere appreciation for my patient.

In the *Song*, the language of desire moves from flattery and compliments to his confession of her emotional impact on his subjectivity. He is full with inner turmoil, spent, destabilized in abject vulnerability (Walsh, 2000). Here desire has

an overpowering force. He has lost his sense of self; he is obsessed and feels psychically overwhelmed.

> Let me lie among vine blossoms,
> in a bed of apricots!
> I am in the fever of love! (2:5)
>
> Swear to me, daughters of Jerusalem!
> If you find him now,
> you must tell him
> I am in the fever of love. (5:8)

The lover is drunk with love. Loss of oneself into the other, an ecstatic death, is the merger of oneself melting into the other. Is this a reason that love and death are often associated, merger and separation, Eros and Thanatos? Freud's (1923/1961) idea of a death wish is not about dying, but about the severing of bonds, deterioration, dissolution. Thanatos severs. Do we know that it severs? For Jung (1927/1964), Eros is relatedness, Eros links, binds. Desire might be one of the purest forces, a vector bringing things together.

We see desire as erupting, chaotic, insistent, wild, uncharted, not listening to reason. Perhaps a therapist avoids the emotion of desire because it undermines the capacity for reason. Does allowing the potential of the moment, allowing what might come forth from being silent and still together, inhibit or abet critical thinking?

When the lover is overwhelmed, risking himself, or when a patient is vulnerable, for example, about our absence, we need to respond. The patient, or the lover in the *Song*, is taking the risk, baring her heart, and if the beloved, or the analyst, fails to respond, she or he is stopping discourse, fending off intimacy.

Lack of Consummation

What I value about the *Song of Songs* is its exploration of the intense and delicate pleasure (alongside the pain) of yearning, without the focus being on consummation, relief or fulfillment of that exquisite longing. Their consummation is not physical but is in their closeness to God. I am trying to find openings through the personal layers of psychology, defenses, habits, acculturations in order to pass through these layers, toward connection and access to the depth of God's love in the therapeutic relationship.

We, of course, live with the patient without the gratification or goal of what Freud called end-pleasure. "By living in the want, the erotic can frustrate and sharpen desire. . . . We emerge not having mastered its principles, but having felt its self-transcending potential" (Walsh, 2000, p. 44). The lovers' search reflects their freedom, and that freedom is reflected in the experience of yearning within the analytic hour. Their lack of consummation reminds us of the limits of the analytic relationship and how we strain to live within those limits through being ethical, through exercising consciousness, by remembering abuses of power, in using strong discipline and theory, and by making the patient more important than ourselves.

Therapists are generally taught not to touch their patients. In the Song, as in analysis, the spiritual lovers actually display little affection; there is a dignified lack of flaunting. Instead, they hope and trust, as we do in therapy, that their love is mutual. We renounce consummation. We strive to marry the other inside of ourselves, an internal marriage. We celebrate in an emotional, symbolic, not enacted way. "The Bible teaches one how to live with desire, in rigorous acceptance of non-fulfillment" (Walsh, 2000, p. 33).

In psychoanalysis, Carl Jung (1946/1954) reminds us, bride and groom symbolize the analytic couple. And we know, from Jung's uncovering and elucidation of pictures in the *Rosarium Philosophorum* that the analytic couple, my patient and I, are symbolically combined in a sexual union, symbolizing our therapeutic connection to one another. In analysis, the acceptance of longing is part of the transformative process—desire in relation to someone else, which, in the alchemical metaphor, brings it to a transformative melting point. Defenses break down, melt away in the love affair between the patient and the analyst, the love affair, which, when gently understood and held, slowly melts the wall of fear.

The Psyche as Garden: Tending the Fruit and Grapes

Metaphors of sexual desire in the *Song* are fruit, grapes, and wine, the natural world of gardens and horticulture, architecture, harvests. To apprehend the mystery of fertility, of life, of being, we are led inward toward our desire for what is invisible, the absent lover, the shepherd, the king, the invisible force of God. The *Song*'s metaphors of the natural world are doves, ewes, and goats on the mountain, images known from their lives.

> How fine you are, my love, my friend! Your eyes like
> doves behind your veil. (Falk, 1973, p. 15)

His

> eyes like doves, afloat
> upon the water,
> Bathed in milk, at rest
> on brimming pools. (Falk, 1973, p. 19)

Doves symbolize the spiritual element in the therapeutic relationship as depicted in the drawings from the alchemical text, *Rosarium Philosophorum* (Jung,

1946/1954). They are eyes as windows of consciousness, Aphrodite's, bird, Noah's dove, the Holy Ghost, spiritual intuition.

Other images: her hair

> falls like jewels on her neck.

> My love is radiant as gold or crimson,
> Hair in waves of black
> Like wings of ravens,
> Cheeks like beds of spices,
> Banks of flowers,
> Lips like lilies, sweet
> And wet with dew. (Falk, 1973, p. 19)

There are repeated images of grapes, wine, lips, sultry hair, tongues, honey, breasts. The repeated images call for meditation. Love and spiritual reality ask that we slow down to be in the presence of the images. In analysis, time is slowed down; the outer world is often forgotten.

> The *Song* provides a banquet for the senses: smell, touch, sight, taste.

> Kiss me, make me drunk with your kisses!
> Your sweet loving
> is better than wine. (1:2)

> Your lips are honey, honey and milk
> are under your tongue. (4:11)

> My beloved is mine and I am his.
> He feasts
> in a field of lilies. (6:3)

> You are fragrant,
> you are myrrh and aloes.
> All the young women want you. (1:3)

> And oh, your sweet loving,
> my sister, my bride. The wine of your
> kisses, the spice
> of your fragrant oils. (4:10)

The Rabbis compared the fragrance of the scented oils with the sweetness of the Commandments (Band, 2005)

We know the memory of taste, smell, touch, the visual that remains in our hearts, minds, and souls while in the presence of or after the departure of the beloved. The text says,

> And my beloved among the young men
> is a branching apricot tree in the wood.
> In that shade I have often lingered,
> tasting the fruit. (2:3)
>
> His mouth is sweet wine, he is all delight.
> This is my beloved
> and this is my friend,
> O daughters of Jerusalem. (5:16)

Or,

> That day you seemed to me a tall palm tree
> [a compliment to her stature]
> and your breasts
> the clusters of fruit. (7:8)
>
> Your breasts will be tender,
> As clusters of grapes. (Falk, 1973, p. 23)
>
> Your mouth will awaken
> All sleeping desire
> like wine that entices
> The lips of new lovers. (Falk, 1973, p. 23)

The lover continues,

> Let us go early to the vineyards
> to see if the vine has budded,
> if the blossoms have opened
> and the pomegranate is in flower. (7:13)

The ancient Jews believed a pomegranate had 613 seeds—the 613 commandments in the Torah (Band, 2005).

The beloved is the vintner, who works gently, slowly, watering lovingly, to seed, to tend and ripen the grapes. There is mutuality in the cultivation. The lovers whisper to one another within a walled garden retreat, the container we hold. We know the planting, fertilizing, growing, weeding of the crops, the

grapes, our garden, the psyche, our patient. We know patience in therapy, as therapist and patient ease into different ways of being together, as we learn to be in the moment, perceive where it moves, live in metaphor, in the complications, dense, thick, multi-layered, sometimes painful power of desire.

We know the ripening of the fruit:

Now he has brought me to the house of wine
and his flag over me is love. (2:4)

Let me lie among vine blossoms,
in a bed of apricots! (2:5)

I am in the fever of love
Daughters of Jerusalem, swear to me
by the gazelles, by the deer in the field,
that you will never awaken love
until it is right (2:7)

Until it is ripe. (3:5)

We see that the *Song of Songs* is as much about anticipating, waiting, inviting, as it is about the attainment of that love (Falk, 1973, p. xviii). In our culture, "waiting for love" sounds foreign to our ears. Our culture dislikes waiting for anything, let alone the passion of physical love.

Curiosity and Understanding of the Person

My dove in the clefts of the rock,
in the shadow of the cliff,
let me see you, all of you!
Let me hear your voice,
your delicious song,
I love to look at you. (2:14)

My belief is that no one wants their true core self to be fully known; there is a precious core we wish to remain hidden.

One way to learn about our patient and ourselves is to pay intimate attention to the body. For the analyst, the body is an organ of perception for learning about our patient. Jungian analyst Samuels (1985) writes:

> It *is* the therapist's own body that is involved [in understanding the patient] and the sensation is quite real, that body is also an imaginal body—in Corbin's (1972) phrase, a 'subtle body'. That is, on one countertransference level the therapist's body does not belong to him at all but to a virtual midpoint between him and his patient. (p. 210)

Samuels reminds us of "the need to be aware of bodily erotic feelings as a foundation for understanding" (p. 211).

The Vineyard Is Her Own

In the final stage of Jung's (1946/1954) four stages of anima development, Sapientia, wisdom, was equivalent to the Shulamite woman in the *Song of Songs*. He reminds us that she is a woman of wisdom and that we might learn from her. The Song takes us beyond gender, beyond the woman as muse, the man as artist. It takes us past Eros as genital sexuality into reciprocity and wisdom.

The aroused lover claims herself at the end of the Song. She lets go of the beloved in hopes of his return. Something strengthens inside her. "Go, go now, my love, be quick as a gazelle, on the fragrant hills!" (Falk, 1973, p. 31). The woman of wisdom has her own vineyard, her own sense of self; she wants him to return, but she's strong on her own. The woman awakens to herself.

In the beginning of the Song, the Shulamite woman had not taken care of her vineyard.

> They [my brothers] made me guard the vineyards. I have not guarded my own. (1:6)[35]

[35] John Davidson's commentary on this verse is the following: "The negative forces in creation, by creating human imperfection and the illusion of the world, have made me waste my time in the pursuit of material mirages. How I wish I had attended to my own

She serenades,

> The king has a vineyard
> Whose fruit is worth silver
> I have a vineyard—
> Its fruit is my own.
> Have your wealth, Solomon!
> Keep all your vineyards,
> Whose yield you must share
> With your watchmen and guards. (Falk, 1973, p. 30)

More Thoughts About the Text

Have I been reading into it? How can one not read into it? How can I prevent it from reading *me*, raising questions about my experience? Perhaps it looks as if I am reading into the song, yet it is truly singing to me.

To quote writer and poet Octavio Paz (1995), "Eroticism is first and foremost a thirst for otherness. And the supernatural (God) is the supreme otherness" (p. 11). Yearning for the intangible presence of God and a desire for union are elusive and momentary, real and eternal. This wanting is a symbolic description of faith and is, in part, why the impassioned *Song* is a book in the Bible. We find that a yearning for God, a sensual yearning for an unseen other, is a tension in life and in psychoanalysis.

The text teases out aspects of arousal and desire: the desire of lover for beloved, the pleasure, the pleasure of the other, the pleasure of desire itself, the desire of desire, human yearning as sacred, the sacred as saintly, holy, set apart, a sanctuary, the sanctuary of sanctuaries, the holy of holies. The holiness extends to the very parchment of biblical scrolls, which are treated differently from

---

spiritual welfare instead!" (2004, p. 98). He is commenting on the necessity in working on our own spirituality, what mystics also call our own human perfection, not neglecting our own souls by concentrating on material attachments and greed, personal ego, and separateness from God.

ordinary books. The holy handwritten Biblical scrolls, when they are worn out, have to be brought to a special sacred repository in the synagogue where they are kept until they can be buried. The texts are holy in their very physicality. This suggests to me the holiness of analysis. Is this too bold?

Different Meanings of the Text

Historically and even today, many readers of the Bible have found it to be God's own word, the expression of divine inspiration, access to the divine. The famous redactor of the Torah and Talmud, Rabbi Rashi (1040-1105), provided commentary on the *Song* that is still read in synagogues today. And, from medieval times into the Reformation, many Christian mystics interpreted the *Song* as an allegory of the relations between the soul and the Lord, including St. Bernard of Clairveax (ca.1090-1153), St. Francis of Assisi (ca.1181-1226), Meister Eckhart (ca.1260-1327), St. Thomas Aquinas (1290-1274), Martin Luther (1483-1546), St. John of the Cross, (1542-1592), and St. Teresa of Avila (1515-1582), who was a *conversa* and, during the Inquisition, was forced to burn her manuscript (de la Cruz, 1994, p. 136).

Jewish Kabbalists, writing from roughly 1200-1500, interpreted the beloved in the *Song* as the Lord, and the Lover as the soul or the Sheikinah, God's divine and immanent feminine presence. This interpretation is especially noteworthy in the *Zohar*, mystical commentaries on the texts of the Torah (Davidson, 2004, p. 64). Most interpreters found an allegorical layer of meaning in the *Song*, an allegory of the extent of God's love for His people, Israel, and a celebration of God's love for man and man's responsive love for God. The Shulamite woman, the aroused woman in the *Song*, is an expression of Israel's

longing for its one God, or Christ's love for His Church. She exhibits true love, trading worldly fame and the riches of Solomon for her love for a shepherd boy, the grace of love. God's love is not about the merit of the recipient but is divinely offered. Love your neighbor as yourself. The Jewish philosopher, Moses Maimonides, considered the *Song of Songs* to be the correct love of man for God, and he is quoted in the Mishna Torah, Hilkhot Yesodei ha-Torah, 2:2 as saying "man's soul is bound to the love of God, 'with all your heart and with all your soul' and this is what the lover meant metaphorically when she says, 'I am in the fever of love'" (as cited in Davidson, 2004, p. 59).

The Song is read on the Sabbath of Passover by Ashkenazi Jews, every Friday night by Sephardic Jews to people older than 30, and before wedding ceremonies (Falk, 1973, p. x). The Sabbath reading for man and woman, the wedding reading to bride and groom, through flattery and compliments, is meant to encourage physical arousal.

Lyrical Poetry

Other layers of meaning of the *Song* are found in its lyrical poetry and in its music—the grace notes, the refrains, the melody, the tempo, the harmonic tones and vibrations, the color of the voices, the heart beat. Its voluptuous music and poetry guide us into the mystery of desire.

Faith

We know that the ancient text is as powerful today, speaks to us as strongly, as it did 2000 years ago. How it touches and stretches my emotions and thinking! In reading and rereading this ancient Israelite paean to love and desire, I re-experience a passion for the life of the soul, for life itself, or, as Georges

Bataille (1962/1985), a French philosopher born at the turn of the 20th century, described it, a passion for existence not separate from our passions.

The lovers in the Song long for one another as they remain absent to one another, and in their absence, they have faith that they will return to one another, just as happens during absences in psychotherapy. The images in the Song are used as sexual metaphor to describe faith. In the lovers' discovery of faith, in their assenting, saying yes to life, we are reminded of Moses' final words to his people as they were poised to enter the promised land, people embittered, exhausted, who had for years wandered a zigzag course, patient and impatient. These people of faith, having followed their leader for forty years, are reminded that faith does not find instant gratification: "I put before you life and death, blessing and curse. Choose life so that you and your descendants may live" (Deuteronomy 30:19).

How does one find God? We find God's presence in desire and the human heart. Are the two souls in the Song moving toward God? In the stories of our loves, what is being said about each of us? We know the imperfection of living with our desires. While we are doing all this, where is God? God becomes more elusive, less visibly present throughout the pages of the Bible.

One's faith is both questioned and strengthened in His absence. God is in the character of the king, the wisdom of Solomon; God is in Jerusalem, in the intimate union of God and his people, of man and wife celebrating Jerusalem, the shalom of God, God and human as married. The lovers in the Song celebrate God in each other's bodies—the union of God and man, the human to the divine. We find God in sexuality, desire, not in a divisive disconnect of spirit and flesh.

We might learn of God through our longings. For example, sometimes the objects of our longings are a stand-in for God (whether for material things, addictions, or an obsessive longing for a person). We call these stand-ins idols or false gods.

Faith is a gift of God, inseparable from God. Feeling deeply loved is inseparable from faith. Desire and contentment are also inseparable from faith. Desire fuels faith as does contentment. Suffering, living through hardship, also helps us find trust and faith, love and God; these all are inseparable. We seek quiet, stillness, less ego, a self-reflective consciousness, a ground of comfort. This is faith, trust, belief.

Spiritual Yearning

Yearning, a hungry desire and search for meaning, "for fuller lives during the course of our lives, makes us all spiritual beings" (Walsh, 2000, p. 8). "Desire is an impulse and emotion for more in life at any given moment" (p. 11). In spiritual yearning, we linger, we wait, and in so doing, we can sharpen what we know of our desire. Desire might lead to glee, frustration, exhaustion, surrender. The passion, sentiment, feeling of longing for an absent Other, for many, resonates with the longing for a God we cannot touch or see. God is not named in the *Song*, but we imagine, we discern the yearning, a yearning greater than for an individual person, as if for God's intangible presence, an impossible union. Absence, we know as therapists, does not mean non-existence. The spirit remains alive.

Tensions in the Song

I welcome the *Song* into the culture and experience of psychotherapy so that the erotic in the Song can help me with intense erotic feelings towards patients, and I am supported by recognizing the erotic as holy. I tell myself that God's love is in the consulting room with me and my patient, as it is in the *Song*.

But, I also experience severe tension in my body and mind, not only a blissful romantic delight for the other in the room. The tension is manifold. Loss of self is indeed a tension. The lovers sometimes mesmerize each other into oblivion. Have they lost their bearings? When I feel immersed in erotic feelings toward a patient, I struggle to maintain my world as I know it. There is tension in the aroused, sensual aliveness of the excitement of the moment alongside the knowledge that I must not act on my feelings. When I let myself lose my bearings, I am paradoxically in the process of finding them. At times I become obsessed with the other. How do I manage the obsession? How do I then concentrate when with my other patients, in my life? I tell myself,

> It will pass. Something is being touched at a deep level inside me. What is it? What wants to happen? What can I learn from this obsession? It is not just about the other person; I know much is projection. Is it because I need to get out of my own ego and into a larger Eros?

Just asking these questions, just using my observing ego, helps me move past the obsession over time. My sense of self and my patient, as with the lovers in the *Song*, will change as we do the deep work, precisely because of my immersion in the feelings. At the same time, my thinking self remains and strengthens as I explore what I am experiencing in my body and psyche. I look for meaning in why this experience is alive now, what has caused it, why we are in it, what is the meta message, and what underlies it.

I am in the *Song*, a Biblically inspired experience of desire, and I am also the therapist. I tell myself, "As a therapist, I am aware of desire in myself and in my patient toward me. I will not act on these feelings. I will not. But I will let them be in the room." I hold the tension between temptation, the mystery of the unknown, and my erotic desires for satisfaction.

To regain my bearings, to move from sexual stimulation and into a more full experience, perhaps in the few minutes between patients or at home, I will read from *The Song of Songs: Eros and the Mystical Quest* by Sviri (1995), a professor at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, with a research interest in Sufism. In her text, which was originally delivered as a lecture in 1993 to the Leo Baeck College in London, she affirms the connection between the erotic and mystical experience. She reminds us that in the fiery, instinctual, earthly, and vibrant *Song of Songs*, Eros is identified, "especially in mystical circles with the motive, the dynamic and the goal of the so called spiritual, or mystical, quest" (p. 43).

> In the later mystical tradition, however, the allegory [in the *Song*] becomes *a reality on another level* [italics in the original]: the very same passion, which in our human experience we identify as "erotic," is transferred, in the rapture and intoxication of a mystical experience, onto God. Whether we can identify with this kind of mystical passion or not . . . the evidence in so many mystical traditions makes it a universal phenomenon. Such an experience . . . therefore can be validated as an authentic experience of individuals whose spirituality has been kindled by the erotic fire. (p. 49)

The yearning of the soul for the Divine Beloved and, by the same token, the yearning of the Divine for the soul of His human lover allude to the inner drama which takes place between two separate entities reaching out for one another. Their completion cannot be brought about unless they unite.

> Our fundamental primordial state of separation. All mystical systems, and for that matter, all creative expressions, start from this point of departure. From its very inception, our inner life has been stamped with an agonizing longing for completion, longing for a fulfilling union with the

> beloved "other." . . . This longing is not usually mystical . . . but in times of great lucidity, or, conversely, in times of great distress, we may become aware that the experience of our incompleteness, coupled with a longing for fulfillment, lie at the roots of our human experience. . . . Somewhere in our depths we carry a reflection, or an image, of completeness, together with a vague memory of a state in which we were utterly fulfilled. (Sviri, 1995, p. 50)

There are other tensions in the Song. For example, there is the verse about the abuses of the watchmen of the city.

> Then the watchmen found me
> as they went about the city.
> They beat me, they bruised me,
> They tore the shawl from my shoulders,
> Those watchmen of the walls. (5:7)

Who are these watchmen? They might represent the lover's self-reflection and inner voice about her behavior. They might represent the tension between the lover's societal restraints and her desire for love making outside of marriage. The watchmen mistook her for a prostitute, or perhaps she saw herself as a prostitute. Perhaps they represent her feelings of guilt about sexual impropriety, whether in thought or action; this may be the Shulamite's unconscious version of crime and punishment. In this beautiful song, there is ugliness and violence.

As one sinks into the text, one finds further tensions. Will the feelings and experience of the lovers last? Will they return to one another? What if the beloved does not return? These questions speak to "Love Is as Strong as Death" (Falk, 1973, p. 28).

Love Is as Strong as Death

All relationships end. When we begin a therapy relationship, we know at the outset it will end, either in termination or in the death of the analyst or

patient. Love is as strong as death. We know the healing power of our therapy is trust and love. Does love endure after death? Is it eternal?

Love is as implacable as death. Love can look death in the eye, a mighty foe, the most essential foe. In the *Song*, we hear that love is as fierce as death,

> Stamp me in your heart,
> Upon your limbs,
> Seal my emblem deep
> Into your skin.
> For love is strong as death,
> Harsh as the grave.
> Its tongues are flames, a fierce
> And holy blaze.
> Endless seas and floods,
> Torrents and rivers
> Never put out love's
> Infinite fires.[36]
> Those who think that wealth
> Can buy them love
> Only play the fool
> And meet with scorn. (Falk, 1973, p. 28)

We can keep this in mind when patients question whether they are buying our love.

Faith, hope, love, and death are forever. Individuals are mortal, but in God, we have a hint of the immortal, lasting longer than the individual. We see the immortal in nature, in the stones and the hills, in music. Is love eternal? Personal love may not be. I loved my grandmother and remember her spirit, but when I die, who will remember my grandmother? God's love is eternal and lasting.

The *Song of Songs* is revelation in Scripture and in life. It connects me to great loves I have experienced. In some love, often touched by the divine, everything is revealed. We believe we know truth, God, man, the other, the

---

[36] This brings to mind Bono's (2000) song, *Love Is Like a Drop in the Ocean*. The fire of divine love refuses to be extinguished.

world. All are linked and re-linked and reunited, there is a fullness to the great mysteries.

When we love, we might assume we experience something that will outlast death, something that is eternal. The *Song of Songs* itself, so far, is eternal, timeless, while the Hebrew words of the *Song* that we read in translation are temporal and limited. The finite words, the descriptions of, say, desire and longing in the *Song* are expressions of, speak to, our moving *toward* the eternal and the infinite. We have truly to be careful when we use such language, presuming as we do to know what we are talking about. It is a question of Faith always, I think, even in our deepest experiences (which are temporal even if they do not seem temporary).

The bookends of the *Song*, Love is better than wine (1:2), and strong as death (8:6) frame the text. Bataille (1962/1985) defined eroticism as "assenting of life up to the point of death" (p. 11). Here, in the framework of the *Song*, we find the enormous range of love and death, which some might simplify as opposites. Love intoxicates more than wine, propels, by the fire of desire, the woman in the *Song* in particular, and the human soul in general, to a life-long quest and search, and only the death of her physical being might quell this yearning.

Diane's Image Connects to the Song.

In an image from a dream of Diane, I am holding her. I am leaning against an apricot tree. A man enters her. I hold her. The tree holds me. There are four of us, the tree, Diane, her penetrating lover, and me. She is a woman who early in our analysis had an image of my hand penetrating her through her abdominal cavity toward her heart and my hand then holding her beating heart. She wanted

to be penetrated, understood, known, and held. The apricot tree is the container of the three of us. Each of us is container. Our unit is uroboric, back and forth, forth and back. The lover in the *Song* was able to let go of her beloved, knowing he would return to her. You have to let go of the external to touch the internal one, and then you have to come back to the external one to touch the internal; it is a unit, a circle.

The erotic in my connection with Diane has calmed for the moment. She has found a real life lover to touch and be touched by. And I will celebrate her wedding in rapt attention as the *Song of Songs* is read. Diane and I have a love relationship that has expanded, generated, and grown to a stronger love.

Love is stronger than death. God is love and cannot be extinguished. As we meditate on these images, we remember the sacred in the text and our work. In the *Song*, we learn to celebrate desire, to affirm life, sexuality, the erotic. Love is in the infinite, the acts of goodness toward the other, in the image of the tree holding me, holding Diane, holding her love.

In the next two chapters, we will immerse ourselves in two of Plato's erotic dialogues in order to see how they illuminate the erotic in psychoanalysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: AN EXPLORATION OF EROS IN PLATO'S SYMPOSIUM

The Academy of Love

I began this dissertation with a brief overview of the history of Eros as framed by Pope Benedict XVI and the philosopher Joseph Pieper, followed by a study of the history of Eros in transference and countertransference, as understood by Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, and their followers. I turned back in time to the Hebrew Bible and the *Song of Songs* to understand how Eros might inform transference and countertransference.

In seeking a meaning of Love in modern psychotherapy, we reflect back on Plato's understanding of the rise of the soul in *Phaedrus* and his teaching us about love in the *Symposium*. In this chapter, I continue to develop my exploration of Eros and psychoanalysis by focusing on Plato's erotic dialogue, *Symposium*. I have chosen Plato because his work has been not been sufficiently well understood by most psychoanalytic thinkers. My argument is that his wisdom provides a backdrop for psychoanalytic theory and practice that must be considered.

Symposium and *Phaedrus* are the first texts on love that are both philosophic and literary, and in both, philosophy and love are united. I will pay particular attention to three speeches in these dialogues, one by Aristophanes in the *Symposium* and two by Socrates, one from the *Symposium* and the other from *Phaedrus*, and address how these teachings of Plato have been incorporated into the works of Freud and Jung, and particularly how they were insufficiently understood by Freud.

There is a voluminous literature on *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*. I ask my reader to keep in my mind that I am selecting texts and passages that are part of a broader context that is beyond the scope of this study. There is an artistic whole to these texts to which I cannot do justice.

One particular problem we will find throughout my trying to make sense of how psychoanalysis has incorporated Plato is that it seems that neither Freud nor Jung truly meditated on the whole text of either *Symposium* or *Phaedrus*—neither entered into the dialogues as works of art. They seemed to have found more dogma than questions. Neither Freud nor Jung, who both knew Greek and cited Plato, seems to understand that Plato is not *teaching* about human nature. They each have borrowed particular bits and pieces to support their visions of truth. For example, when Freud focused on the Myth of the Androgyne in order to address our sexual instinct and our desire to regain the lost object, he takes only an aspect of Plato's text and implies it is the whole text and misses the aliveness in *Symposium*, with all its speeches. For example, Aristophanes' speech can not be separated from the Ladder of Love image, which Diotima teaches Socrates, who teaches his drinking companions, who then teach us. And, the Ladder of Love can not be separated, for example, from Socrates's dialogue with Alcibiades.

In this chapter, we will be asking the questions, "How does Plato's representation of Eros contribute to our understanding of human nature, the mind and soul? Can this understanding be of use in psychoanalytic practice?"

Rueben Fine (1985), in *Academy of Love*, writes:

> Symptoms, as we know, can only be understood properly in the light of total character structure. All character problems however result from disturbed love relationships. Patients come to therapy with a disturbance

> in some aspect of their love life. The goal of therapy in the deepest sense is to help the person achieve a mature image of love. (p. 26)

What is a mature image of love? To even begin to attempt an image of "mature love," we need to start at the beginning of Western culture, Plato's dialogues. In a short, soon to be published paper, "My Theory of Therapy," I have contended that love is the *sine qua non* of healing in psychotherapy (Cohen, 2009).

In 1908, at a Viennese Psychoanalytic Society, Freud suggested that an Academy of Love be established in Vienna to handle the problems of modern man (Fine, 1985). His wish was never realized. Was he remembering the Platonic Academy, a 15th Century discussion group in Florence, sponsored by Cosimo de Medici and directed by the philosopher and doctor, Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499)? Or, was Freud thinking about Plato's erotic dialogue, *Symposium*, where seven men present their views, particularly historical, mythological, and philosophical, in eulogy and praise of Love?

Twenty-five hundred years after Plato wrote *Symposium*, at a panel organized by the American Psychological Association in 1970, love, especially romantic love, was condemned. The dissenter was Albert Ellis. Lawrence Casler began the discussion, "There is no evidence that love is either necessary or sufficient for psychological maturity. Indeed to the extent that love fosters dependency, it may well be a deterrent to maturity" (as cited in Curtin, 1973, p. 18). Forty years later, some analysts still fear love in the analytic relationship, either for fear of encouraging dependency or from their own idiosyncratic dysfunctionality.

The Symposium

In Ancient Greece, a symposium was a drinking party (the Greek verb *sympotein* means "to drink together") but it has since come to refer to an academic conference or style of university class or discussion, characterized by an openly discursive rather than lecture format. (Wikipedia, 2009). A symposium, a drinking party, provides a setting for *synousia*, a Greek word meaning "being together." It means a conversation, a communion, and the act of coitus. Socrates preferred conversing with individuals to speaking in public, and therefore the symposium worked well for him as a forum for his rhetoric and discourse (Bloom, 1993).

This key Hellenic social institution was a place for men to debate, plot, boast, or simply to party with others. They were frequently held to celebrate the introduction of young men into aristocratic society or to celebrate other special occasions, such as victories in athletic and poetic contests. Singly or in pairs, the men would recline on couches arrayed against the three walls of the room away from the door. Food was served, as was wine.

Plato's *Symposium* is historical fiction. Some of the guests are important men from Socrates' time, especially Aristophanes, Agathon, and Alcibiades. The seven party guests are old friends, members of the artistic aristocracy of the 5th century Athenian intelligentsia. The guests are: Phaedrus, a handsome young student of rhetoric; Agathon, the host, who invited his friends to celebrate his first prize for a tragedy he wrote for an Athenian dramatic festival, the Dionysia; Pausanias, Agathon's lover, who seems to be a legal expert but about whom little is known; Eryximachus, a pompous physician; Aristophanes, the well-known comic playwright; Socrates, who offers the teachings of Diotima; and Alcibiades,

a handsome Athenian statesman and general who wanted to seduce Socrates, the same Alcibiades who became a traitor to his city.

At the beginning of the dialogue, following the party mode of eating and too much drink, they decide not to drink much more because many of the guests—but not Socrates—have a hangover from a celebration the night before. One of the guests, the physician Eryximachus, reminds the group of what Phaedrus has reminded him: that the great god Eros has been neglected from praise and eulogy and it is time to give him his due.

Phaedrus' Speech

I will try to synthesize each speech, which is almost impossible due to their grandeur and richness. Phaedrus, as I noted in Chapter One, invokes from Hesiod's *Theogony*, that Eros is one of the oldest of the divine forces: "Chaos came first, then thereafter broad-breasted Earth, always the safe seat of all, and then Eros" (178b, Jowett, trans., 1952). Phaedrus's theme is that love is a spur to wisdom, justice, virtue, and moral action. "The veriest coward [once the god Eros had entered him] would become an inspired hero, equal to the bravest, at such a time; Love would inspire him" (179b, Jowett, trans.).

Pausanias' Speech

The next speaker is Pausanias, who reminds his fellow revelers that Phaedrus' praise of all Love is too broad, that in fact only Love that is for a noble purpose is worthy of praise. "Evil is the vulgar lover who loves the body rather than the soul . . . he loves a thing [the body, which ages] which is in itself unstable" (183e, Jowett trans., 1952). Pausanias contrasts the lover of the youthful and beautiful body with the lover of wisdom, truth, virtue, and philosophy and

says that the lover of wisdom may educate youth (184, Jowett trans.). Socrates later elaborates on Pausanias' point, that the insightful lover of wisdom is to be encouraged over the blind lover of the flesh.[37]

Dr. Eryximachus' Speech

Dr. Eryximachus[38] is next and speaks to what Socrates will also take up in his turn, that Love is not only a human but also a cosmic phenomenon. And (as if he were a good Jungian analyst) the physician states, "The best physician is he who is able to separate noble love from base love . . . and can reconcile the most hostile elements in the constitution and make them loving friends" (186, Jowett, trans., 1952). He continues by explaining that all sacrifices and the whole province of divination (both of which an expanded form of psychotherapy touches on) "are concerned only with the preservation of good love and the cure of evil love" (188, Jowett, trans.).

Aristophanes' Speech

Aristophanes, the Athenian comic playwright (ca. 446 – ca. 386 BCE), follows. His paean to Eros is the first speech in the *Symposium* to introduce an erotic accounting of Eros, describing embraces and orgasms[39] (Bloom, 1993). Aristophanes recited an ancient myth, The Myth of the Androgyne, which tells of

---

[37] Glenn W. Mott (2005) underscores that these two speeches of Phaedrus and Pausanias enter the theme of Eros by way of theology and law and in so doing, "call our attention to the supra-individual, social dimension of the phenomenon of desire" (p. 34).

[38] According to Mott (2005), the second pair of speakers, Eryximachus and Aristophanes, highlight the individual, corporeal experience we each have with own bodily Eros (p. 35).

separated halves of original wholes.[40] In our original state, we once were one entity. We were then cut apart, and hence, we have a primal wound. Aristophanes is both comic and serious in that he describes a tale about our basic human suffering, a tale about creation, a fall, and redemption. Aristophanes' myth came from the world of Plato's imagination, inspired by the Muses. Plato was a great story teller, seriously playing with his own creativity.

The origin of the myth, as we know it, is Plato's inspiration. Jung might say this myth is an archetype of the collective unconscious, in that it speaks to universal human experience, an over-arching form for an essential image, symbol, drive, emotion common to all, a potential never fully to be realized. The early Greek myths are advanced poetic reporting of our mythic origins. Plato's dialogues are works of art intended both to draw us into the dialogue continuous with ourselves as we read the texts.

To answer the question of what psychoanalysis may have borrowed from Plato, I will amplify some highlights. Aristophanes begins by explaining the power of Love to the dinner party guests.

> He is the friendliest of the gods to human beings, for he helps people and cures them of those things which stand in the way of the greatest happiness for the human race. I will try to explain his power to you and you will be teachers for others. (189d, Cobb, trans., 1993)

---

[40] In the beginning of Genesis, man and woman, Adam and Eve, are an original unit, and God, who has already separated light and darkness, continues to create the primary distinctions of our world when he separates female from male in his divine plan of unity. Genesis 2: "Then God said, 'It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make a helper suitable for him'" (v. 18). "For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh" (v. 24). Here God tells us marriage is for completion and a restoration of our original unity. Jung might call this the original *Conjunctio*.

> The original human nature was not like the present, but different. The sexes were not two, as they are now, but originally three in number; there was man, woman, and a union of the two, having a name corresponding to this double nature, which once had a real existence, but is now lost, and the word 'Androgynous' is only preserved as a reproach. (189e, Jowett, trans., 1952)

> Secondly, the looks of each human being were as a whole round, with backs and sides in a circle. And each had four arms, and legs equal in number to his arms, and two faces alike in all respects on a cylindrical neck, but there was one head for both faces—they were set in opposite directions—and four ears and two sets of genitals, and all the rest that one might conjecture from this. He could walk upright as men do now, backwards or forwards as he pleased, and he could also roll over and over at a great pace. (190a, Benardete, trans., 1993)

Aristophanes tells us that our unusual relatives possessed an abundance of hubris and dared to defy the gods.

> The gods took council and Zeus discovered a way to humble their pride and improve their manners. They would continue to exist, but he cut them in two. (190d, Cobb, trans., 1993)

So, they were diminished in size and strength and increased in humility.

> As he sliced each one, he ordered Apollo to shift its face and neck toward the cut, so that when it looked at its own scar the person might be more orderly. (190e, Cobb, trans.)

Here we have the capacity for self-reflection and an example of a fundamental attitude of psychotherapy—that one needs to look at one's wound in order to heal one's basic experience of disorder and self-deficiency, a deficiency based on the inner knowledge that we are no longer what we once were.

> After the division, the two parts of man (the Androgyne), each desiring his other half, came together and throwing their arms around one another, entwined in mutual embraces, longing to grow into one; they were on the point of dying from hunger and self-neglect because they did not like to do anything apart. (191a, Jowett, trans., 1952)

When Zeus recognized that mankind was not reproducing and was dying out, he was upset because he wanted to be worshipped. Changing the course of

our history, he subsequently moved their sexual organs to the front of their bodies.

> They were being destroyed when Zeus, in pity of them, invented a new plan. He rearranged their genitals toward the front—for up till then they had them on the outside, and they generated and gave birth but not in one another but in the earth, like cicadas—and for this purpose, he changed this part of them toward the front, and by this means made generation possible in one another, by means of the male in the female; so that in embracing, if a man meet with a woman, they might generate and the race continue . . . and they might pause and turn to work and attend to the rest of their livelihood. (191c, Benardete, trans., 1993)

Their embraces bring satisfaction and fulfillment.

> Their encounters produce intense pleasures, and their orgasms release them momentarily from the terrible plain of their loss. Sexual satisfaction is a momentary self-forgetting connected with the permanent remembering that afflicts men. (Bloom, 1993, p. 108)

Throughout the generations, couples, because of reproduction, were no longer from the same half, and the offspring of these mixed couples reproduced to the point that there were no longer any true other halves. Aristophanes continued: "so ancient is the desire of one another which is implanted within us, reuniting our original nature, making one of two, and healing the state of man" (191d, Jowett, trans., 1952), or from another translation:

> It is from this situation that love for one another developed in human beings. Love collects the halves of our original nature, and tries to make a single thing out of the two parts so as to restore our natural condition. (191d, Cobb, trans., 1993)

or:

> So it is really from such early times that human beings have had, inborn in themselves, Eros for one another—Eros, the bringer-together of their ancient nature, who tries to make one out of two and to heal their human nature. (191d, Benardete, trans., 1993)

Love originates from our lack of wholeness and provides the energy for the fantasy of a reunited togetherness.

> Each of us, then, is a token of a human being, because we are sliced like fillets of sole, two out of one: and so, each always in search of his own token. (191d, Benardete, trans., 1993)
>
> Thus, whenever a lover . . . happens to encounter the person who is their other half, they are overcome with amazement at their friendship, intimacy, and love, and do not want to be severed, so to speak, from each other even for a moment. These are the people who spend their entire lives with each other, though they don't know how to say what they want from each other. (192c, Cobb, trans., 1993)
>
> . . . for no one would be of the opinion that the intense yearning, sexual intercourse was what was wanted, but of something else which the soul of either evidently desires and cannot tell, and of which she has only a dark and doubtful presentiment. (192d, Jowett, trans., 1952)
>
> They would think they had discovered what they had really desired all along, namely, to be made one out of two by being joined and welded together with their beloved. (192e, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Since our original nature was once as whole beings, "Love is the name for the desire and pursuit of the whole" (192e, Jowett, trans., 1952). The finality of being cut in two created the deepest of longings to reunite with one's other half. The cutting, the primal wound to our basic nature, gave birth to our distinctive humanity, our longings and our longings for wholeness (Bloom, 1993, p. 107). We often rush to become one whom we *imagine* to be our other half, a return to our original nature of oneness and wholeness. This concept, that we long for a lost but pleasurable symbolic union, is embraced by Freud and Jung and their followers but they have different ideas of what this original wholeness is.

Now mankind was less preoccupied with defying the gods and more self-preoccupied with finding its lost half. And, because being deprived of our original bliss led to our deep fears of separation and abandonment, many of us live in fear of betraying our god as we would hate to be punished again. Because of our misdeed we were made by god to live in a separated state.

> We are afraid that if we do not maintain good order in our relations with the gods we may be sliced in two again . . . for this reason, every man must advocate continuous reverence for the gods in all things, so that we will avoid fate and encounter good fortune, with Love as our guide and commander. (193b, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Aristophanes' myth tells us that humankind originally moved like twirling windmills. After they were cut in two, Aristophanes laughs, if they disobeyed the gods again, they could "become like flat, half-hearted disks that childish sweethearts wear" (193, Morgan, trans., 1964). This is also called *symbolon* or half a die, which each of a pair of lovers kept in the belief that their lover's half a die would complete their own. Douglas Morgan (1964) noted that American sweethearts in the 1950s wore a broken heart which was symbolically the other half of a broken heart worn by their loved one (p. 45).

A Poem

The poet, Galway Kinnell (1973) in his poem, "The Call Across the Valley of Not-Knowing," wrote about the tragic aspect of the comic, Aristophanes:

> Sweat breaking from his temples,
> Aristophanes ran off
> At the mouth made it all up—nightmared it all up
> On the spur
> Of that moment which has stabbed us ever since:
> That each of us is a torn half
> Whose lost other we keep seeking across time
> Until we die, or give up—
> Or actually find her . . .
> And yet I think
> It must be the wound, the wound itself
> Which lets us know and love,
> Which forces us to reach out to our misfit
> And by a kind
> Of poetry of the soul, accomplish,
> For a moment, the wholeness the drunk Greek
> Extrapolated from his high
> Or flagellated out of an empty heart,
> That purest,

Most tragic concumbence, strangers
Clasped into one, a moment, of their moment on earth. (p. 59)

Applying Plato's Aristophanes to Psychotherapy

Psychoanalytic thinkers, beginning with Freud, connect the origin of love with loss, deficiencies in the self, and longing for a return to a symbiotic union. They believe that we idealize and wish to possess the object, the other person we long for, because we are compensating for a felt deficiency in self, because we believe, in body, soul, and mind, that the other possesses what we originally had but now lack. Had Aristophanes been a psychoanalyst, Plato would be the originator of modern analytic thinking on love.

These thinkers might be describing the person, or patient, who, like an infant, is so vulnerable, dependent, lost without the therapist, whom he might experience as his projected other half, that waiting for the next session is unbearable. He imagines that the desired object possesses what he feel he lacks. I have had many patients throughout the years, particularly those I have seen multiple times a week in a deep analysis, who sometimes find the weekends, or times in-between sessions, intolerably painful. The longing for connection, which they can experience only when we are actually together, dominates their psyches. We might talk or check in over the weekend because I do not believe in causing more pain for them than they feel able to bear. Working together, over time, the patient becomes able to hold me as a found, rather than a lost, object. Throughout the therapy, the patient is finding more of herself in herself, and feeling that the touchstone she has in me is a part, but not the whole, of her life. She, according to Freud, has projected her lost self, her lost other half, perhaps

her mother, onto me and is working hard in our treatment to regain it as her own.

The patient might be seeking the blissful state of the mother-infant symbiosis, a state she either had and lost or a state she never had. Without separation there can be no individuation, but we still might search in our fantasy for a love in order to restore our lost self to an imagined state of wholeness and perfection and, in so doing, undo our original separation.

How Freud and Jung Might Differ About Aristophanes' Myth

What I extrapolate from Aristophanes' understanding of Eros are some essential themes and underpinnings of humanity, the themes of loss, wholeness, and healing. In our field, we believe there is truth to these searches. Much of psychoanalysis is moved, perhaps unconsciously, by a definition of love as "the desire and pursuit of wholeness" (192d, Cobb, trans., 1993). Some questions to ask are, "What is the origin of wholeness? Where do we seek it?"

Many contemporary therapists reduce the origin of love to oneness in the womb, or to a mother/infant symbiosis outside the womb, and believe that in love we seek what we originally lost, and through an attachment to our love object, we wish to return to our original wholeness. Freud and Jung, of course, each had a different *teleos* as to what compromises wholeness. For Freud, it is the lost object, as in Aristophanes' myth.

Freud interpreted Plato to mean that love is regressive. The other half of our individuality is lost forever and that, through a pull to merge and meld boundaries between separate individuals, we wish to recapture the lost unity of our original nature. For Aristophanes, the "essence of eros is not sexual pleasure

(as Freud first thought), but in the embrace . . . a vain reaching out for one's other half, which is not the other that is ever embraced" (Bloom, 1993, p. 186).

A fundamental difference between Freud and Jung is that of potentiality, recognized by Jung as progressive not regressive. Freud (1930/1961) states that the "oceanic feeling is a regression to an infantile state where the baby can not differentiate himself from what is not his ego" (p. 11).[41] In Jung's concept of a therapy relationship, some patients seek an archetypal potentiality, rather than a lost object. They seek what has never been realized in actual experience, and the analyst might carry this potential for them in what Jung calls an archetypal transference.

Another major dividing mark between the two great analytic thinkers is that Freud views incest as actual incest, and for Jung, it is a symbolic way into the inner world and a metaphor of psychic union of analyst and patient. In Jung's model of individuation, we are completing ourselves by realizing our own psychic potentiality. Initially we seek completion and union with another, or others, through projection. But he also leads us inward in our quest for wholeness through our wish or desire for the immanent potential of an inner *conjunctio*, a symbolic incest, a wish to merge with our lost other half within, or in analysis, a symbolic merger with our analyst. Jung believes the melding of inner boundaries in an internal *conjunctio* is a necessary developmental step

---

[41] "This feeling, he [Freud] adds, is a purely subjective fact, not an article of faith; it brings with it no assurance of personal immortality, but it is the source of the religious energy which is seized upon by the various Churches and religious systems, directed by them into particular channels, and doubtless also exhausted by them. One may, he thinks, rightly call oneself religious on the ground of this oceanic feeling alone, even if one rejects every belief and every illusion" (Parsons, 1999, p. 12).

toward individuation. For Freud, the melding of the boundaries is an experience with an external other that is essentially regressive.

For men, the female side, or anima, and for women, the male side, or animus, contain the possibility of inner wholeness. Jung (1958/1964) said an unknown woman in a male patient's dream "bears the technical name of 'anima' with reference to the fact that, from time immemorial, man in his myths has expressed the idea of a male and female coexisting in the same body" (p. 29). The anima and animus stand at the gateway to the collective unconscious, which is made up of forms for the whole range of human potentialities, some of which we realize in ourselves in our own uniquely individual way. The animus and anima symbolically represent these potentialities. These terms of Jung's are used less today by modern Jungian analysts because their original meanings, confused by Jung at the beginning, have been superseded by gender issues regarding what today constitutes masculinity and femininity. A Jungian analyst, regardless of whether he thinks in concepts of animus or anima, does pay attention to our inner other and our basic wish, which is to reunite and become whole, knowing full well its impossibility.

In Jungian object relations, the man initially projects his other half, his anima, onto a woman. The theory states that when we withdraw the projection and embrace the projected quality within, we can relate to the former object of our projection more as a subject than an object. In a mature relationship the anima projection has been somewhat relinquished, and one's wife is less an object of projection and more a subject in her own right; two almost-complete subjects relating to one another. For example, by taking back projection, we find ourselves less in awe of, or less contemptuous or dismissive of, our partner.

Wisdom tells us we can never completely renounce our projections, that a full individuation remains unrealized in our lifetime. In a long relationship, we hope the other continues to carry some mysteriousness, engendering curiosity and surprise.

We are drawn to Aristophanes' myth because it justifies our longings and our quest for a binding connection to our loves, our family attachments, and the friends we have chosen and want to hold on to. We remain in the search for our true other half, but it is an illusion. It is hopeless. As a reminder, Tresan (2004b) wrote that in analysis there is mutuality, not merger. At some points, we might fantasize a true, not symbolic, merger, but it will be illusory.

What Freud Did Not Understand

First of all, in reading Plato, it is important to remember that Aristophanes is both playful and serious. He is a comic writer and his story of man's creation is a fun, imaginative one. Aristophanes, in his play, *The Clouds*, makes fun of Socrates. Perhaps Plato's Aristophanes is somewhat ludicrous as retaliation for Aristophanes' having ridiculed Socrates, Plato's beloved teacher. Again, Freud did not understand the dialogue as a unified work of art. Instead he found a particular point in Aristophanes' speech that corroborated Freud's particular vision of the truth. Freud disregarded the climax and golden nugget of Plato's dialogue, Socrates' speech.

According to Irving Singer (1966), Freud misunderstood Plato (p. 54) because Freud views Aristophanes' myth only as a lyrical attempt to trace "the origin of an instinct to *a need to restore an earlier state of things* [italics in the original]" (Freud, as cited in Singer, p. 57). Freud originally thought only of a

sexual instinct and failed to incorporate into his theory what Aristophanes refers to as innate love, "inborn in themselves," (191d, Benardete, trans., 1993), an instinctual search for one's other self. "Eros, for one another—Eros, the bringer together of their ancient nature who tries to make one out of two and to heal their human nature" (191d, Benardette, trans). The sexual instinct is a derivative from the earlier erotic instinct, which is actually a non-sexual instinct for wholeness.

When we were once spherical beings, when we were in our original state of wholeness, love did not exist. Eros, the name for the desire and the pursuit of the whole, primary and distinct from sexuality, came into being after we were cut in two and we began to yearn for togetherness forever with our other half. Eros precedes sexuality. Wholeness, Eros, sexuality—is it the primordial drive for completion, more than a sexual instinct that is the source and meaning for the sexual act?

It is important when questioning Freud to allow for the whole of his thinking. In 1905, when he published *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Freud alluded to Plato's myth:

> The popular view of the sexual instinct is beautifully reflected in the poetic fable which tells how the original human beings were cut up into two halves—man and woman—and how these are always striving to unite again in love. (1905/2000, p. 136)

For Freud, every finding is a re-finding.

For Jung, what we seek already exists as an inborn archetypal potential for an expectable human experience, which is greater than the temporal experience with the mother. Michael Fordham (1995) calls this original state of wholeness, the Primal Self.

Freud broadened his thinking in 1920, when he asked, "Is it really the case that, *apart* [italics mine] from the sexual instincts, there are no instincts that do not seek to restore an earlier state of things?" (p. 35). He then acknowledged that there is more than a sexual instinct that governs us. He answers his own question with the reply that seeking to restore an original state of things is a universal characteristic of instincts.

> Science has so little to tell us about the origin of sexuality that we can liken the problem to a darkness into which not so much as a ray of a hypothesis has penetrated. In quite a different region, it is true, we do meet with such a hypothesis; but it is of so fantastic a kind of myth rather than a scientific explanation . . . it fulfils precisely the one condition whose fulfillment we desire. For it traces the origin of an instinct to a need to restore an earlier state of things. What I have in mind is, of course, the theory which Plato put into the mouth of Aristophanes in the *Symposium*, and which deals not only with the origin of the sexual instinct but also with the most important of its variations in relation to its object. (p. 51)

In 1920, Freud said we are groping in the dark when trying to understand the theory of drives and instincts, and I agree. In his exploration of the death instinct, when he discovers what he calls the life instinct, he realized he had *not* thought deeply enough about the sexual instinct and tries, in his theory, to apprehend something greater. "Sexuality is an important phenomenon in human life, but it is itself in the service of a deeper and more encompassing force; a tendency towards unification and development" (p. 52). He called that force Eros, love or the life drive. The sexual drives, he concludes, "are best comprised under the name Eros; their purpose would be to form living substance into ever greater unities, so that life may be prolonged and brought to higher

development" (p. 108). Here Freud sounds more like Jung in hinting at a teleological perspective that moves toward greater wholeness.[42]

In 1920, Freud wrote, in the preface to the Fourth Edition of his *Three Essays*, "Anyone who looks down with contempt upon psychoanalysis from a superior vantage-point should remember how closely the enlarged sexuality of psychoanalysis coincides with the Eros of the divine Plato" (1905/2000, p. 134). Here he is still equating Eros and sexuality.

But we do not know which aspect of Plato's divine Eros that Freud means. Is he going backwards and speaking to Aristophanes' vision of love as the desire to restore the lost self? What can happen when a neurologist turned psychoanalyst tips his hat to philosophy is this: In Freud's Preface to the Fourth Edition of *Three Essays*, he endorsed the thinking of Oskar Pfister (1922) in *Plato: A Fore-Runner of Psycho-Analysis*. "Of all the thinkers of the western world Plato was the first to observe our subject (Eros) deeply and to describe it plainly. According to him, Eros, Love, is above all the instinct of sex or propagation" (1905/2000, p. 169). It might be from minister, psychoanalyst, and his good friend, Oscar Pfister, that Freud takes his understanding of Plato!

Once again, Freud failed to grasp Plato when he writes in 1925, in *Resistances to Psycho-analysis*,

> What psychoanalysis called sexuality was by no means identical with the impulsion towards a union of the two sexes or towards producing a pleasurable sensation in the genitals; it had far more resemblance to the all–inclusive and all-preserving Eros of Plato's *Symposium.* (p. 218)

---

[42] Even before Jung and Freud met, "the groundwork had already been laid in the mind of Jung for an idea of the unconscious based on a teleological outlook directed toward the possibility and even character of future potential. Such a view implies that the two men had wholly different epistemological approaches from the outset" (Addison, 2009, p. 139).

Freud's Eros, at best, might be life-giving and unifying but fails to move forward and upward, addressing Socrates' vision of love as an ascent toward the higher life of beauty, truth and goodness and instead Freud remains with Aristophanes.

On the Way to "Mature Love"

Sometimes the best way to understand big ideas is to turn to children's literature. Shel Silverstein's (1981) story, *The Missing Piece Meets the Big O,* has succinct and symbolic value for someone trying to understand Aristophanes' myth and its relevance to relationships and love. He reminds us that the wish to restore a lost object, while we, too, are lost, cannot offer us the mature love we are seeking. In the beginning of Silverstein's tale, the "missing piece sat alone . . . waiting for someone to come along and take it somewhere" (pp. 1-2). The missing piece, a small triangle on its side waits for its other half. Other pieces come along and try out the fit. Some fit, but the two are not able to roll together, so there is no movement to their relationship. Some just do not know anything about fitting together. There is something wrong with each piece that comes along, just as we tend to find fault with someone who wants to join with us if we are not "ready" for a relationship and need to protect ourselves.

Finally, after many disappointing first dates, the "right one" comes along and they are able to roll and fit perfectly together. Original bliss of wholeness is restored, until, very unfortunately, the missing piece begins to grow (change) and the newly-found missing other half plaintively replies, "I didn't know you were going to grow" (Silverstein, 1981, p. 25). The missing piece responds, "I didn't know it either" (p. 25). The dejected, original missing piece, went off sadly still trying to find its missing half. But now, maybe because of its

disappointments, it was more assertive. "What do you want of *me?*" (p. 28) asks the missing piece, taking better care of itself, when it came upon another piece that looked different and could roll. The missing piece continued its questioning, "What do you *need* of me?" "Nothing," answers the other piece. Still demonstrating curiosity, the missing piece asks, "Who are you?" "I am the Big O" (p. 29). (O, as in Bion's transcendent O, Truth, I, of course, wondered.)

The missing piece said in earnest, "I think you are the one I have been waiting for" (Silverstein, 1981, p. 30). The Big O, (Truth, we'll call it), was candid about not missing a piece, about not looking for anyone. "That's too bad," comments the missing piece, "I was hoping I could roll with you" (p. 32). "You cannot roll with me," answers the Big O Truth, and lovingly adds, "perhaps you can roll by yourself" (p. 33).

When the missing piece responds that a missing piece cannot roll by itself, the Big O sounds like an accomplished psychotherapist: "Have you ever tried?" (Silverstein, 1981, p. 34). The missing piece lacks confidence and continues to believe he could never roll and does not ask for help. "Perhaps one day we'll meet again" (p. 36), suggests the Big O Truth, as he rolls away.

After many depressed days, the missing piece pushes himself a bit and tries to move, and ever so slowly, begins to move forward, its sharp triangular edges wearing off. It had become whole on its own. Sure enough, as it rolls along, it catches up with the Big O Truth, and I would add, they lived happily ever-after, rolling side by side, in this tale of quest and fulfillment (Silverstein, 1981).

The modern Aristophanic analyst would tell his patient that the best love follows from two whole individuals who come together rather than two lost

parts seeking wholeness together. Perhaps this is what Socrates is alluding to in his Ladder of Love, which entails the integrity of the full human being.

A Quick Look at Agathon's Speech

In the first four speeches, we have learned what Eros can contribute to sexuality (Phaedrus), virtue (Pausanias), the cosmos and science (Exyimachus) and relationships (Aristophanes). Agathon will explain what Eros does for our value of beauty. He praises only the good, non-violent aspects in Eros. Love is both beautiful and virtuous, actually possesses the four cardinal virtues: justice, moderation, courage, and wisdom (196d, Cobb, trans., 1993). As Agathon catalogues Eros' gifts, he is effusive, superficial, hollow. Maybe Agathon is describing how he sees himself, but he is surely presenting a foil for Socrates to deepen our knowledge of Eros, to elevate us toward an understanding of erotic wisdom. Agathon helps set the stage for Socrates, who insightfully responds that Agathon cares more about Agathon, vanity, and making a good impression than he does the truth. Agathon's speech, however, helps create our hunger for a truth about love that Socrates promises to deliver.

Diotima

Freudian themes of loss, longing, and re-finding the lost object fail to describe or encompass enough about the human condition or the wholeness of a person. In his speech in *Symposium*, Socrates talks about Eros as producing offspring, generativity—he means more than just having children—and creativity. As we read Socrates' famous speech about the Ladder of Love, gleaned from his teacher, Diotima, we might wonder if Aristophanes' myth stops at the first rung of this ladder.

We find a contrast in the stories of Aristophanes and Diotima—Eros that seeks to restore what we imagine was once ours and Eros as a spirit between man and God, who propels the lover upward, vertically, in an ascent, toward Absolute Beauty or truth. And, for Socrates, in *Phaedrus,* Eros is also about recollection and the quest for immortality, in an ascent toward, and a longing for a unity with the Divine.

The human possessed of the daimon, Eros, seeks transcendence: to be taken outside of, above, beyond and upward of oneself, a yearning for something more, rather than being pulled backward to the original lost union or paradisiacal state that Aristophanes postulated. Some who dive into an erotic experience with their loved one, who swim in these deep and familiar waters, long perhaps for something above the waters, more spiritual, a calling beyond the familiar. For others, Aristophanes' explanation of love may be complete, meaningful, and satisfying.

In the grip of Eros, we wish to transcend our individual identities. "The compulsion to transcend them implies some enigmatic woundedness, some obscure reminiscence of wholeness" (Gifford, 2005, p. 12). Socrates will agree that what love seeks is integrity of being, albeit, because of its basic ineffability, elusive of understanding.

Perhaps Mann (1997) speaks for many other analysts, including Freud, when he writes, "I feel uncomfortable at locating such a human quality as love and the erotic outside the human orbit and in the realms of gods" (p. 32). One reason I am exploring Plato's wisdom for therapists today is that not including the divine realm in the human realm of experience severely truncates the work

we do. Mann leaves out the divine and the experience of God as part of the human experience. It is all part of human experience.

Socrates and Diotima

Diotima, a priestess and prophetess, is mysterious. Her name means "honored by Zeus." The name of the place where she is from, Mantinea, is the identical name used for the science of divining. She is a fictional initiatrix, a female initiate of the mysteries and secrets of Love. Women served as oracles for the Gods at divine sanctuaries such as Delphi.

Socrates learned wisdom and truth about Eros from this priestess. As a woman bringing wisdom to the men at the drinking party, Diotima heralds the female erotic connection to the mysteries of life: pregnancy, birth, and nurturing, all metaphors for our work with patients. I bring my own prayerful attention to the process of what my patients and I are doing together, and I invite the reader to bring his prayerful attention to the teachings of Diotima, attending to ways she can teach us (Paul Caringella, personal communication, February 28, 2009).

The Birth of Eros

> When Aphrodite was born, the gods were feasting, a group of them, including the son of Invention, Resourcefulness. And when they had dined, Poverty came along begging since there was a party going on. So she stood there at the doors. Now Resource, having gotten quite drunk on nectar—there was no wine then—had gone out to Zeus' little garden, and in his discomfort fallen asleep. Here Poverty, schemed, since she herself was without resource, to have a child by Resource; and she lay with him and thereby conceived Love. (203b, Jowett, trans., 1952)

Therefore, as the son of Resource and Poverty, Love finds himself always impoverished, and always resourceful,

> and far from being tender and beautiful, as most people think, he is harsh and rugged, barefoot and homeless; always lying unsheltered on the ground, he is lulled to sleep on doorsteps and in the open roads. Possessing his mother's nature, he is always in need. But, then again, through his father he turns out a schemer for beautiful and good things, is courageous, bold, and intense, an awesome hunter always devising some machination or other, eager for understanding and inventive; he is a lover of wisdom throughout his life, and a brilliant wizard, healer and philosopher. (204a, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Eros is born on the birthday of Aphrodite (the goddess of love, sex, and beauty). When I think of Aphrodite's birth, I think of Botticelli's "The Birth of Venus," one of the world's most beautiful portraits of the birth of a woman. Eros is conceived on the day when beauty and love are celebrated. Eros, the god of Love, as we shall learn from Diotima, who teaches Socrates, who teaches his friends at the drinking party, who teach us, creates our quest for the beautiful, the good, for the truth and wisdom.

In the genesis of the daimon, Eros, we find the DNA of his parents and grandparents. Eros' paternal grandmother is Metis, the goddess of wisdom. Even though his parents and grandparent do not direct his fate, Eros inherits and incorporates their qualities. The mother of Eros is Poverty: needy, wanting, and deprived. Here Eros' father, Resourcefulness, is important because when one is acquisitive, one requires the resource and capability, the capacity, to find what one lacks.

Because of its mother, Love always hungers. Because of its father, it has the resource to find what it lacks. It finds, but is never fully complete. Because of its parentage, "lacking" combined with the "capacity" to find what it lacks, Love's energy is self-perpetuating. The gift that keeps on giving, resourcefulness, implies to me a self-aware desire to strive or receive, that it knows what it wants and is thinking about its object of desire, rather than a blind wanting.

Both sides of his parentage are important and create the unity of Eros' character. Each of us might fall down the ladder if we were either all need or all resource. We have to balance fragility and strength. Resource could make us too cocky. Need could make us too eager for what we want. Patients generally enter therapy because of a felt lack. The experience of lack provides the energy for locating the (internal) resource at hand for their quest.

Metaxy: The In-Between

The whole realm of the spiritual is halfway indeed between (metaxy) god and man. (202a, Jowett, trans., 1952).

We find the tension of opposites or poles within Eros as we look at Diotima's teaching and in Socrates' recantation speech in *Phaedrus*. Eros is the son of two conflicting and contrasting tendencies or realities: riches and deprivation. Between (*metaxy*) his parents, Love is never utterly at a loss nor completely wealthy but exists in the middle, between a mortal human being and an immortal god, between wisdom and ignorance, between plain and beautiful, neither fully one nor the other, but having to live in the tension of being between, a daimon trying to bring unity to humans and their gods, because gods are gods and humans remain humans. This intermediary spirit, a powerful divinity, is the mediator of the human and divine. Eros allows for communication and exchange between the gods and man.

Most people who know Eros, the erotic, feel the tension, see the beauty in Eros and also see its poverty in themselves. Socrates holds the tension in Eros; he praises its neediness. Eros can go either way, toward deprivation or beauty, ignorance or wisdom. It touches both poles. If for the patient, the therapy leans

toward the disturbing side of Eros, the patient and therapist must work it through, or the patient quits. Eros leads not only to fulfillment of satisfaction but to yearning, an ascent toward something beyond oneself, as is indicated by the term, daimon, spirit, something more than merely human.

To more fully understand the truth of Love, Socrates, as is his style, says he knows nothing about love and must teach his symposiasts about love through his teacher. Diotima, who's teaching will encompass the rest of this chapter. Socrates on his own can not say what he knows. Socrates acknowledges Diotima's wisdom as he surrenders to her teaching about the in-between. The spiritual powers

> interpret and convey things human to the gods and things divine to men; carrying prayers and sacrifices from below, the answers and commandments from above being themselves midway between the two, they bring them together and weld them into one great whole. (202e, Jowett, trans., 1952)

Since the daimon is in the middle (between the gods and human beings) "it fills in between the two so that the whole is bound together by it" (202e, Cobb, trans., 1993). Therefore, we humans are not completely closed off from the transcendent or heavenly level. Eros provides access to it.

> Diotima: A god does not have direct contact with a human being; on the contrary every interchange and conversation between gods and human beings is through a daimon, both when we are awake and in our dreams. (203a, Cobb, trans.)

When we help patients access their dreams, sometimes as messages from the divine realm, we are helping them seek relationship with the divine. We, too, are hearing something from the middle ground.

But primarily, since it is the human in Eros to which we pay most attention, we wonder, "What is the human experience of Eros?" Does its tension

between the divine height and depth start with our first passionate look at our mother, our first kiss, our first blush of love with the opposite sex parent, our first crush? Or is it our first passionate attempt to crawl? Since it is both lack and resource, desire and seeking, it permeates our world. When do we not experience it? In depression and despair it feels beyond our grasp.

Political scientist and philosopher Eric Voegelin (1974), in *Order and History, Vol. 4: The Ecumenic Age*, draws us into the heart of the *Symposium* when he describes the in-between (*metaxy*) dynamic tension that is Eros in us:

> The truth of existence in erotic tension conveyed by Diotima to Socrates . . . the dialogue of the soul . . . is a dialogue in Plato's soul . . . setting the truth of the *Metaxy*. For this truth is not an information about reality but the event in which the process of reality become luminous to itself. It is not information received, but an insight arising from the dialogue of the soul when it "dialectically" investigates its own suspense "between knowledge and ignorance." When the insight arises it has the character of the "truth," because it is the exegesis of the erotic tension experienced. . . . Hence, Socrates carefully refuses to make a "speech" on Eros. (p. 186)

The truth about Eros is illuminated and unfolds in the dialectic, the dialogue between Socrates and Diotima, in the space between them, in the metaxy. Voegelin concludes his long paragraph, "The *Symposium* presents itself as a report of a report over intervals of years; and the reporting continues to this day" (p. 186).

In psychotherapy, our patients also enter into a work of love, a dialectic, a mutual questioning and answering, more questions than answers, a continuing to question, a creating of truth between the two participants, a talking back and forth, a speaking and an attentive listening, a deep paying attention to the other, a conversation. (When I use the word "conversation" in the course of my argument, I mean the word as Plato used it, as dialogue, in the best sense of the word.)

Eros is all about relationship. Eros, Socrates implies, is always in relation, between god and man. It is relational before it enters into relationship. It is always Eros of something, desiring something. When, in psychoanalysis, we focus on the unconscious of both participants in the relationship, on a mutual, newly created moment, as well as on the Eros in the room and in each of the participants, we are also living in the metaxy, the analytic space between patient and analyst.

Procreation, Generativity, and Immortality

Diotima reminds Socrates, and the others, that Aristophanes misses the mark because, in truth, Love does not desire just any other half, only another half that is good (Cobb,1993). Diotima makes the bold statement that Love is the fundamental drive of all human activity, the basic motivating force of being human. In other words, Love is the fundamental nature or core of the human being and "the basic structure of all human activity" (Cobb, p. 74).

Now that we know what Love is and who its parents are, we learn about its function and work. What is the essence, the function, of Eros? Since Eros is

> giving birth in beauty both in body and in soul. . . . All human beings are pregnant, both in body and in soul, and when we come of age, we naturally desire to give birth. . . . One can not give birth in ugliness, only in beauty . . . birth is a divine affair. Pregnancy and procreation instill immortality in a living, mortal being. . . . Procreation is eternal and immortal. (206c-207a, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Eros' task is to procreate or create in beauty in order to find immortality through fecundity. We know Eros creates in beauty because we create the one we love as beautiful, even though others might easily disagree. And, if perhaps someone we love is not as beautiful as we would like, we talk about an inner beauty—that which therapists seek in their patients.

Eros moves toward what is ahead. It seeks to transform and also is the energy for procreation. Procreation is both spiritual and physical. Diotima reminds Socrates, just as Jung reminded Freud, that the path is forward moving, implying ascent, rather than the regressive pull of Aristophanic Eros. Jung looked to where we are heading in life, rather than to an unfulfilled wish of what never has been.

More than a desire to possess beautiful things or be acquisitive (as some have accused Eros of being), Love, for Plato, is the "desire to create and produce 'in beauty'" (206e, Cobb, trans., 1993). Diotima explains that the union of a man and a woman is birth and is a divine matter. "Pregnancy and procreation instill immortality in a living, mortal being" (206c, Cobb, trans.). Many parents believe their newborn is a divine child (Jung & Kerenyi, 1989), just as some Jungian analysts pay attention to the divine, as well as the divine child, in their patients (Cohen, 2008).

Eros wants to create. The creative urge itself is erotic (Hyland, 2008, p. 49). Enthusiasm for beauty, joy, passion is what Diotima is describing. Diotima's words are the words of reproduction: fertility, arousal, intercourse, pregnancy, and birth (206-209e, Cobb trans., 1993).

The mortal human being desires immortality each time it births an offspring or a work of art. In the generativity of parenting and our work, we leave behind what we create, in hope that what we helped create will create anew. Diotima brings immortality to our awareness, in a striking way, as a function of Love. She reminds us that a lover, pregnant in soul, gives birth to what is fitting for the soul. These lovers, these poets are our creators, artists, statesmen, lawgivers, educators—those

> who are remembered for the children, not of their loins, but of their brains and hearts. . . . As Diotima might have put it today, who remembers the twenty children Frauen Bach bore to John Sebastian? But who can forget his Art of the Fugue? (Morgan, 1964, p. 34)

The immortality gained from the "soul pregnancies" of poets, such as Hesiod or Homer, or a lawgiver such as Solon, is lasting. We remember their words longer than we do their children and grandchildren. (Hyland, 2008, p. 51).

This ideal lover, for Diotima, is very engaged in the world, talks about the virtues of ordinary life, cities, households, has useful and helpful conversations with others. We, too, have a similar bias when we encourage our patient to be a part of the world.

The immortality of the soul, which results from generating wisdom, intelligence, and moderation, arises through education. It is an ongoing dialogue in Plato's soul, and in our souls, about what is of lasting value. According to philosophy professor, Michael Morrissey, "For Plato immortality is achieved by way of cultivating the love of knowledge. . . . The highest activity of love is the conversation of souls" (as cited in Hughes, pp. 23, 17). This is the search we are engaged in with ourselves and our patients, a seeking of an abundant, worthwhile, lasting life.

In the same search, we are reminded of and moved by the mark of Eros' mother, Poverty. As Morrissey, explains,

> Everyone whose soul enters into the philosophical activities of love experiences the quest for fullness, or completion, or perfection, or true goodness and wisdom, which inevitably follows upon the prior awareness of one's state of ignorance and need. (as cited in Hughes, 1999, p. 17)

One of my favorite passages in *Symposium* relates to what analysts think about quite often: continuity, change, loss. While we might imagine that there is a central core to our being, we are also always changing:

> But in actuality one hasn't any characteristics at all whereby one can be called the same person. One is always becoming a new person, losing things, portions of hair, flesh, bones, blood and all the stuff of the body. And not only in the body. In the soul as well one's habits and character, beliefs, desires, pleasures, pains, fears—none of these things remain the same in anyone—they arise and they die out. But what's even stranger than these facts is that we not only gain knowledge and lose it, so that we don't remain the same people with respect to what we know. . . . Forgetting is a leaving of knowledge, and study, by implanting new knowledge in place of what has left, saves the memory of it, so that it seems like the same thing. It is in this way that everything mortal is preserved—not by its being utterly the same forever, like the divine, but by what is old and withdrawing leaving behind something else, something new, like itself. It is by this method, Socrates, that the mortal partakes of immortality. (208a, Cobb, trans., 1993)

This quote does not catch the extraordinary paradox of sustaining a sense of identity, an identity when everything ultimately changes. The passage throws up to us the ultimate contradiction of mortality and the immortal soul.

David Tresan (2001), in a paper on Heraclitus, examines the Pre-Socratic's language of the "penetrating and powerful view . . . of a world in constant flux alongside the overarching unity that was said to prevail at the same time" (p. 8). Heraclitus wrote "the soul has its Logos, which increases itself" or "the logos of the soul is increasing itself" (fragment 115, Freeman, 1948, p. 32). Logos, like goodness, increases itself. The more logos one experiences, the more consciousness one gains. The begetting of logos is self-perpetuating. Another of Heraclitus' fragments speaks to how we are always in a state of change: "Just as the river where I step is not the same, so as I am not" (fragment 81, Haxton, 2001, p. 51). Who I am now is not who I will be. Again, Heraclitus: Change is the only constant.[45]

---

[45] Tresan (2001) refers us to Heraclitus's "genius . . . his means to express the essential aspects of his experience of the penetrating and powerful view he had been vouchsafed in a world in constant flux" p. 9. Tresan notes these fragments of Heraclitus as 6, 12, 49a, 53, 91.

Each of our cells is continually mutating, changing. Our body is growing and decaying, "every idea in our mind is flowing in and out" (Morgan, 1964, p. 34). This is the human condition itself, not only are our bodies in constant flux, but our souls (psyches) as well. For Diotima the soul is constantly changing, its habits, characteristics, opinions, desires, pleasures, pains, and fears, even its knowledge, in which new knowledge is constantly replacing the old. (Hyland, 2008, p. 52)

In Diotima's teaching we find a metaphor of our ever changing engagement in life and in analysis. We are in continuing psychic movement. Even when it seems as if we are staying the same, the Eros of the relationship is continually changing both analyst and patient. Each of us carries our childhood with us while we are in an ongoing state of renewal. We remind our patients and ourselves that feelings are temporal; they pass. Even depression, sometimes the most chronic, ebbs and moves.

As therapists, I imagine most of us are not contemplating our own or our patients' immortality while we are spending time together. It is a subject that has rarely arisen in my practice. But the way in which Diotima describes the quest for immortality makes the subject quite real for me. As we age, it is increasingly more difficult to deny our fate of mortality.

When our patients terminate what has been a meaningful analysis, the immortality of our relationship lives on in both patient and analyst. In dialogue, in society, in educating, the immortal is alive in Plato's soul, alive for us today. Through Plato's dialogues we experience the ongoingness, the immortality and generativity of his thinking. Through his writings we receive an act of love.

Life lived in the metaxy, between mortal and immortal, between human and divine, is a life of the spirit, a spiritual life. Eros is human participation in the immortal divine. Before death, we are able to partake in a love that is stronger than death, a divine lastingness. Much greater than the individual, love is immortal, as we remember from the *Song of Songs.*

Carl Jung, in his 1925 *Seminars in English,* locates our immortality in our collective unconscious. When we are aware of how our ancestral past is present in the life we live today, there follows

> a sense of the renewal of life to which there is no end. So when we obtain a complete realization of self, there comes with it the feeling of immortality. Even in analysis such a moment will come. (Jung, 1989, p. 144)

Jung believes a goal of individuation is to experience a continuity of one's life through the ages. I do not believe we achieve an end point of a fully individuated self, but we hope to proceed along a path where, in our connection with a collective soul, we do feel "eternity on this earth" (p. 144).

The immortality question does not deny the truth of our mortality, but touches a wish to live on in the memory of our patients and other loved ones. We provide immortality for our patients when we proffer them development of a self that passes on to their children, or a sense of well being which helps them give to others, through their teachings, their works, their creative endeavors, their relationships, their love for others, gifts which pass from generation to generation.

Eros is desire for, the conscious and unconscious drive for, immortality. Love is always seeking happiness, good, the beautiful, Socrates' teacher tells us. Who does not seek happiness? Who does not want goodness and beauty to last forever? We find the generative energy of immortality in birth and in the

metaphor of birth, in the reality of the developing self through analysis. The therapist may be an instrument, a midwife, who enables birth in the other. How are we to understand experiences of what endures when all else changes? Perhaps there are glimpses during the clinical hour.

While no one can say exactly what immortality is, it may be the truth and goodness between myself and my patient, or myself and a loved one, when together we transcend the moment and evoke an experience of foreverness in a moment. The moment represents both the past and is a promise of what will be.

The Upward Climb

In Diotima's transcendent text we learn about the assent up her vision of love. I am reminded of Paul Gifford's (2005) understanding: For Plato, "erotic love while primed by sexual desire, and drawing on its energies, is . . . a 'godlike' or 'divine' principle of transcendence immanent in the human psyche" (p. 18). Eros both initiates the movement for and is the energy, dynamism, and vitality for cultivating a love of knowledge and seeking immortality in the climb upward on love's ladder.

The rungs of the ladder, like the steps of a staircase, are simply stages. We know about stages: Freud's stages of psycho-sexual development; Jung's stages of anima development; the stages of a human life. Plato describes five stages through which love needs to pass. As with the growth of the person and the psyche, there is always movement between the stages, and as an analyst, I attempt to hold in mind all the stages as a unit, certainly not imposing any order of growth or development, but letting one reach each stage or place as he or she

so needs in a non-linear progression and the stages of Eros come to us independent of hierarchy.

Colman (1994) says that, for Plato, "sexual love was the first step on a ladder of love towards the contemplation of absolute beauty, *and only* [italics added] valuable insofar as it initiated the quest for this goal" (p. 502). The rungs on the ladder are all connected and joined. We misunderstand Freud if we think one must first complete and master the tasks of one stage before heading to the next. We head both up and down this staircase of love. Diotima describes the process of love leading and moving from one step to another but we recognize the top rung is part of the bottom rung and vice versa.

First Stage

> The person must begin while young to turn toward beautiful bodies, and at first, if he is correctly led by his guide, to love a single body and to bring forth beautiful conversations in that situation. He must then realize that the beauty of one particular body is akin to the beauty of every other body, and that it is necessary to pursue beauty of form, it is quite mindless not to believe that the beauty of all bodies is one and the same. . . . He must become a lover of all beautiful bodies. (210b, Cobb, trans., 1993)

The first stage may have been an ideal among affluent, educated Athenian males, as they focused on a beautiful younger male body as their lover, educating him into wisdom. Sexual attraction was the initial impulse. (I would say infant love of mother is the initiation into bodily attraction, the protoype for falling in love with one particular body). But if one became a lover of all beautiful bodies, through the arduous process of moving from a single beauty to universal bodily beauty, would not a lover become less possessive and fixated in his own pleasure?

What would analysis be like if the analyst had in mind the image of Diotima's ladder of love? How does meditating on the text change me as an analyst? Diotima offers a rational, linear presentation about an awakening, a glorious perspective, from one body to other bodies.

In the first stage, one's mind might travel to the end of the sequence. As one realizes he or she cannot possess all bodies physically, one is already in another dimension of reality, a new spiritual state, more detached. There has now been an essential shift internally that sets the tone for all the stages.

In analysis, while we desire to make beautiful conversation in the container of our rooms, we grow to love the mind or being of the person we are talking with. But do we also love their physicality, the space they inhabit in themselves? Diotima's view incorporates the body. The body is always important in the consulting room, and, if we sexualize it, we tend also to fear it. Can we imagine the body in a larger way, an image inspired by a larger vision—a larger vessel—of the manifestation of and participation in what was for Diotima full Absolute Beauty?

Second Stage

> After that, he must believe that the beauty of souls is more valuable than that of the body, so that if someone who has a decent soul is not very attractive, he will be content to love him, to take care of him, and with him to search out and give birth to the sort of conversations that make young men better. (210c, Cobb, trans., 1993)

As we know, psychotherapy is soul work. We have been taught to help our patients love the "whole person" in their life partner or dating partner. We are taught that if our patient sees the other as "part object," we need to analyze

why that is. We are trained to see our patients as whole, rather than parts, and clearly, this second stage, moving past persona, is worthy of our attention and contemplation.

As a therapist, how would I climb Diotima's ladder? What would I do differently in my work? I might push myself a bit internally and ask myself the following questions as I contemplate my work with a patient outside our session: Am I able to see past the body and sexuality and the physicality of the patient? Does the patient peer inside me? Do I let him? We believe the dream is the portal to the soul. Is the whole unconscious a portal to the soul? Is the body? Does anyone know?

At what point do I experience in the physical and emotional presence of my patient something as mysterious as the soul? We sense its presence; the higher forms of love are indications of soul. Diotima is connecting us to higher forms of love that move past carnal love to agape love (to be discussed in the last chapter), forms of love that are equated with soul, and perhaps less easy to discuss—self-forgetful love and loving without attachment.

Diotima's model is relevant for psychoanalysis as she relinquishes attachment. We help patients break attachments to earlier ways of thinking about themselves, thoughts that restrict and limit their development, and early attachments to those they want to move beyond.

Third Stage:

In a profound shift from the preoccupation with the beauty of one body or all bodies, to beauty at all other levels, one will be "compelled to study the beauty in practical endeavors and in laws and traditions, and to see that all

beauty is related, so that he will believe that the beauty connected with the body is of little importance" (210c, Cobb, trans., 1993). Why does Diotima say that the body is of little importance? We do not need to devalue the body in order to move toward heart and spirit.

But those who maintain an obsession with beauty in the body might be lifted to something greater. Once a patient told me she found her boyfriend unattractive because he had a crooked tooth that was visible when he smiled. As she was telling me this story, I was staring at her mouth and noticed several teeth in imperfect alignment. I gently broached the topic and we were able to laugh.

Living in the city of Athens, citizens—males with property rights—would come together in the Agora, the marketplace, to talk. Many therapists want their patients, male and female, to contribute to the community, to the larger activities of our society, the education of their children. We encourage the capacity for selflessness. Is this a dimension of their love?

Fourth Stage:

> After practical endeavors, he must be led to examples of knowledge in order that he may see in turn the beauty of knowledge and no longer look upon what is limited to an individual case as being very beautiful. . . . On the contrary after turning toward the great sea of beauty, he studies it and gives birth to many splendidly beautiful conversations and thoughts in a magnanimous philosophy. (210d, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Diotima tells Socrates that the lover, after concentrating on a single beautiful body, now knows that the soul is more important than the body, and at a soul level, helps the beloved give birth to ideas. The "magnanimous philosophy" is love and the beauty of wisdom. In the mind, in ideas, lies an idea of beauty, the beauty of all knowledge, the great sea of beauty.

Through this ascending staircase, through therapy as it deepens, we approach generativity in the beautiful and arrive at the creative rung of the ladder. Through the creative process of analysis, we approach the person and sink into the unknown, let it gestate, give it time to birth and live. We move through layers of the person, move closer to the core, to their truth, to goodness and beauty. Plato does not speak to the beauty in their shadowy darkness. A patient said to me the other day, "Even if I never have a relationship of truth with anyone else in my life, I will have had one with you." This was a painful expression of her being; much grief followed. The sharing of her experience of aloneness in the world outside our therapy is an example of our moving in closer to her truth. Through "beautiful conversation" she knows that I might be the first person in her life to see and honor her beauty.

The Fifth and "Final" Stage

Diotima tells Socrates that, at this final stage, we will see "something astonishing that is beautiful in its nature... the purpose of the earlier efforts" (210e, Cobb, trans., 1993). What is so astonishing? Absolute Beauty. Some have called it God, Enlightenment, the Self, Cosmic Goodness, Buddah nature, Satori, Krishna, the Universal or O.[46]

> In the first place, it is eternal; it neither comes into being nor passes away, neither increases or diminishes. It is not beautiful at times, but always. It is

[46] When we experience a moment of being profoundly struck by a truth, we are reminded of Bion's O, just as Plato believed we are reminded of the ultimate Ideas of Beauty and Goodness (J. Symington & N. Symington, 1996, p. 122). Tresan (2004b) states: "According to Bion, O is ultimate reality, absolute truth, the godhead, the infinite, the thing-in-itself, and experience. Characteristic of O, knowledge is constellated in its field, not arrived at through reasoning, inference, or by agenda (Bion, 1995 [1983]). This kind of knowing is identical to the special kind that is also among the attributes of the pre-Socratic nous" (p. 389).

> not ugly to some, but beautiful to all. It is not a beautiful face or a particular beautiful piece of knowledge. . . . All other beautiful things partake of it in such a way that, although they come into being and pass away, it does not, nor does it become any greater or any less, nor it is affected in any way. (211a-211b, Cobb trans., 1993)

We have moved from the particular to the universal, to the highest form of love. Beauty is eternal, always, without a beginning.

> It is the understanding of that beauty itself, so that in the end he knows what beauty itself is. . . . Here is the life that a human being should live, studying the beautiful itself. . . . If someone should happen to see the beautiful itself, pure, clear, unmixed, and not contaminated with a lot of other mortal silliness, but rather if he were able to look upon the divine, uniform beautiful itself? . . . When a person sees the beautiful in the only way it can be seen, only then will he ever be able to give birth, not to imitations of virtue . . . but to true virtue, because he would taking hold of what is true. . . . By giving birth to true virtue and nourishing it, he would be able to become a friend to the gods. (212a, Cobb, trans., 1993)

Here we see the connection between the vision of beauty with Diotima's metaphor of birth in beauty and the life of virtue. Ascending Diotima's staircase of love does not take us out of this world but leads us back into it. We are led to creative works, an engaged life of ordering our cities and households, to creative, useful and enlivening conversations (Cobb, 1993, p. 79). Diotima stresses the importance of contemplation and study of beauty itself. One should read Diotima as one wishes. For some, her emphasis on study might seem more a rational activity, a logos, but for others, especially when considering the whole of the journey, there is a mystical experience inherent in her quest for knowledge, wisdom, and the absolute.

Diotima is talking about a state of being, and what would that state be like? As an analyst who has meditated on Diotima's teaching, I would take away the ladder with its linear implications. The image she evokes is not linear. From the very beginning, it is infused with love. We believe her teaching because her

invitation to an awakening, her invitation to spirit and love comes to us throughout the whole text. She presents it as a hierarchy of goods, but we hold them as a fluid process, which becomes unitary by the time we ascend to our heights.

Diotima's ascending the staircase of love possesses another vision for us. Not only do we let go of attachments, we slowly learn to transcend ourselves, to reach a bigger picture of self and other, beyond self into other. This should be happening to the therapist throughout her work, and when now I meet a new patient, I will have the dialogue of the *Symposium* already as a part of who I am.

A patient told me her sadness after years of being divorced, having been rejected by her husband. In one of our sessions, she noticed a book on Plato in my office and asked me what I was reading and chose to read it herself. In a future session she discussed Diotima's ladder of love image.

She was angry with herself for her tearful feelings, that she could not transcend her sadness (or anger), that she could not reach God, or Absolute Beauty as Diotima calls it. She knew it wise to focus on the moment and not the future. She had had a decade of psychotherapy and questioned why could she not see the glass as half full and appreciate the whole of her life and its gifts, rather than focusing on the painful lack. Her desire was strong, and she was suffering from a lack.

She tried to meditate on Absolute Beauty, to pray to Eros that it become the transcendent force it can be. Would Eros help her transcend her feelings and at the same time bring her deeper into them, where her true and best self resides? Heraclitus: "The way up and down is one and the same" (fragment 60, Freeman, 1948, p. 29). Transcending them and going deeper into her feelings happens

simultaneously. Our theory is that if she travels deeper into her feelings, they are more likely to move toward truth, which might provide some relief for her.

We talked about how no one ever gets to Absolute Beauty except for infrequent and rare moments maybe a few times in one's life. We discussed how she might translate Absolute Beauty into virtuous acts in her life as she knows it. The ladder of love leads us to correct judgment that lies in-between understanding and ignorance. We remember that we are working in between the two.

Have I ever seen Absolute Beauty? How can I help her with these questions? The two times I am sure I saw Beauty were at the birth and first sight of both my babies. Nothing else mattered. I knew Beauty. Of course, I did not share the memory with my patient. I helped her ease up on herself and her unreachable goal as I held the image of Absolute Beauty in mind and in the space between us. We have arrived at the limits of language for there are no words for the insight gained at this level of Beauty. Even with the self-sacrificing journey up the ladder, there is only grace, not a guarantee that one is able to study and know true Beauty and if that be the case, we might experience true virtue.

I can only incorporate Diotima's teaching through my own psychic birth, by receiving the gift of God, becoming alive in my own way, giving birth to the best in myself, to a higher level of the nature of God, to creativity, a more beautiful reality, the formless beauty one also sees at the top of the rim of heaven in *Phaedrus*.

There is virtue throughout the ladder; there is movement and relinquishing of self-interest to achieve a greater good. Happiness is living justly with temperance, and contemplating the transcendent Beauty itself.

Contemplating Beauty is a state of mind while living in justice, temperance and courage in behavior, in action. "Socrates treats the virtues as attributes of soul intimately connected with wisdom. The connection between virtue and contemplation may be taken as internal" (Allen, 1991, p. 88).

With these thoughts about the virtues in mind, what my patient and I worked on during her despair about not reaching the final rung of the ladder was generally, but not specifically, the following: we want to remember that the final rung exists. In remembering it, in reminding ourselves about it, we are in it and it in us. We need to fully surrender to our pain in being about to see it, know it, yet remain unable to live in it. We talked about her letting up on expectations of herself, being mindful and allowing herself to feel held. All of these concepts are just that, words and concepts for something there are no words for. What she seeks is already within.

Another person provides an occurrence, or might be considered a carrier, of Absolute Beauty. Someone else might be an occasion for giving our love and coming closer to the final rung. The archetype of Absolute Beauty is far above our society's image of romantic love; for that we are grateful. What we know about Absolute Beauty is that "the form of it is eternal and unchanging, discovered in and through conversation, and that seeing it will transform one's life" (Cobb, 1993, p. 79).

Beauty implies the visual. Diotima is talking about a state of being, and what would that state be like? In analysis, we hold the image of Moira, fate, as she presides at childbirth, creates new life and new ways of being for the patient—Moira with feeling and logos. Feeling is a way of understanding but not at the level of reason or cognition; feeling can operate well even if one is ignorant

of the facts, in connection with the other. Feeling is valuation, and our work is informed by feeling, the value in ourselves and in our patients in order to do this work. Logos is our connection to the virtues.

Love is a great spirit, between mortality and immortality, neither mere mortality nor God (Absolute Beauty). It is a spirit and an instinct informed by feeling, a messenger, the in-between, the psychopomp of the soul.

Alcibiades

After Diotima finishes her teaching, and Aristophanes is about to retort to Socrates, the handsome, young, and proud Alcibiades, an ardent admirer of Socrates, bursts into the party, drunk, an embodiment of the god Dionysus. He came to crown Agathon as victor of the tragedy competition, and placed some garlands on Socrates instead. Alcibiades, as the reader knows, is a complex historical and tragic figure, full of promise, wealth, noble birth, political power, who succumbs years after the *Symposium* to raw ambition as a irreligious traitor fighting for Sparta against Athens. He also destroyed religious icons and mocked the Eleusinian mysteries.

In his speech, Alcibiades personifies Eros and moves Diotima's teachings down to earth from abstraction. Alcibiades offers passion, danger, insistence, and beauty. Through Alcibiades, who loves and worships Socrates, his friend and teacher, Eros has now entered the *Symposium* in the most real of ways. The relationship of Alcibiades and Socrates is a living description of what the divine-like Diotima has been describing. Alcibiades, instead of praising Eros, praises Socrates, who, for many, including Alcibiades was a human/divine embodiment of Eros.

Alcibiades declares that Socrates is the most like Silenus, ugly on the outside, but, when opened up, has beautiful gods within (215b, Cobb, trans., 1993). He tells Socrates he is telling only the truth and that Socrates should interrupt him if he does not speak the truth. Socrates does not interrupt him. Alcibiades confesses that Socrates is the only man who makes him feel ashamed:

> Socrates is the only human being in front of whom I have experienced what no one would believe possible for me—a sense of shame in front of someone—though I only feel shame in front of him. (216b, Cobb, trans., 1993)

> Socrates . . . when someone hears you, whether it's a woman listening, a man, or a lad, we are astounded and possessed. . . . When his interior is opened up, he is more filled than you would think . . . with judicious good sense. . . . He doesn't care at all whether or not someone is beautiful. . . . How little regard he has for . . . whether one is wealthy or has anything else the multitude values as contributing to happiness. . . . [I did see] the glorious figures inside him and they seemed to me to be so divine, golden, splendid, and amazing, that, to put it briefly, whatever Socrates commands must be done. (215d-217a, Cobb, trans.)

Alcibiades provides several lurid examples of times and places where he prostrates himself before and tries to seduce Socrates, but none coerced Socrates. Alcibiades is in conflict and perhaps did not want Socrates, his teacher, to be seducible as a lover. Alcibiades, in his truth, praises

> Socrates' physical endurance, his moral courage, gifts as a teacher, the magic of his insight. . . As the stages along love's way had earlier been described in general terms, we see here in Socrates' own life and person their fulfillment. . . He who seems least the lover—especially by contrast with Alcibiades—is really supreme in love, because he above all loves the truth which alone is genuinely worth loving. (Morgan, 1962, p. 38)

We note the contrast between a lover of the body, Alcibiades, and a lover of truth, Socrates. We enter the real and particular world of love and physical attraction, beauty, and the need for restraint. Alcibiades reminds me of a particular kind of patient, powerful charismatic men, with adolescent qualities, like Bill Clinton.

Genuine love and truth are victors over the body. Alcibiades' relation to Socrates is a fascinating metaphor for the therapy relationship. One way we expand the psyche in therapy is by loving the patient while letting the patient seduce us emotionally at times but never sexually. Socrates shows his love for Alcibiades by his denial of the physical. Socrates drinks as much as he wants at the end of the party, does not pass out like the others do, does not even fall asleep, paying attention throughout. His drink is the nectar of the gods, drinking in the love of wisdom and the wisdom of love.

For Diotima, as for Socrates at the end of this story, philosophy is living in a virtuous way. Plato will expand further on the Love of Wisdom, Philosophy, and the ascent to it, in *Phaedrus.* Alcibiades' mad passion for Socrates is our entrée into Plato's description of Eros as a divine madness, to which we now turn.

CHAPTER FIVE: AN EXPLORATION OF EROS IN PLATO'S *PHAEDRUS*

In *Phaedrus*, Plato takes us on another adventure into Eros through metaphor, allegory, poetry, religion, philosophy, and psychology. Socrates and Phaedrus are in the country, sitting along the river, Illisius, talking about love in the inspired setting of the beauty of nature. In this discourse, there are three speeches on Love. First, Phaedrus reads a speech by the rhetorician Lysias in praise of the Non Lover. Socrates mocks and bests Lysias speech but then admits his second speech was blasphemous and delivers a second and truthful speech, his palinode, an ode to Eros. It is unusual for Socrates to venture outside the bounds of the city, and we pay attention to his wisdom.

My argument will concentrate on Socrates' second recantation speech in the dialogue, Plato uses human language to describe a divine tale. We enter into his imagination, his poetry, his myth about the gods as we learn that there is more than one path to God. In *Symposium*, we ascend and look forward toward the spiritual, while in *Phaedrus*, we remember an earlier state of existence when our souls were blessed with a transitory glimpse of God. Socrates now educates the eponymous Phaedrus about love, through dialogue, just as in the dialogue of psychoanalysis, the patient and analyst explore love, sometimes defensively, sometimes in truth.

To understand Eros, we are first led into the realm of the divine, into divine mania, *theia mania.* Socrates tells the beautiful Phaedrus, "The greatest goods come to us through the madness that is given as a divine gift" (244b, Cobb, trans., 1993). Plato elaborates on divine mania—madness not caused by

disease—and it is not until later in the dialogue that we learn about the fourth divine mania.

The First Three Divine Mania

Prophecy

The first mania is prophecy. Socrates cites three prophetesses, the prophetess of Delphi, the priestess at Dodona, and Sibyl, all of whom, in an excited, exalted state of mania and prophetic ecstasy are "being besides themselves" (Pieper, 1962, p. 52), the divine acting upon man. Being beside oneself is being possessed by a god—or a complex—being filled with a god, enthusiasm. "The multitude regard him as being out of his wits, for they know not that he is full of a god (enthusiasm)" (p. 50).

Why did Plato use Sibyl as an example of *theia mania*? In the *Aeneid*, Book VI, we learn from Virgil that the god Apollo breathed into Sibyl "a great mind and soul" (Pieper, 1962, p. 55). The breathing in is *inspiratio*, inspiration. The inspiration is unexpected, without warning, a force from who knows where.[47]

Plato has Socrates say that the ancients did not believe that madness was shameful or blameworthy, for they knew it was a wonderful gift from god. "The evidence of the Ancients attests that the *theia mania*, heaven sent madness, is more worthy of veneration than the products of human discretion" (Pieper, 1962, p. 53). Plato contrasted prophecy, which comes from a god, and augury, where people are sane and in their senses. "Madness is nobler than sanity; the first

---

[47] Heraclitus, fragment 92: "The Sibyl with raving mouth uttering her unlaughing, unadorned, unincensed words reaches out over a thousand years with her voice, through the (inspiration of the) god" (Freeman, 1948, p. 31).

proceeds from a god, the other from mere man" (Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956, p. 26).

These prophetesses accomplished great acts of clairvoyance, admirable in their capacity to help people lead greater and more fulfilled lives, more so than had they been sane and in complete self-possession. Plato uses the language of the divine. If we are uncomfortable using the word divine, we can still appreciate these experiences of grace.

The consequences of divine mania for therapy today are manifold, although they are rarely stressed when studying the theory of the unconscious. We know that if a patient is psychologically intact, but we intuit, through his or her enthusiasm, that there is also divine inspiration, we try not to shame or blame but to look for the divine truth. To know that our ego is not in charge helps protect us against arrogance and strengthens our humility. We honor the fact that inspiration is autonomous, that we are stunned by a sudden burst of insight or knowing that seems to come from the outside. As we relinquish self-sufficiency, the fantasy of autonomy and being in control, we surrender to the unknown, to a sudden illumination and insight. In accepting the limits of human nature, we allow for revelation.

When we are able to abandon holding tight to what we think we already know, we open to truth, light, the uncanny, the unexpected. We allow the breath of an inspired thought or creative moment to pass through us. Even the Catholic theologian and philosopher St. Thomas of Aquinas (ca. 1225–1274), usually more rational, says, "The cognition of the sleeper is more powerfully receptive than that of the waker" (Pieper, 1962, p. 58).

The importance of being beside oneself, rather than locked into oneself, is to be guided by an inner prophet, to listen to our own self, our own voice, to follow the prophet in our dreams, to pay attention to a transcendent god within. "We suffer something. Something happens to us" (Pieper, 1962, p. 49). The illumination of dreams and the resulting expansion of consciousness remind us that we are guided by something far greater than ourselves.

The prophetesses were highly intuitive, and when attending to their craft in our work as therapists, we are reminded of our gratitude for the gift of divine mania. Within the structure and boundaries of psychotherapy, there is no technique that can produce grace on demand. In order to receive a gift from the gods and allow ourselves to be affected by grace, we cannot be locked into a technique. If we are locked into technique while with the patient, we will block the unfolding of material and experience.

Paradoxically, in divine inspiration, we are both beside ourselves and most fully in ourselves, without preconceptions, old tapes, harmful ways of being. The late German Catholic philosopher Josef Pieper (1962) questions,

> is there not a vital substratum, far removed from all rational technique for living, where the psyche truly knows what it wants and what it needs, where, unspoken, the possibility of such healing is at least dimly felt? In letting go of himself, man does not surrender to the purely "irrational," he surrenders to the healing darkness of his own divine origin. (p. 62)

In receptivity to our divine origin, we experience transpersonal phenomena such as synchronicity, surprise, divine inspiration. Jung (1947/1960) might say we are at the psychoid level, where we most truly know what we want or need, and it just comes to us.[48]

---

[48] "Psyche is essentially conflict between blind instinct and will (freedom of choice). Where instinct predominates, *psychoid* processes set in which pertain to the sphere of the

The psychoid level is that very ancient realm in which psyche and soma come together, that mysterious realm in which we as individuals are connected with the *unus mundus*, that vast organic wholeness in which everything is connected—where synchronicity operates, where the uncanny holds sway. It is the archetypal psyche in its deepest, most timeless dimension, where space and time, past, present, and future, are non linear and undifferentiated. The psychoid level is a metaphysical construct which subsumes our inner and outer selves and world.

Catharsis

A second type of madness is a cathartic mania and includes rituals and mystical experiences. Madness and maladies that have been present in families, because of previous sins and guilts, are purified through purification rites and catharses. The maladies are psychic—not physical—burdens, and the psyche is not healed by rational technique. Psychoanalysis provides relief from hardships that man has endured. Someone who takes refuge in therapy hopes to break the cycle, heal the early wounds, transmissions of family and ancestral guilts and crimes, when no one before consciously tried to end the pattern. The patient, while approaching the madness of the sins from the past, looks for redemption.[49]

Psychoanalysis, through the process of free association, asks the patient to be receptive to what is within, to what comes up. In the Jungian tradition, we are

---

unconscious as elements incapable of consciousness. The psychoid process is not the unconscious as such, for this has a far greater extension. (Jung, 1947/1960, p. 183.)

[49] The best work I have read on intergenerational transmission of trauma is Wayne Cristaudo's chapter called "Damage: A Logic of Evil" in his book *Power, Love, Evil* (2008).

to be receptive to the dream and the unconscious, to let them speak through us. Jung writes, "We endure the dream" (as cited in Pieper, 1962, p. 61).

When we let the dream work on us, we are outside the ego; we bow to a state of *mania*, for the sake of healing and wholeness. Jung (1946/1954) refers to the ancient Greek religions, initiation rites, mystery cults: "Give up what thou hast (have), and then thou will receive. . . . What is to receive bears the same name in modern psychology as in Plato's: purification, *katharsis*" (p. 59). In "The Problems of Modern Psychotherapy" Jung recommends this motto for the first stage of psychotherapy:

> The beginnings of psychoanalysis are in fact nothing else than the scientific discovery of an ancient truth: even the name that was given to the earliest method—catharsis, or cleansing—is a familiar term in the classical rites of initiation. The early cathartic method consisted in putting the patient . . . in touch with the hinterland of his mind which the yoga systems of the East describe as meditation or contemplation. . . . The aim here is to observe the sporadic emergence, whether in the form of images or of feelings, of those dim representations which detach themselves in the darkness from the invisible realm of the unconscious and move as shadows before the inturned gaze. (p. 59)

We allow ourselves kenosis—emptying out—in order to change and purify. Although we aspire, through catharsis, to know our shadows and honor our and the other's humanity, we must still confess to someone. Jung (1946/1954) realized that

> Privacy prolongs my isolation . . . but through confession I throw myself into the arms of humanity again, freed at last from the burden of moral exile. The goal of the cathartic method is full confession—not merely the intellectual recognition of the facts with the head, but their confirmation by the heart and the actual release of suppressed emotion. (p. 59)

Of course, sometimes we are so anchored in the conscious mind that cathartic confession, which might pry us loose, is not possible. This is when we need divine intervention or further therapy to help melt the frozen avenues into

the unconscious and ourselves. Only when we "lose our wits" are we privy to the healing madness, the richness of healing and purification, knowing fully that madness, mania, enthusiasm are not "at variance with the dignity of man . . . but constitute true wealth, and are essential to a truly human life" (Pieper, 1962, p. 70).

Poetic Inspiration

For Socrates, the third mania is poetic inspiration, true poetry from the soul, madness found in the enthusiasm of being possessed by a god. We are possessed by the muses in order to create, to create a meaning and a self. In this mania, patient and analyst make "beautiful music" together, are attuned to language as a poet is, finding the right words at the right time, a poetic free association. We know our muses inspire stories and poetry. Those who think they can approach therapy from the point of view of technique and rules will miss their muse. In analysis, we are reminded that the purpose is not solely to alleviate suffering but also to realize that suffering, as the gift of divine madness, is to be experienced and revered.

The Parable of the Soul and Mind

Socrates continues by describing the fourth divine madness, love of wisdom in mind. Through an allegorical myth about the soul, a soul which is difficult to distinguish from Eros, we will note his poetic inspiration. We will be reminded that philosophy, the love of wisdom, the primary form of Eros in this dialogue, "involves a similar 'inspiration' to that of poetry and art" (Hyland, 2008, p. 72). Philosophy being inspired, and not just logical, is not how we usually think of it. It becomes easier to connect philosophy and analysis when we

realize that both are inspired and encompass knowledge, self-knowledge, and the desire for truth. In *Phaedrus*, thinking and love are not separated. In the fourth divine mania, love and intellect as philosophy, we are also reminded of Hesiod's Eros as the power, the force, the movement at the beginning of the world and time. The intellect of the soul is propelled by Eros; Eros and intellect are inseparable.

When I first read the dialogue *Phaedrus*, this defense of love in dialogic form, it was an erotic shock to my being. It was then that I knew the erotic as a forever experience, that Plato understood me, and I understood Plato. Before I read *Phaedrus*, I had not fully known how to talk about the erotic. It felt like a passionate longing for the other, the other who seemed like me, my psychic lap, in whose connection I felt whole and had a sense of melting and calm, my armor removed. I thought I had found a name for this experience when I read about Heinz Kohut's "self-object," but, as I said, *Phaedrus* came as an erotic shock, and Kohut did not. In the presence of my imagined beloved, there was more than magnetic attraction; there was light and moving out of myself toward something greater. While trying to digest the experience of reading *Phaedrus*, I knew I had to find a way to connect it to my work. As I quote from the text, my thoughts arise from the experience in my soul. I will quote from the text in an order that is Plato's.

In Socrates' ode to Eros, his palinode, his recantation speech, his telling Phaedrus about what love really is, Plato was able to illuminate many psychological concepts for me: soul, mind, a tribute to memory, growth, wholeness, and, of course, love. As Diotima taught Socrates, Socrates now teaches Phaedrus about love, and Plato continues to teach us.

In order to attain the truth about Eros, first we learn about the nature of the soul, human and divine. Socrates apprises us that his allegory will not be logical. "Our exhibition will be persuasive to the wise, but not to the clever" (245c, Hyland, trans., 2008). Clever people will look for a proof and logical validity, while the wise will go deeper and recall Plato's explanation in the *Republic*, "Don't you understand, I said, that first we tell myths to children? And surely, they are as a whole false, but there is also truth in them" (377a, Hyland, trans.). The wise reader will know that Plato's myth is truth couched in fiction.

Plato's imagination creates an image that I employ: the soul's form is a composite of a charioteer and a pair of winged horses. The gods' horses are immortal and perfect, but a human has one black, unruly horse and one white, good horse, one beautiful, one ugly. The chariot driver of the human soul must navigate and manage both horses, and hence, our difficulty in living. The charioteer has the exigency to both remember the vision beyond the heavens, a Reality I will soon explain, and to control the two horses. The charioteer is also the highest part of the human soul's participation in the cosmic soul.

Chariot driving is "painfully a difficult business" (246b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995) as the black, unruly horse of desire is a primary constituent of the soul and of Eros. Jung describes the two horses as morally contradictory opposites that exist side by side in the psyche, as in the god image of Yahweh in the Hebrew Bible, in the dynamic unitary image of the psyche containing opposites (Jung, 1928/1964, p. 448). Jung understands that the horses hold the tension of the opposites but is not explicit. Instead, he writes "Plato used the white and black horses to illustrate the intractability and polarity of the human psyche" (Jung, 1936/1990, p. 544).

We know that Freud (1920) borrowed and truncated Plato's image of the tri-partite psychic apparatus. The ego, the reality principle, the autonomous one in control, is the driver; the id is the pleasure principle, the basic drives seeking immediate gratification, and the super-ego, the ego ideal, authority, is the moral conscience. Which descriptive language do you prefer? Freud's I, It, and Over-I, or Plato's horse from good stock, beautiful, noble, handsome and the horse from opposite breeding? Or the charioteer as the movement toward the vision of True reality that has to be remembered? Plato's language is real language, which creates an experience of the tension, and clearly represents beauty and poetry that are missing in Freud's structural model.

When we in the Western world today discuss soul, we tend not to mean the divine soul, but "soul as a principle of life which shapes the body from within" (Pieper, 1962, p. 73). As Pieper explains, Plato expands on the image of the divine soul as the

> quality common to both the human soul and to God; spirituality . . . of *psyche*, of breath, *pneuma*, variations on the word breath. . . . We must, says Socrates, ponder *this* aspect of the divine as well as the human mind; otherwise we shall not understand the nature of Eros or the gift which man is destined to receive when he is in love. (p. 74)

Plato distinguishes between body and soul, and in analysis we tend to divide them as well. Feelings begin in the body. We experience feelings in the other's body, body language, universal facial expressions. We observe the other's body moving, but do we observe the movement of the soul or the mind of the other thinking? We know body unconsciously and directly but we communicate it through mind. Socrates is trying to help his interlocutor, Phaedrus, as Plato is his reader, to understand, to think about the body and soul, psyche. We know the words, soul/psyche in Greek, or breath, or anima (Latin). We know them as

breathing, in movement, living, animation, as expressions of energy, emotion, passion, vitality and life, our chariot moving through life.

Socrates believes the soul is immortal, always in motion, moves itself, cannot be destroyed, has neither birth nor death, continues from the remote past into the future forever, soars toward the heavens and helps govern the whole cosmos, the anima mundi, the world soul, the collective soul, until it loses a wing. Simply, the soul is not a substance which has the attribute of self-motion; no, the soul *is* self-motion.

In our imagination, with the patient before us, we open to the patient's depths. We know the person's soul is in movement and we grow to love his soul. What may seem "stuck" is always alive and changing. The same holds for my soul, my psyche, and our two psyches in motion, joining in the space between us.

Each of our mortal souls loses its wings and settles into an earthly body. Why does a soul lose its wings, or, to put it in recognizable language, why does a patient enter therapy? When we are in touch with the nobility of our soul, we see a larger, less self-referential reality. When we are mired in shame, ugly behavior, when evil has damaged us, when we perceive foul and disgusting behavior in others and when they treat us thusly, we lose our strength. Our wings, our potent carriers, shrink and disappear. We lose our wings and fall discouraged to earth because the black horse of desire can not be reigned in by reason and good thought. Often as patients in therapy, we arrive wingless, unprotected, unable to fly, imprisoned.

> More than any other part of the body the soul partakes of the divine nature which is beautiful, wise, good, and all such qualities. Nothing, certainly, contributes more than these to the nourishment and development of the soul's wing; while by their opposites, ugliness and

> evil, it is wasted away and destroyed. (246e, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956)

Eros drives the twelve gods, led in procession by Zeus[50] to a feast at the rim of heaven. The gods, with their evenly balanced team of horses have an easy time ascending the steep path to the top of the sphere of heaven. The human souls have a more arduous time, for their horses are ill-trained, inferior, unruly, even evil, and are pulled to earth when they encounter difficulty, toil, and struggle (247a, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956). Furthermore, our chariot drivers can be incompetent, and in the midst of the turmoil, our wings are quick to break. Our fate is precarious.

Feasting and Recollection of the Beyond

In contrast, what do the gods visualize beyond the rim of heaven? "Of that region beyond no one of our earthly poets has ever sung worthily, nor shall ever do so" (247c, Cobb, trans., 1993). Again, we are beyond the limits of language. The truth, Plato's theme, is that Reality lives beyond the heavens, is intangible, without shape or color, visible only to the soul's pilot, reason, intellect, mind, *nous*, the object of all true knowledge. *Nous* is the soul's pilot. Eros draws the intelligent souls, which use reason and mind to see the most beautiful sight known to man, beholding justice, self-control, and knowledge and wisdom in their essence, by which the souls are nourished. The gods behold "a being that really is what it is" (247d, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995), a Reality that is

---

[50] The ten gods who follow Zeus are Hera, Queen of the gods, protector of marriage; Poseidon, God of the sea; Demeter, Goddess of fertility, grain, and agriculture; Apollo, God of light, manly beauty, music, poetry, and order; Artemis,Goddess of the moon, forest, childbirth, and the hunt; Ares,God of war; Aphrodite, Goddess of love and beauty; Hermes, Messenger of the god and god of business; Athena, Goddess of wisdom and military victory; and Hephaestus,God of fire and the forge. Hestia, Goddess of home remains at the hearth to care for the home.

truly real Reality. We humans, of course, never attain a god's life, but we long for it nonetheless. We never reach the same heights, never behold what the gods see, and even if we are blessed, it appears only briefly in human or artistic form.

Through the telling of the tale, Socrates is persuading Phaedrus to go along for the ride, ascend to the heavens in our imagination and in our soul, not for any other purpose. The purpose of the story is to have Phaedrus, and the reader, see the transcendent Reality beyond ourselves. We are pulled upward toward the divine, to feast in the meadows beyond heaven's rim, for in those meadows there is the nourishment of beauty, good, and truth. The transcendent Reality is in the *hyperouranian,* which is a transliteration of the Greek word that means beyond the heavens.

The feasting takes place in the form of contemplation of the truth of God. One who seeks the truth, in true contemplation, cannot be harmed; his vision cannot be destroyed. The souls who most resemble and closely follow their god see reality but just barely. Some of the souls, says Socrates, have difficulty seeing above the rim as they are distracted by their horses, which trample and jostle. They are envious, try to outdo their neighbor with rivalry, competition and envy, have incompetent drivers, or their wings break. Plato reminds us that the human mind, the charioteer, is susceptible to weakness, temptation, degeneration, and downfall, as the mind, reason, is finite (Pieper, 1962). The ones who do not fully see Reality, when they return to earth, depend on illusion and their own opinions for nourishment (248 b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995).

The Decree of Destiny is that if a soul, which is a companion to a god, has seen any of Reality, it will remain safe until again it circles to the rim of heaven.

Only the soul that has seen a glimpse of Reality and has remembered will be able to enter a human body.

> The one who has seen the most Reality shall at birth be implanted into man who will become a lover of wisdom (a philosopher) or of beauty or who will be cultivated in the arts and prone to erotic love. (248d, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

Whoever lives a just life shall obtain a better fate, and those who have led an unjust one will obtain a worse lot, such as houses of correction beneath the earth.

The most alive and knowing elements in our psyche are those that have remembered that they have once followed a god, followed the gods beyond where they live, to vision beyond their heavens. Plato symbolizes a vision of Beyond the Cosmos, beyond the horizon. Psyche's mind is ascending in order to see what the gods see; our *nous* goes beyond the limits of our language. Our recollection keeps our yearning alive to see what was once glimpsed by the mind, the charioteer of the soul. This remembering, this yearning, points not only to the past but to something forward, greater than ourselves.

Plato has placed great emphasis on recollection, memory of what we once knew to be true. In analysis, in the way we usually understand memory, we too, especially in the early phases of therapy, rely on the memory of the patient. What is his earliest memory and what does that tell us now about this person? The patient often says he cannot remember, and dreams belie his thinking. He wants to know if what he thinks he remembers "counts" as much as what actually happened, and a Jungian analyst reminds the patient that his inner reality is as important as his outer reality; so, yes, what he thinks he remembers, the experience as he recalls it, true or false in actuality, does "count" as valid and

reliable. We try to bring the patient to a deeper, more knowing, reality while remembering that human knowledge is indeed limited.

The Fourth Divine Mania: Love of Wisdom

The philosophers' minds, those who followed Zeus, are able to grow back wings sooner than the 10,000 years that it takes the followers of the ten other gods. Why? The memory of heavenly beauty keeps the philosopher close to the divine. The follower of Zeus, the lover of wisdom, the soul who practices philosophy, whose pursuit of love involves the pursuit of wisdom with no ulterior motive

> is at the most perfect and highest level of initiation. . . . He stands outside human concerns, draws close to the divine and ordinary people rebuke him as disturbed, unaware that he is possessed by a god. . . . Now this takes me back to the whole point of my discussion, the fourth kind of madness. (249d, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans. 1995)

When someone lives as if he knows earthly beauty and is also reminded of true beauty, he sprouts wings and is eager to fly, but he cannot. He gazes upward like a bird, pays no attention to what is below and is called Mad. Since the soul is a winged being, it has the power to ascend, the power of Eros.

> This is the best and noblest of all forms that possession by a god can take for anyone who has it or is connected to it . . . and when someone is touched by this madness, and loves beauty, he is called a Lover (250a, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995).

Now we have come full circle, back to the fourth divine mania, back to possession by a god, ecstatic *enthousiasmos, theos* (God), *en* (within), the god within a person.

> Love reaches its apogee and attains its own potentialities only by awakening recollection, or rather, when it itself is recollection of something that exceeds any possibility of gratification in the finite realm. (Pieper, 1962, p. 81)

Socrates repeats himself to Phaedrus, and we know what the repetition signifies: pay attention to the process of recollection.

> As I have said, "nature requires that the soul of every human being has seen reality, otherwise, no soul could have entered this sort of living thing." (250a, 249b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

When Socrates tells Phaedrus that the whole story about the soul has actually been about the lover, about Eros, how does this make sense? Perhaps the self-motion of the soul, the very essence of the soul, is the movement of Eros, for Eros is also motion. In the *Symposium*, we found Eros as the drive for wholeness from a state of incompletion, and as the driving force to the ascension up the ladder of love toward Absolute Beauty. We have now learned that much comprises the movement of the soul: the horses, the driver who controls the horses and provides direction, but primarily the wings, which are allocated to both the horses and the driver. It is primarily the wings that provide the motion, and Socrates tells Phaedrus that Eros is the "winged one" and, therefore, is the soul in its self-motion (Hyland, 2008, p. 81).

In her lovely, literary treatise entitled *Eros, the Bittersweet*, Anne Carson (1986), poet, essayist and Professor of Classics, explores the wings of Eros. She describes how Plato re-imagines the traditional wings of Eros in that we are able to recover some of the original nourishment received when we gazed outside the rim of heaven.

Our souls' wings offer us the capacity to recover some of our lost memory. When we fall in love, succumb to the fourth divine madness, our souls' wings grow and, given the best of conditions, allow us to return to our beginnings. From the memory of the original reality of true beauty, as the original wings of our soul begin to grow again, it hurts. The soul feels "like a child whose teeth are

just starting to grow in, and its gums are all aching and itching" (251c, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995). Babies moan and wail as their teeth begin to grow, but this is also a beginning. Carson (1986) writes,

> When you fall in love you feel all sorts of sensations inside you, painful and pleasant at once; it is your wings sprouting. It is the beginning of what you mean to be. (p. 157)

For Socrates, Eros begins the moment of glimpsing the immortal beginning that is soul. It initiates potential.

The soul carries the memory of beauty, truth and wisdom, and transmits the memory from the heavens to the human; yet many souls have failed to remember what they once saw. Some only had a brief glimpse, some had bad luck when they fell to earth and were influenced by those who lead lives of injustice, and, therefore, they forgot the sacred objects, the holy vision they had seen before. It is our task as analysts to help them remember. Our work is to help the patient remember, a true recollection, a re-presenting of the vision of the divine that she once barely saw. Memory is within and without, immanent and transcendent. If the patient previously has not glimpsed the reality of God, perhaps the initiation into his own Eros, his own enthusiasm through connection with his analyst, will allow a moment of unbidden memory into his own potential, perhaps through an inductive process.

One way to help a patient remember is to remember who the patient is. We hold the person in mind and the holding abets a re-creation of their past and present. I had one patient who asked her mother, "What do you remember about me as a baby?" The mother responded, "Nothing." "What about as a young child?" "Not much." Needless to say, I have never forgotten the horror I felt at hearing about this hollow mother. Freud understood the importance of memory,

and we connect it to love. Freud (1923) acknowledged, "Living means the same as being loved" (p. 58). My patient lived on the cusp of life. In our work I held her in mind and maintained a steely memory of what would happen between us. This helped her recreate a memory and sense of herself her mother could not hold. Remembering is about the past but it is an action in the present; strengthening our wings through memory is active and alive.

Because of our difference from the gods humans have a cumbersome time remembering the partial glimpse of what they once saw. The gods have an easier time altogether, since they have no black horse, do not speak, and are pure *nous* (knowing):

> Since the gods' noetic visions of the beings are complete and unadulterated (they have no black horse to interfere with their visions), they have no need of logos . . . Logos is a peculiarly human phenomenon, which is to say, it is somehow a function of our mortality, the incompleteness of our noetic visions—or, one might say in anticipation, of our eros. (Hyland, 2008, p. 77)

In other words, human knowledge, unlike the knowledge of the gods, is finite. Failing to remember this, humans often place inexorable expectations on themselves to achieve and live a better life. Our path is difficult. Our recollections and memory are always compromised. We have a noetic, non-discursive, intuitive knowing sense, a beginning of a way to seeing what is beyond the heavens. An unbidden something happens to us that is beyond language. We try to explain it via speech and logos. Usually we are left feeling overwhelmed and incompetent, like our chariot drivers (Hyland, 2008, p. 77).

What happened to me, what happens to the lucky ones who fall in love, what happens when some patients behold their analyst (and vice versa) is that we are enlivened by the epiphany of an erotic shock of being. Socrates tells

Phaedrus (250b) that if one beholds true beauty, a beloved, and his or her memory is good enough to recollect Reality, one is now startled and amazed. When we discern an image of Goodness once seen in the *hyperouranian* place, the Plain of Truth, our perceptions are dim, we are beside ourselves, and have difficulty with self-control (*sophrosyne*). We fail to comprehend why this emotion overtakes us.

Along with the revelation and shuddering glimpse of the lover's experience of the divine, through catharsis or emotion that shatters one's core, when the doors to one's inner life are forever opened, we know we are mad. Thus the true lover receives a gift similar to that of the prophet and the poet, a gift not to be found in a book on the technique of loving. The true lovers, having remembered what they once saw, ravished by the sensuous sight of beauty, are forever changed. Forever changed, however, includes an initial state of being overcome, of unrest, helplessness, carried away by the sight of the beauty of the beloved.

Beauty and Eros

Those of us who followed the god Zeus are able to envision Beauty with our mind. Beauty is visual; we do not behold Justice or Self-control or Knowledge, and, therefore, these other virtues, these beings, do not carry the same power to overwhelm our very nature as does beauty. We were able to celebrate and be initiated in the

> blessed and spectacular vision and ushered into the mystery that we may rightly call the most blessed of all. And we who celebrated it were wholly perfect and free of all the troubles that awaited us in time to come, and we

> gazed in rapture at sacred revealed objects that were perfect, and simple, and unshakeable and blissful.[51] (250c, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

Our original vision of beauty was seen shining in pure light. Socrates gazes at Phaedrus' shining beauty and falls in love with his soul as they talk, just as we grow to love the psyche, the soul of our patients. Phaedrus, in Greek, means the shining one. Beauty, too, is seen in pure consciousness, because we were then pure, before embodiment, before our soul fell to earth and was unfortunately tarnished and defiled by the body and its desires. Again, since we cannot perceive wisdom through our sight, only beauty, the loveliest and most manifest of the beings, has the privilege to awaken an earthly love.

Memory is what enables us to see beauty, for beauty is a particular of the universal, unitary Beauty beyond the rim of heaven.

> It is necessary for a human being to acquire understanding of what is said according to forms, gathering together many perceptions into one through reasoning. This is a recollection (anamnesis) of those things which our soul once beheld when it traveled with a god, and lifting its vision above that which are now, rose up into what really is. For this reason, it is just that only the thinking of the philosopher will make his wings grow. . . . When a man uses correctly these reminders (memory) he is always initiated perfectly into perfect mysteries, and he alone becomes really perfect. (249c, Hyland, trans., p. 79)

This sensibility also enters into Jungian theory. We gather many perceptions into one, as the universal experience of Beauty or Love.

And how do we know the universal oneness of Beauty? By remembering our former insight into the beings when we once trailed our god. We know what we know through insight, intuition, and what cannot be explained, but might be accompanied by logos and thinking. For Socrates, it is the "occasional

---

[51] This is the language of initiation into the highest level of a mystery religion. The initiate is allowed to view the sacred objects, such as beauty, which are supposed to change his life; hence, the analogy to seeing our own truth in psychoanalysis.

experiences of insight into formal unity that make us as perfect as can be" (Hyland, 2008, p. 79). Beauty can never be reduced to a definition or to a thinking or logos and remains as non-discursive insight (Hyland).

Love and Lust

When we envision true Beauty, our wings begin to grow. For the wings to develop, we also need to relinquish previous ways of being, to learn, create, change, and adopt new ways. Some people do not gaze at beauty reverently but instead "surrender to pleasure . . . go after unnatural pleasure without a trace of fear or shame" (250e, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995). They yield to passion, lust, indiscriminate procreation, wantonness.

Another person who has seen much beyond the heavens, when she sees a godlike face or the bodily form of beauty, gazes with reverence and awe. A more recent initiate into the mystery of beauty, when he

> sees a godlike face or bodily form that has captured Beauty well, first he shudders and a fear comes over him like those he felt at the earlier time; then he gazes at him with the reverence due a god. (251a, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

This person, according to the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas (2004), has seen a trace of the face of God in the Other and does not want to defile the sacred Other by grabbing at him. Instead, as in analysis, one shows the deepest respect and love for the patient by caressing through words, kindness, attention, and presence.[52] The therapist, a caring person, passionately caring, might also feel passion, of course, in the sense of the Good Eros. Perhaps he is passionately attentive to the patient's feelings, and to his own reactions and responses. Plato

---

[52] To learn more about the caress versus the grasp see Levinas, *Totality and Infinity* (2004, p. 257).

now leads to the edge of a description of beauty and a sensual experience. He describes male and female sexual arousement (swelling and growing, moistening and softening).

> Once the shudder of awe and reverence has passed, his initial chill gives way to sweating and a high fever because the stream of beauty that pours into him through his eyes warms him up and waters the growth of his wings . . . and the shafts of his feathers begin to swell and grow. (251b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

The entire soul "throbs with excitement and a flood of particles flows from him" (Hyland, 2008, p. 83). When the lover is separated from his beloved, in longing and yearning, the wings fail to sprout because the openings where the wings were sprouting now dry up. The ensuing pain begins, drives the soul wild and the soul retains the memory of the object of beauty. We call this retaining of memory object constancy. From the ambiguity of a sexual experience and the soul's surrender to true beauty, the soul recovers its joy.

Again, we have felt erotically the knowledge of beauty in the one we love. Diotima has already reminded us that the experience of Eros begins with, but does not remain at, the level of the love of one body and opens us to transcendent possibility of Eros.

But if we remain in the erotic and genital sexuality of one body we are also obsessed and unable to move beyond our own self-preoccupation. The soul is confused, distraught, and, as in the *Song of Songs*, the soul can neither sleep at night nor be still by day. In obsessive thinking, the lover of the one beautiful body forgets all other early concerns.

> It forgets mother and brothers and friends entirely and does not care if it loses its wealth through neglect. And as for proper and decorous (acceptable) behavior, in which it used to take pride, the soul despises the whole business. Why, it is even willing to sleep like a slave, as near to the

> object of its longing as it is allowed to get! (252a, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

Socrates tells Phaedrus, "This is the experience we humans call Love" 252b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans.).

In love we are faced with losing ourselves in oblivion and passion, forgetting the insight into the beauty one's soul feasted on in the *hyperouranian* treasure land. In Jungian terminology, when one is in the complex of Eros, one experiences obsessive love. Because there is such power and energy in Eros, it is easy to forgo wisdom and "fall into" a complex. A way out of the complex, Plato might say, is to recover, recollect our possession by the benevolent god. Memory helps to bring one back to the source. Socrates finds true virtue in being possessed by god guiding the soul.

If the analyst views the state of possession in the patient as either unfortunate or resistant in some way, psychosis or inflation, the analyst might fail the patient. Something new might emerge for the patient with the diagnosis guided by the therapist's understanding of divine madness. The patient's "madness" is not acted upon or denied by the therapist. Instead he uses his therapeutic wisdom to move toward insight and knowledge, toward Eros as inspiration rather than the danger of vulgarity. Through the insight, attention, connection, and relationship gained in analysis, we move toward a personal individuation, as best we can, by not blindly living out an archetypal pattern of possessive Eros driven by the black horse.

Many analysts and therapists pathologize someone in a state of erotic madness, sometimes viewing it as addiction. It is important to remember the phenomenology. Is the patient's life hindered or enhanced by being erotically

possessed? Is she hurting anyone? Is she aware of her experience and where it is coming from, and does she maintain a sacred distance in observing it? Rather than fearing or judging the possessed person, do we approach her and enter into dialogue and abet her observing ego through curiosity and admiration?

Socrates again invokes *Nous* by quoting Homer and reminding us to use our minds to understand our madness: "Though mortal men call Eros winged Love, gods call him Pteros for he fathers wings" (252b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995). Again, memory redeems us. Pater is father; Eros fathers wings; God knows that Pteros, who is provoking the memory of the following of Zeus, is the paternal force, the father of the uplift, the creator of the ascent. Souls help us remember where we came from. And, again, as in psychotherapy, we learn of our origins.

Eros includes both the *pathos* (describable experience as Love) and the *aitia* (cause or reason, the aetiology as Pteros) of desire. The cause, the *aitia* of Eros is not clear but our felt experience, *pathos*, is. "We do our utmost to grasp the *pathos* of erotic experience as it soars through our lives, but the *aitia* folds itself away and disappears into the written words of Plato's text" (Carson, 1986, p. 164).

To continue with the text, Socrates tells us we react to the experience of Eros and Beauty according to the god our soul once followed. If we are lovers of wisdom we are drawn to a lover of wisdom to become our beloved.

> They take their inspiration from Zeus . . . and they pour it into the soul of the one they love in order to take on as much of their own god's qualities as possible . . . there is no envy or mean-spirited lack of generosity . . . and they seek one whose nature is like the god's . . . and this is any true lover's heart's desire. (253c, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

In the true penetration of one soul to the other, the therapist holds the patient's madness as no one has in the past. We try to use our fantasies and our own

madness to understand and take in the patient with the fullness of our hearts and rapt attention, as close to the other's experience as possible.

"Because of their long and concentrated vision of the god in the past, they need draw on their own resources and nothing else" (253a, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956). Psychoanalysis at best draws us inward to resources we did not know we had, or that were once damaged by neglect or abuse, or which will develop through our philosophic friendship, the mutual love of wisdom with our analyst. If one has an awareness of one's god, we become more conscious of our own behavior, and we are grateful to the beloved for what he or she is teaching us.

We believe the lover is the cause of our growth and we love him even more. There is mutuality in the re-finding of someone who in our imagination resembles our god. We remember the lover in a particular way, like our god, as far as we can, and he or she returns to us the affirmation that we are like him.

We are all too aware of the difficulty Eros bestows as we rein in the desire for sexual consummation, and exhibit the capability and restraint of a philosophical friendship. The metaphor of an analytic relationship as philosophical friendship is an easy transition. Socrates leads us into the battle between the black horse of desire and the white horse. The white horse is nobler, upright in frame, a lover of honor, modesty, temperance, decency, and self control. He needs no whip and is guided only by verbal commands (253d, Cobb, trans., 1993). He listens well, and he listens to reason, *nous.*

The dark, black horse is crooked; his eyes are bloodshot. He does not see clearly. He is insolent and deaf and pays little attention to the whip or spur. Can the unruly horse, lust, be transformed? Can lovers ruled by the black horse come

to truly know one another? Can true wisdom emerge if the black horse wins, even for a little bit of time? Yes, but if the black horse dominates most of the time, we will not find wisdom, but rather the abandonment of self. The good part of the bad horse brings us to our beloved through our first feelings of desire. In the best of therapies, the lust is able to transform through dialogue and consciousness.

It is hard work to control the black horse. When there is weakness in our chariot driver who fails to rein in the lustful horse, we are more likely to fall, to descend. When the black horse takes over, we are not following Zeus as a lover of wisdom, and we are offering bad therapy.

As Socrates attends to the great struggle and resistance of temptations for the lover of wisdom in entering a philosophical friendship, he evokes the feelings of this universal struggle. When the charioteer looks in the eyes of his beloved, his whole soul is filled with warmth and tingling and desire, and the obedient horse, always constrained and controlled, does not leap upon the beloved. The dark horse pays no heed to the whip or spur and wildly leaps forward, tries to force his driver and his mate to approach the beloved and suggest the pleasures of love (253-256e, Cobb, 1993,).

At first the driver and the good horse resist the dreadful and lawless thing but then because of the evil horse's insistence, they are dragged and forced toward the beloved. When they behold his radiant face, they are struck "as if by a bolt of lightning" (254b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans. 1995). This sight of the beloved on the sacred throne next to Temperance recalls the memory of the real nature and form of Beauty.

Now it has been humbled and follows the driver's instructions; when it

> catches sight of the beautiful, it is like to die of fear. So from this time on the soul of the lover may follow the beloved with reverence and awe. (254d, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956)

Our recognition and our intellect are invoked when we see our object of beauty, the beloved as the occasion for the memory of Real Beauty. When you fall in love, what is in that particular person you are reminded of, and what do you learn about yourself from that memory? Freud says we fall in love with our ego ideal, which has qualities of those we were attached to early in life. Jung is more likely to sound Platonic and refer to the selection process of our lovers from what has preexisted in our souls. Both Jung and Freud talk about overestimation and idealization. Plato is the first to refer to the lover's history as he describes "historical, genetic, developmental explanations of the attraction of earthly beauty and the selection of the beloved" (Santos, 1988, p. 71).

In therapy, we are involved in looking for the truth in each patient, as we try to help them use their minds in recollection. In regard to erotic obsessions, one must use one's mind, the inspiration of one's memory of the lover as a memory of the true beauty.

When the charioteer and his horses have pulled back, the good horse, in shame and sweat, drenches the whole soul while the bad horse, after recovering from its pain from the bit and fall, reviles, insults, accuses its mate and driver of cowardice and weakness. The bad horse does not give up easily. He is all desire, without reason, and again encourages the other two. He struggles, neighs, drags them on and forces them to again approach the beloved with the same proposal (254c-d, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, 1956). We have all had patients who do not give up in their wishes to seduce us, calling us weak or theory bound or uncaring

or uptight. Therapists also, in the height of lack of reason, use the same manipulative language on their seducible patients.

Again, the charioteer is struck with awe at the sight of his beloved.

> The charioteer . . . jerks back the bit even more violently than before from the teeth of the wanton horse, bespatters its malicious tongue and jaws with blood, forces its legs and haunches to the ground and causes it much pain. So when the bad horse has gone through the same experience again and again, it finally has enough of wantonness. (254e, Helmbold and Rabinowitz, trans., 1956)

The evil horse, now less insolent, has become obedient enough to follow the charioteer's warnings, and when it sees the beloved this time, and going forth in time, the soul of the lover may follow its beloved in amazement and devotion (254e, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, 1956). We see the charioteer does not have full control over the unruly horse. And here we have the repeated struggle of what does happen in analysis. The primitive horse, who needs to be reined in on both sides, is also informing the analytic relationship which is fulfilled at a spiritual level. The skill of the analyst in keeping the role of charioteer, instructing the patient, the beloved, in what needs to be a therapy of self control and reason, co-creates a good therapy in which the beloved receives help and wants to learn.

Socrates talks about the how the lover is slowly able to penetrate his beloved's soul.

> And because he is served with all the attentions due a god by a lover who is not pretending otherwise but is truly in the throes of love, and because he is by nature disposed to be a friend of the man who is serving him . . . as time goes forward he is brought by his ripening age and a sense of what must be . . . he allows his lover to talk and spend time with him, and the man's good will is close at hand, the boy is amazed by it as he realizes that all the friendship he has from his other friends and relatives put together is nothing compared to that of this friend who is inspired by a god. (255a-b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

The boy who loves the attention of the man could be a man or woman in love, both mutually enamored by the mirror of the other, or the patient and analyst, who change in the glow and caress of each other's eyes. The implications for psychoanalysis are large: The lover leads the beloved toward the love of wisdom, knowledge, and self-knowledge. And, as we watch the beloved influenced by the lover's attention, adoration, and love, we note the pleasure and mutual benefit for one another—hence, the mutuality of the analytic encounter. In a working analysis of mutual presence and commitment to truth, like in Socratess' palinode, we explore Love as a relation to truth and asceticism (*sophrosyne*, containment).

Socrates continues to describe the romance between lover and beloved and again we see how the beloved loses some of his defenses. Now he is infused with love, changes and grows and comes more to life. The softened beloved now welcomes the lover, takes pleasure in their conversations and is astonished by the lover's good will and intimacy

> Then the fountain of that stream which Zeus, when he was in love with Ganymede, called the "flood of passion," pours abundantly upon the lover . . . Just as wind or echo rebounds from smooth, hard surfaces and returns when it came, so the stream of beauty that flows back again into the beautiful beloved through his eyes, the natural inlet to the soul. There it comes and excites the soul . . . as in a mirror, in his lover he beholds himself and does not know it. (255c-d, Helmbold & Rabinowitz, trans., 1956)

Again we have the looking glass of the lover and the reflection of the beloved mirroring each other as the wings of their hearts and souls grow from their mutual emulation. Would that not be a satisfying analysis? But we know there is difficulty and burden. To repeat, the unruly horse of desire does not relent with ease. "The lover's undisciplined horse has a word to say to the

charioteer—that after all its sufferings it is entitled to a little fun" (256a, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995). We have all had this request—"just once, please, one time won't matter." But the good horse says "no" with thought and kindness. If the better part of reason and intelligence wins over the minds of both of them, they will have an orderly and philosophical life, with happiness, harmony, discipline and self-control. "They have subdued the source of evil and set free the source of goodness" (256b, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995).

It is only those who want a philosophic friendship that can resist the sexual temptations. Those who followed Aphrodite will probably not resist (Hyland, 2008, p. 86). If the pair cannot resist temptation, boundary violations in psychoanalysis and the damaged therapies of yesterday and today will prevail. We lose the ethic of the psychotherapy relationship, of our structure. If the charioteer sees what is really at stake, and controls the desirous horse, then the experience can be transformed from the possibility of vulgarity to the hope of virtuous living (Hyland, p. 86).

Plato goes beyond the body/mind duality and knows there is not an easy flow between the two. This is why he needs two horses, and both need to be engaged in the unit of the soul. Reality has both the good and the bad horses, part of the triangle of the human condition; all have soul and are a part of the world soul. The bad horse is attracted to something of beauty, and wants physical satisfaction—whatever he wants. Yet, by desiring what he finds beautiful, he is expressing the wants of the charioteer and the good horse. Everything has something of beauty, which needs to be educated, in the Platonic way. Without the education, because of the dominance of the bad horse or the

weakness of our reason, we abuse our object of love, which becomes an object of possession.

Eros Tyrannos

When the black horse rules, and the analyst is in a state of unrelated possession, Eros tyrannizes and is destructive to the patient. When there is no real interest in either the analyst or the patient for the other, the relationship is about power. At the beginning of this study, I described Eros as a cosmic force known to man, religion, humanity. In Hesiod's inspired story of the origin of everything, including the gods, Eros is a divine power and reality, a primal element, the power and source of all creativity and generativity. We have looked at other expressions of the use of this term Eros. These uses are not disconnected from the Hesiodian primal force, Eros, which therefore can be broken up into a rich spectrum that includes, as we have seen, the degenerative forms of Eros.

In *Symposium* we noted the tension of the birth of Eros between poverty and resourcefulness. The degenerative form of Eros follows from Poverty, the needy, acquisitive, deprived parent of Eros. And in *Phaedrus* we were familiarized with the destructive, evil, primitive, unruly, uncontrollable Eros in the metaphor of the black horse of desire. As I have stated, we need both parents of Eros and both horses of the soul.

In *The Republic,* Plato shows how the erotic movement can derail and deteriorate into Eros Tyrannos. The ruling part of the soul slumbers while the "beastly and wild part . . . gorged with food and drink . . . seeks to go and satisfy its dispositions . . . released from, and rid of, all shame and prudence" (571d, Bloom, trans., 1968). Plato understands that "love has, from old, been called a

tyrant" (573c, Bloom, trans.). Every man has the potential to become a tyrant. "Surely some terrible, savage, and lawless form of desire is in every man, even in some of us who seem to be ever so measured. And surely this becomes plain in dreams" (572b, Bloom, trans.). As Socrates asks his interlocutor in *The Republic*, I ask you: "Now reflect whether I seem to be saying something and whether you agree with me" (572c, Bloom, trans.).

The tyrant is mad but not divinely mad, for wisdom does not triumph. The tyrant allows "the lusts of his dreams to enter his waking life" (Voegelin, 2000, p. 126). The mad tyrant tries to rule over human beings, to possess them as the hungry tyrant eats up the other for his or her own pleasures.

How does my tyrant, my black horse of desire, dominate my reason as an analyst? When the tyrant invades my thoughts, I watch and try to understand them, acknowledge the truth of wanting what I want, thinking only of myself. I take in the destructive and alone side of myself and pay attention. I allow the needy side of Eros to dominate if I try to keep a patient in analysis when the patient wants to leave. I tell myself my wish for her to stay is because I love her, and it would harm her to lose my love. I would be shamefully trying to possess her, grasp at her because of love, but it would be love not governed by wisdom, love not chained to the good horse.

The path toward being the best analyst I can be is arduous because "the good and bad Eros lie close together in the soul" (Voegelin, 2000, p. 127). When one feels love, it is easy to fall into human mania and fail to be led by a benevolent god. She who is overcome by Eros Tyrannos, screams, "I want him! He's mine!" She is the possessive lover with nuclear power.

The Evil Urge

For a biblical equivalent of Eros Tyrannos, Martin Buber, from the Hebrew tradition, takes us back earlier in time to Ecclesiastes and the Talmudic tradition. Buber (1952) points to the ambivalent urges in man: good, *yetzer hatov*, and evil, *yetser hara*. "The two urges are set in opposition to each other. The Creator gives them to man as his two servants which, however, can only accomplish their service in genuine collaboration" (p. 94). In genuine collaboration with our patients and ourselves, we seek truth and mutuality.

As we know, even the denial of the evil urge may lead to its expression. Buber reminds us that this evil urge is necessary to the human for generativity, procreation and growth. "For without it, no man would woo no woman and beget no children" (Buber, 1952, p. 94). God has placed this ferment in the human soul, this "yeast in the dough...for without [it] the human dough does not rise" (p. 94).

Some are confused by whether the evil urge is caused by God or man. In Judaism, man is the culprit; "only through man did it become evil" (Buber, 1952, p. 95). We bear the responsibility not to separate the two urges and make an idol of the evil urge. "Man's task is not to extirpate the evil urge, but to reunite it with the good . . . as did Abraham, whose whole heart was found faithful before God" (p. 96).

When we are instructed to love God with all our heart, we are instructed to include both the good and evil urges, our "servants," both aspects of Eros. The evil urge is passion, which left unharnessed, leads men

> astray . . . the good urge as pure direction. . . . To unite the two urges implies: to equip the absolute potency of passion with the one direction

> that renders it capable of great love and of great service. Thus and not otherwise can man become whole. (Buber, 1952, p. 97)

Sonnet 129

To leap forward 2,000 years from the Hebrews and the Greeks, William Shakespeare has described Eros Tyrannos, lust in action, the black horse, the analyst out of control, in the 1609 edition of his Sonnet 129. Shakespeare knows the experience well and his poetic self-analysis alludes to his struggle to find the truth in balance. We might dream of indulging in the tyrannical side of Eros, in *yetzer hara*, but in reality we must let the charioteer dominate. Why choose Shakespeare to finish our discussion on Eros Tyrannos? Because he is a master of the conflict between dream and reality, the tension between them, and the language of the conflict. (Voegelin, 1981, p. 328).

> Th' expense of spirit in a waste of shame
> Is lust in action and till action, lust
> Is perjured, murderous, bloody full of blame,
> Savage extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust
> Enjoy'd no sooner but despised straight,
> Past reason hunted, and no sooner had
> Past reason hated as a swallowed bait,
> On purpose laid to make the taker mad.
> Mad in pursuit and in possession so,
> Had, having, and in quest, to have extreme,
> A bliss in proof and proved a very woe
> Before a joy proposed behind a dream
> All this the world well knows yet none knows well
> To shun the heaven that leads men to this hell.
> (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 132)

"The expense of spirit," spirit as semen, human essentials, male sexual passion, discharge of sperm, unsettles us as the sonnet begins. Is it an expense or freely given? There is a waste, a madness, a price we pay. We enter into pondering incredible contradictions, an art form of contradictions, the absurdity of the human experience of passion, the shameful spurting out of one's powers,

and madness. Shakespeare does not resolve, but expresses the quandary and dilemma.

We are lured into ironic word plays, verbal conventions, a containment for the poet's vision of passion and desire, his madness and anger: expense and waste; hunted then hated; pursuit and possession; through the extreme stages backwards, had, having, in quest; bliss and woe; well one knows and none knows well; heaven and hell. We have here the phenomenology of lust in action, and it is not pretty whatever we call it, whether the exaggeration of self or lustful power or an aggressive libido (Voegelin, 1981, p. 328).

Therapists are taught not to act in lust, the expense of spirit, the tension in lust, to avoid the extreme of shame, to know of shared madness but to leave it in the patient. Lust takes one over, becomes a madness that promises bliss, joy, a dream, then hands you Hell. The mad lover wants to possess his object and as soon as the lust is acted out, he despises the beloved (or himself). He hunted for his prey; before and after the hunt, he hates the bait he swallowed, the possessed other. He could not find a true beloved for he swallowed the object of his own lust, his catch.

The person in lust is humanly mad, not divinely mad. His bliss becomes a problem. He imagines his object tried to make him mad. He wants to make his victim mad, as he is. His prey has enough reason and consciousness to sense the extreme imbalance.

Shakespeare's 14 lines turn around finding the balance between madness (extreme, shame, possession, mad, savage, not to trust, despised, blame) and Reason, represented by Shakespeare as rhetorical contradictions. The tensions in the extreme become a woe to the dreamer imagining his joy. Beyond reason, the

conflicts, the irrationals will not allow him to sustain the lust in balance. In balance, discernment, distance, a long distance from the heart to the genitals, the therapist steps back and examines feelings. In the clear and truthful examination of his erotic passion, in not abandoning his reason to the swamp of possessive pursuit, he can be trusted. Shakespeare, too, has a distance from the reality of lust as he is able to describe it in all its ambiguity.

We know not to give into this extreme of Eros, the black horse set free to do what it wants, an Eros that continues to lead man to Hell. The tyrant is going to keep acting out his or her dream of passionate possession of the other. The heaven of passion, the dream heaven, continues its irresistibility. We all pass through the extreme of attempting to rid ourselves of the savage parts, reason hated. But reason is the wisdom of knowing the two parts, the two urges, of balancing the two horses, which continues to be precarious. When caught unbalanced in love, we learn about love in spite of ourselves.

Why I Think the *Symposium* Needs *Phaedrus*

Eros Tyrannos appears in *Phaedrus* when the unruly primitive horse of desire does not obey reason and makes unwanted sexual advances toward his object of both physical attraction and beauty of human form. In *Phaedrus* we are told that passionate sexuality is a part of the human soul. In *Symposium*, the waters are calmer. Even though we are reminded there that Eros is both human and divine, the human aspect of Eros in *Symposium* does not include the frenzied intensity and irrationality that we find in *Phaedrus*' Eros. We could surmise that perhaps Plato noted the absence of this passionate Eros in *Symposium*, where he focused more on the desire for the good, immortality, creativity, generativity and

absolute beauty. We know the irrationality and turbulence he adds to our knowledge of Eros in *Phaedrus* is part of the whole of Love. Plato also describes the psychological motivation behind the lover's choices and selections and we receive a fuller analysis of more nuanced responses to beauty (Santos, 1988, p. 58).

Phaedrus contributes more insight for the psychotherapist into the psychology of love; the particulars of love as Eros remain at a more interpersonal level. In *Symposium*, we are carried up the ladder toward virtuous living, but *Phaedrus* adds the struggle involved in both leading a virtuous life and embracing a philosophical friendship. In the study of human behavior we find images of conflict and the fight for control. For example, whether the erotic component in love and beauty will be experienced and known, neither repressed nor concretized, is an inherent conflict presented in the *Phaedrus*. When there is balance between primitive desire and our identification with the governing god, we approach our relationship with our beloved from a noble, related place. If we link *Symposium* with *Phaedrus*, we are carried through the widest spectrum, the order of, the ascent and descent of love: tenderness, love, sexuality, desire, passion, lust. With the guides of psychology and philosophy we hope to locate our own place on the ascending plane, or at least balanced, in the spectrum. Meditating on Plato reminds us of the challenging work we as therapists require to be in the ascending movement of both climbing the ladder and riding in our chariots.

CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT, DISCUSSION AND CONCUSION

Summary of Argument

There are dimensions of Eros that have been diminished or contracted for various reasons in our field of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis has focused on Eros as attached to an object and has neglected its more general cosmological force and power. Eros has been feared and interpreted away by many modern psychoanalysts. Although love is commonly thought to be needed to "cure" the patient, analysts have tended to avoid, deny, and deflect intense love toward or from their patients. I have added to existing theories of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy by applying ancient and current wisdom from Biblical and Platonic texts, the disciplines of theology and philosophy, to inform the clinical practice of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. In particular, I have brought the visions of love in the *Song of Songs* and Eros in Plato into the therapeutic setting to inform an analytic way of feeling, thinking and being, bridging ancient philosophical and religious wisdom traditions with modern psychoanalytic thinking, understanding that in the evolution of psychoanalytic thinking, the two are already implicitly bridged.

In addition, I have addressed a puzzling and contradictory finding in relatively early psychoanalytic thinking of the 1920s in which Freud professes to be following Plato. Freud, in his model of love seeking an original wholeness, thought he was using Plato. I have demonstrated that he was addressing only a particular, partial aspect of Plato's imagery, and that he, therefore, used only a very small part of Plato's vision of Eros. I noted how Freud and Jung paid

attention to different aspects of the same Platonic dialogue, *Symposium*, and the implications of these partial understandings for the development of psychoanalytic theory. I have examined contradictory findings in Freud and Jung on the aetiology of love and have broadened and deepened our understanding of Eros through a deep, thorough, and meditative concentration on what Plato actually said in his erotic dialogues.

My method has honored the original meaning of *theoria* (theory) in Greek philosophy, mainly by the major figures of Plato and Aristotle—that is, a vision of truth or reality that one comes to by hard work, study, speculation and meditation/contemplation.

Discussion

The scope of the discussion will include: how Jung's and Bion's use of Platonic concepts substantiate my argument in favor a cosmological Eros as ground for psychoanalysis; Jung's often neglected idea of pure psychic energy as well as Plato's vision of *therapeia* (therapy); substantiation of my argument from the work of David Tresan; and I will include a clinical example illustrating how Plato's *therapeia* deepens what we have known from Freud and Jung since 1895.

Platonic Template for Analysis

As in *Song of Songs*, as in the dialogue between Phaedrus and Socrates, and as in a good analytic relationship, we cannot avoid erotic desire. Erotic desire is omnipresent. The tension in desire creates the texture, the propeller, the movement of our work.

In a hierarchical analytic relationship, one between the knower and the known, or the observer and the observed, the analyst hides his secret knowledge

(such as splitting or internalized objects) and interpretively inserts them to prove his truth. In an analytic relationship based on mutuality in knowing of mind and feelings, we recognize Plato's attempt, like Freud's and Jung's, to bring intellect and reason to feelings, to bring *Nous* to help integrate the person. Jung's concept of both patient and analyst in a process of separate and combined individuation is one based on mutuality.

For Plato, Reality is in the *eidos*, the forms, ideas, which are the ground of true knowledge and basis of all philosophical discourse (Cantlie, 1993, p. 224). When one's soul has been nourished by the feast of the *eidos*, Truth, the ability to see above the rim of heaven, we are reminded of Bion's O. O, Ultimate Truth, intangible, formless Reality, visible only to the mind, to *Nous*, the object of all true knowledge. O, like the intangible and formless, is not symbolizable. Bion (1965), from Plato, reminds us that beautiful objects are important, not only because of their beauty, but because they remind us of a beauty that once was but is no longer known (p. 138). In analysis, we might seek the reminder of that beauty and of O through our connection to our analyst. O can be known about but not known, thought about but not thought, but can *become*. The analyst's task is to become at one with the patient's O, but like the glimpse beyond the heavens, that at-one-ment will only be in moments. [53]We become close to apprehending O, the unity of subject and object, through intuition (Bion, 1995, p. 26).

---

[53]In *A Beam of Intense Darkness, Wilfred Bion's Legacy to Psychoanalysis*, James Grotstein (2007) says that Bion, in a personal communication, used the word "become" as Plato meant it: "That which is always becoming, becoming as never completed; it is always evolving" (p. 43), which is similar to Jung's individuation model.

Socrates' teaching Phaedrus about love is analagous to the experience of analyst with the patient. The analytic seeking of truth is symbolic of the chariot's ascent; the mental strivings of the patient are the food and nourishment above the heavens, and the growth of the wings of the soul is akin to our growth through the analytic relationship. Truth is nourishment (and lies are poison) (Bion, 1995, p. 102).

The poet Plato draws us into a dialogue of reason, temperance and lust, into the ride of the three, engaging in our own memory, into the image of a pulsating cosmic soul, the pulsating psyche. If we have a Platonic template in mind, when a patient falls in love, we know that love is greater than the beloved and that love might take us beyond the beloved to a higher consciousness, to God. We try to help the patient live in a metaphor of formative moments, forgotten glimpses of the divine nourishment of an earlier ascent or descent, to realize that a larger love has been awakened.

The insights gleaned from Socrates' palinode and in the speeches in *Symposium* are parallel, associated to, similar to, but not the same as the insights that come from a Jungian understanding of the psyche. In my imagination, I translate these insights into Jungian terms: when we recall what we saw above the "'supra-celestial place' where the 'Ideas' of all things are stored up" (Jung, 1946/1954, p. 326) we discover where Jung finds his theory of archetypes. Jung clearly connects his idea of archetypes with Plato's Forms (*eidola*):

> Universal dispositions of the mind . . . are to be understood as analagous to Plato's forms, in accordance with which the mind organizes its contents. . . . In the case of our 'forms' we are not dealing with categories of reason but with categories of the *imagination*. As the products of the imagination are always in essence visual, their forms must, from the outset, have the character of images and moreover typical images, which

> is why, following St. Augustine, I call them 'archetypes'. (Jung, 1939/1958, p. 518)

And the gods represent anthropomorphic embodiments of the archetypes. The ultimate chariot driver is Zeus who seeks the highest wisdom and goodness, what Jung might call a path of individuation, a relation to life that is informed by a correspondence with the Self, the nature of which is wisdom and wholeness. A difference between Plato and Jung is that Jung ascribes the early imagos, the archetypes and the Self, images that most likely he has learned from Plato, to the unconscious. Plato is talking about a metaphorical statement which is not from the unconscious but from something much larger than psyche—something infinite. Plato is describing experiences he and others have known, guiding others who have had similar experiences.

Plato helps Jung in his creation of complex theory insofar as the Ideas or Forms are the archetypes, and archetypes are at the core of complexes. If we are relatively free of complexes, we circle at a higher level of vision of objectivity and reality, where our vision circumabulates everything. At a lower level of awareness and insight, when our observing ego is surrounded by darkness or descending, we are more in the grip of a complex.

Another analogy to Jungian theory is the concept of Fate as determined by our attachment to the image of the god we once followed.

> There are present in every psyche forms which are unconscious but nevertheless active—living dispositions, ideas in the Platonic sense, that preform and continually influence our thoughts and feelings and actions. (Jung, 1959, p. 79)

And, were Jung to have described his notion of an archetypal transference in reference to Plato's *Phaedrus*, which he did not, we might say that the god in the patient is projected onto the analyst. The projection of potentialities of the Self, or

self-objects, are projected onto the analyst in a most compelling, influential, and immediate connection. When the patient finds his or her own god in the person of the analyst, the patient's own potentiality, not yet realized, has the possibility of developing. With the realization of this projection comes the struggle to find one's own relationship to one's own essence. The analyst must be aware of and somewhat comfortable when in the grips of an archetypal projection. In receiving such an abundance of Eros, both patient and analyst hope to slowly melt their defenses. As each is able to live more comfortably with intense affect, and appreciate it for its divine nature, the therapy, the combined meeting of Eros and *Nous* is able to work.

Unbounded Eros

Psyche is a larger reality than the psyche in the room between analyst and patient, just as huge, important things like Eros are also much larger and cannot be squeezed into ethics or fears of boundary violations. In following the history of the huge Eros, originally evoking an originary power at the beginning of time, we find the relationship between things larger than the individual and his libido. As Jung intimated, the cosmos was the organizing principle before the psyche became our organizer. The history of Eros, which gives rise to a spectrum of meanings, enters into all levels of human experience, including what Hesiod is describing. Eros has an effect on the mind and the will, and, as we know, by working through the body, the power starts permeating all of human understanding and activity.

Tresan (2004b) in his exploration of the "This New Science of Ours: A

More or Less Systematic History of Consciousness and Transcendence, Part 2," helps us understand how Jung attempted to broaden our concept of Eros from Freudian libido, connected to an object, to the Hesiodian concept of Eros. In Jung's (1961) autobiography *Memories, Dreams and Reflections*, toward the end of his life, he tells his interlocutor, Aniela Jaffé, that

> Eros is a *kosmogonos* (cosmological), a creator and father-mother of all higher consciousness. I sometimes feel that Paul's words—"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love"—might well be the first condition of all cognition and the quintessence of divinity itself. . . . Whatever one can say, no words express the whole. . . . Love "bears all things" and "endures all things" (I Cor. 13:7). These words say all there is to say. . . . For we are in the deepest sense the victims and the instruments of cosmogonic "love." . . . I use the word as something superior to the individual, a unified and undivided whole. (Man) is always caught up by it and enclosed within it. . . . He is dependent upon it and is sustained by it. (p. 353-4)

Thirty-five years earlier, in 1928, Jung acknowledged that his concept of pure psychic energy is more than psychological, rather a metaphysical concept akin to pure spirit. According to Tresan (2004a), Jung's "avowal was so unscientific that Jung never repeats it elsewhere" (p. 373). Because Jung avoided metaphysical concepts, it may be difficult for the trained analytical psychologist to imagine what lies at the top of love's ladder, above the rim of heaven, or in the space between the lovers in the *Song of Songs*, where Eros is the guide toward transcendence and states not translatable into words of conventional scientific language.

In the *Psychology of the Unconscious*, Jung postulated a theory of pure psychic energy, not attached to an object, a concept unprecedented in the young history of psychoanalysis (Tresan, 2004a, p. 199). Jung (1916/1991) calls upon the meaning of Hesiod's and Plato's Eros as an example of free psychic energy. Here

we have the foundation, rarely referred to by other psychologists, of Eros as libido, but libido not subsumed under the instincts (Tresan, p. 200).

Tresan traces Jung's concept of free psychic energy through Jung's 1928 paper, "On Psychic Energy," and I use Tresan's synthesis of Jung to substantiate my argument regarding Eros without boundaries. Jung writes that free psychic energy is divided—part is used for work in the world and part is excess energy. Man always has an excess of libido (free psychic energy) and this excess leads to the religious question which Jung links to primal unity and God. "I think it is Jung's inexorable religious instinct that has him ever pulling towards the ineffable" (Tresan, 2004a, p 203). Free psychic energy provides a "state of expectancy," (Jung, 1928/1948, p. 46), an aliveness, a staying in the tension of existence, a state where man is able to live without certainty, with an openness to what could be, an expectancy of what might happen to and in the unknown.

Allowing, not freezing out, Eros in our clinical spaces, maintaining a balance of emotion and reason, Eros and *Nous*, in the absence of static rules of technique or theory: this is an example of what Jung means—but is not explicit about—by a state of expectancy. Were Jung to have developed further his thinking about free psychic energy and living in expectancy, he might have realized that this was the phenomenological object of the best and truest scientific investigation: faith, hope and love, words that mean little without the actual experience.

"Expectancy" is the acute awareness we can have, the sense that we are seeing a glimmer of something richly worth knowing, perhaps a guide toward transcendence. Is not then expectancy a way of expressing what faith, hope, and love actually are, that is, the already always present gift to which we are

responding—and more, much more, which makes it not only possible but imperative that we do respond?

Rationality is dead and dry if it is not enlivened by this expectancy of love (Eros), hope and faith. That is why *Nous* and Eros are inseparable in Plato's ascent to the beauty of the divine in the *Phaedrus*. The "driver" in the chariot of Psyche is *Nous* and what is "driving" it is noetically ordered Eros. If Eros were only free floating, it could become Eros Tyrannos.

There is a parallel ascent in the soul's noetic climb up the ladder of the erotic in-between to immortalizing Beauty and Truth in the *Symposium*. Jung, despite his insistence on symbols and real objects, could see and know that free psychic energy was not "a rational affair," says Tresan. "There is good reason why Plato identifies the god Eros as the patron of such activity" (Tresan, 2004a, p. 206; *Symposium*, 210ff). In the *Symposium*, the author is trying to draw the reader into this dimension of Eros, to see and know himself to be in the in-between of the irrational and the rational, where he is then to be guided by the rational, by reason, ultimately to reach wisdom.

Without expectancy what could our learning and understanding, our *Nous*, ever gain? Indeed, why would ever we want to enter into the life of knowing? Some kind of faith, hope, and love has to be moving us.

As I have tried to demonstrate through the *Song of Songs*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedrus*, cosmological Eros, the huge Eros, can show itself, beginning with an erotic attachment; from being in the attachment we can be led beyond the individual to Pure Beauty and Divine Truth.

Jung's use of pure psychic energy adds to my argument for the understanding of the large reality of Eros in the clinical setting, rather than the

narrow sexual and instinctual, a narrowness which leaves us in fear of disobeying our boundary rules. According to Tresan (2004a),

> The ultimate source of a free energy is, of course, God in whatever tradition or by whatever name, immanent or transcendent. It is the source of the quickening power at the core of us, of the *élan vital*, the *vie vivre*, of all vitality, of all energy. As such, in speaking of God in whatever garb, we are dealing with the *realissimum* or what is most real, the consideration and contemplation of which conjures up the most comprehensive questions concerning human life. In approaching the source of all energy, we encounter the boundaries of the human condition, the line that runs between what we can and can't know about the world, ourselves, and the origin and laws of the universe. (p. 205)

What Tresan is describing is science in its fullest sense, with its proper humility before the unknown, the potential boundaries of human experience, the tension of existence, the state of expectancy.

Pure psychic energy is formless, free floating, unbounded, with which one might be able to reach closer to the mysteries of the universe. Jung opened up the concept. Freud did not. According to Tresan, Jung did not follow through, but stayed a "scientific" distance away from including his own experience in his study. It is unfortunate in the development of psychoanalytic thought that Jung touched on excess energy and then left it behind. My study continues from Jung in its exploration of Eros as a heightened experience, one shape of excess energy, in an attitude of humility toward the ineffable.

> In an unguarded moment in 'The Psychology of the Unconscious,' Jung waxes particularly ecstatic. He speaks for the first and last time of '*real transference*' (1991, p. 65; Jung's italics) 'absolutely necessary for the efficacy of the miracle of redemption.' And what is '*real transference*', says Jung, but the love of Christ as template for the love of man for man. (Tresan, 2004a, p. 206)

This is transference as surrender to faith, not a Freudian notion of transference as projection, distortion, or object transfer. At this one place in his writings, Jung (1916/1991) finds a larger use of transference, far beyond the

person, in a cosmology—even a theology—and indeed writes of transference as mutual love, the deepest of loves between man and God. He says, "God is Love, corresponding to the platonic Eros, which unites humanity with the transcendental" (p. 65). And, here we have succinctly put my major argument: Eros infuses the analytic field, and if we surrender, allow and open to the Platonic Eros, we are more likely to form a unity, a *conjunctio*, perhaps only momentarily, with the divine, or in Jung's words, "humanity" (man) with the "transcendental" (God).

Perhaps my study, this exploration of the mystery of unbounded Eros, which has included some personal exegesis and a hint of what lies beyond the boundaries of psychic reality, will unfold future conversations and research into how the passion of Eros might open us to transcendence, both together or apart, on our analytic journeys.

Therapy, Therapeia

I use Plato's *Therapeia* in this study in order to broaden our concept of what we mean by Therapy. We have learned that our knowledge of therapy, based on Jung and Freud, lies at the tip of the knowledge we could employ in our wish to understand the souls of our patients. Were the modern therapist schooled in a classical education in the humanities, philosophy, history, literature and art, she would likely be familiar with Plato.

Plato draws us into his concept of therapy. He describes therapy as resolving contradictory wills, through education, particularly through Socratic dialogue, *elenchos,* a dialogical questioning, dialectic as honest inquiry. It aims to stimulate a hunger for knowledge.

The nature of our will is inherently contradictory. There is essential discord and conflict within the soul, sensuous desires warring with rationality. In the *Symposium*, Diotima tells Socrates that man strives for the good. In *Phaedrus*, man desires to seek love of wisdom and knowledge, *nous*, intellect and reason. While we seek the good, the best choice we can make, the love of self-knowledge and of wisdom, or through proper education, an acquired judgment to pursue what is best, we are born with an inherent desire for pleasure that can become Eros Tyrannos.

Platonic therapy and education aim at relieving men's blindness and encourage "the emancipation of this primal affection (eros) in which the hope of education depends, beyond the contributions of the sciences" (Cushman, 2002, p. 187).[54] Plato, like the modern therapist, envisions his *Therapeia* as a remedy for the plight of man, a way out of the misery of his self-contradictory existence, an education to cope, a preparation for the soul, and a contribution to the polis (Cushman).

My contention is that today's therapeutic language is similar to but not as encompassing or profound as Plato's. We help man's blindness through in-sight. We deal with the essential conflicts of the psyche: aggression and passivity; desire and lack of libido; control and submission; merger and separation; love and hate, to name a few. We seek wisdom in self and other, reason over ignorance, and are learning that love promotes knowledge.

People in our field of psychotherapy tend not to be familiar with the Platonic philosophic *Therapeia*. It was never presented to me in my education in

---

[54] This is an important book that concentrates on Plato's works, the Socratic work as therapy. Robert Cushman chose Plato's own word for the title of his book, *Therapeia*.

psychology or psychoanalysis nor have I found a clinical literature that speaks of it. Yet, it should be the ground for a therapist's formation.

Perhaps a brief clinical example can extend my discourse. A male patient in his thirties found it very disturbing to have fallen in love with his female analyst in her sixties. He had an erotic crush on her but felt foolish, insecure, unwise, and lost in fantasies similar to those of the black horse when he perceived his sensuous object of beauty. Of course my patient and I looked at the usual possibilities: was I being tested; are his feelings also an ennactment of earlier incestuous fantasies?

I have written that welcoming the Eros in one's self and the patient is imperative for healing. How does it feel for the analyst when the patient professes love, physical desire, and perhaps is even masturbating to fantasies about her? Does the analyst feel numb, annoyed, intruded upon, pulled back? In the case of this young man, who had been coming twice a week for about two years, who now wanted me as his love object, I felt flattered, mildly surprised, even reassured that the therapy was doing what it needed to do.

I also felt somewhat anxious about the intensity of feeling in the room. Both the patient and the analyst have to be vulnerable enough to know they are afraid. Were he to ask if we could hug at the end of the session, might I say, "Yes," when I knew it was important to show restraint, use reason and discuss the meaning of our touching? The warring conflict inside me, between sense and sensuality, abated as we talked and used symbols for our desire. He very much wanted to hug, to touch, and we agreed to shake hands when he left the session. I asked him what he wanted of me and he replied, "That you love me, admire me, find me attractive and desire me, too."

When there is a deep erotic connection between therapist and patient, the therapist must be able to go to the depths in herself, change who she thought she was. Toward my inner depths I plunged with his question. Do I desire him? Is it harmful to tell him if I do? Will he tell people and hurt my reputation or license? Did I want to possess him? To that I could answer "No," and I was relieved. Eros Tyrannos is the wish to possess, and in this example, I could honestly answer, "No, I do not." With other patients, I have had years of struggle and wrestling with my soul's two horses. But, in this case, I was safe; the field was wide open for truth and the good. Before I answered if I desired him, we talked about the difference between a real love object and a safe love object. He thought about it and admitted it was better to have me as a safe love object than a real one, for he felt fragile and alone and easily hurt by women in the real world outside our sessions. I am truncating months of talking around this subject and oversimplifying a complex and meaningful dialogue between us. We had our own *elenchos*, our own questioning and puzzling over how to come together with non-physical Eros. I did tell him I was attracted to him, and we would never act on it. He was relieved. His dreams brought us to a younger self with a mother he wanted to bring to life, to vitalize with his spirit. But it was not the telling of my feelings that made the difference for us. It was his experience, his knowing of the feelings, his seeing me see him as a sensual object of beauty, the glimpse of what I had recollected from my ascent above the abode of the gods.

Because of my patient's withholding mother, it was not until he could experience Eros in the room, until his need for adoration, "the emancipation of this primal affection (eros)," could be experienced that our therapy could proceed. What was unleashed in the relationship anchored and grounded him.

The early level of experience with the mother should be intense, without boundary, and cannot be later satisfied by an intellectual conversation. Eros had to be present for the break in his fixation to his mother to occur at that time in his life. He could not move forward without an analytic anchor.

We are still working together, and my refusal combined with our honesty slowly helped him find an appropriate contemporary woman he could hug and make love to. We now have a container and trust that has brought another lover of his into our room. Finding in me the recollection of what he had once glimpsed of truth and beauty helped carry his passion beyond me to further passions for himself, other loves, his work, his mind and spirit. This young man allowed himself to live in a state of expectancy, knowing not where he was going, but fully responding to his experience in the moment, perhaps, whether consciously or unconsciously, moved by faith, hope and love.

Like Plato's seeking beauty and wisdom through ascent and reason, with my chariot driver as guide, I was able to enlist his chariot driver to stay the course and pay attention to what is larger than the two of us. Through allowing the bad horse some room for play, pleasure, and inquiry, through not moralizing about the good horse, through the love of the knowledge we were both gaining—an education of the soul's primacy and movement—and through living with the tension between the two horses, both of our chariot drivers were trotting in the hard work of trying to repair wings, move out of self preoccupation, and discover a generosity inside.

Of course it was necessary that I had read and meditated on Plato's two erotic dialogues and had the image of love's ladder and nourishment above the heavens. I imagined that this patient and I had once followed the same god

(Zeus) as we both sought wisdom and temperance. Plato's therapy, his education, is man reconciling with himself. The struggle is for self-control, good sense, clear headedness, being in your right mind. As Socrates told Phaedrus, we, too, need to remember.

> Each of us is ruled by two principles which we follow wherever they lead; one is our inborn desire for pleasures, the other is our acquired judgment that pursues what is best . . . there are times when they quarrel inside us, then sometimes one of them gains control, sometimes the other. Now when judgment (*do*xa) is in control, and leads us by reasoning toward what is best, that sort of self control is called "being in your right mind"; but when desire takes command in us and drags us without reasoning toward pleasure, then its command it knows is "outrageousness" or hubris. (237e, Nehamas & Woodruff, trans., 1995)

I paid attention to my judgment, capacity for reflection and the weighing of alternatives. I knew the Eros in the room was a force greater than the two of us, and that our mutual yearning was a recollection of an essential beauty once seen. In my welcoming the passion of Eros, my patient was slowly able to welcome his own. When he first brought up his intense desire, I remember saying, "I am glad you can tell me about it. We welcome it into this room. We will respect it and show it kindness." I did not want to freeze, destructively impinge on the process, or quench the fire.

I have a deep appreciation for Plato's understanding of passion as inherent in the life of wisdom, that the rational man is also a lover, that "uninspired by love, no man can partake of wisdom" (Cushman, 2002, p. 190, 2002). Socrates created a unique method of inquiry and reflection "to lift the knowledge we already possess into consciousness" (Cushman, p. 7). When a patient or I feel a sexual Eros, I also remind myself, "Use your reason; the metaphysical Eros is always present." My desire is not imprisoned but, instead, leads to an openness of what could be. I am now able to think of my sensual

desire for a patient with a new logos, a pure psychic energy I can bring toward God.

I ask myself, "Why wouldn't an analyst fall in love with a patient?" Often the patient has values and qualities I admire, such as a self-reflective capacity, humor, intelligence, vulnerability; sometimes he or she is beautiful to look at, adorable, sexual. A genuine love occurs alongside the self-object needs of an analyst, or the narcissistic needs, whatever one wants to call them, of being adored, admired, loved, seen—these universal needs are realized in a deep relationship.

When the patient is engaged in the movement of divine madness, and the analyst is a way station toward the love of wisdom, it is difficult not to feel special and grandiose. When I remind myself of the aetiology of divine madness, it is harder for my ego to swell, to attach to the projection. I want to remain in humility.

Most likely we have all had erotic feelings toward our patients. Often a patient does not feel sexually adequate or loveable, and when I feel erotic toward this person, man or woman, my mirror provides possibility and hope. If I do not fall in love with the patient, unfortunately the patient receives less.

Many times in four decades, I have had erotic feelings toward patients, with accompanying anxiety, obsessive thinking, longing. These feelings, like all feelings, change and pass through. Nothing horrible has ever happened to me because of these feelings—only symptoms such as headaches, sleeplessness, discomfort, sadness.

I now can invoke Plato and the *Song of Songs*, invite the divine energy, the third, the guest, the spark into the room, and the patient and I swim together in

these erotic waters of physical beauty grounded in the body, holding the tension of body and spirit.

Many depth psychotherapists have moved away from using techniques in their relationships with patients. We are encouraged to be as present to the moment as possible without the armor of planned intervention, interpretations as weapons, a direction or planned goal for the work. Plato also does not offer a technique, but a possibility for the deepest meaning of love:

> In erotic emotion purely received and maintained, and perhaps in no other way, man can catch a glimpse of that promise which aims at a satiation affording deeper happiness than any gratification of the senses. (Pieper, 1962, p. 87)

Like Goethe, who says, "Beauty is not so much performance as promise" (as cited in Pieper, p. 85), we remember that when we behold beauty in our offices, and obviously not just physical beauty, we welcome Eros. When we are not content or particularly satisfied, but restless, in a state of promise and expectancy, taking us where we know not where, we are afforded the chance for newness and surprise, to tackle the discomfort of not being in control. We have awakened our wings, which is why the gods call Eros the giver of the wings of the soul. This form of Eros is our exit from a self absorbed ego, a putting ourself first, a concentration on the self, for we are taken aloft, to something greater than ourselves, to a memory of what is holy (Pieper, p. 86).

Plato is responding to the perennial theme of the connection of love and lust. As I have stated and repeated, psychoanalysts and psychotherapists have tended to sexualize Eros. I have understood Plato as a counter to, or amplification of, how our profession has sometimes tended to confuse love with lust. Plato is clear in that our reaction to sensuous beauty, our Eros, and the love

of wisdom leads us out of ourselves and deeper into ourselves, out of our fixation on bodily pleasure, toward what we might become, "what potentialities of richness and true possession of life can be . . . made accessible by love and perhaps only by love—if man himself does not corrupt love" (Pieper, 1962, p. 93).

Eros contains both a spiritualized love which negates the flesh and a physical love which includes the flesh. The spiritualized love becomes agape, God's self-sacrificing love for man, which brings us back to Pope Benedict XVI and his understanding of our need to include agape with Eros, that they remain adjacent to each other, as are the two horses in the soul's chariot. Agape has been a given in our field but not as a unit with Eros. It is the needed link to including Eros in analysis. As I demonstrated in Chapter One, Eros as sexual love and love for God was integrated and fulfilled in agape. As Pope Benedict reminds us, the word Eros does not appear in the New Testament. I am bringing back Eros.

Directions for Further Study

For further research on Love in analysis, I would study the intersection of Eros and agape, especially through the work of Paul Tillich (1957) who writes that there is no real love without a unity of eros and agape, that both are qualities of love which lie "within each other and are driven to conflict only in their distortions" (p. 132). I would look at the work of Kenneth Lambert, Jungian analyst, in his focus on agape in St. Paul's I Corinthians 13: 4-8 (Lambert, 1981, p. 35) and in his article entitled "Agape as a Therapeutic Factor in Analysis" (1971). It is not within the scope of this dissertation to go further into the broad use of agapaic love and analysis.

Conclusion

We have arrived at the beginning quote of the dissertation:

> The link between *amor* (love) and *caritas* (charity), or, in Platonic terms, of Eros being rooted in the sensual realm—the same Eros which seeks to carry us with the wings of birds to the abode of the gods—this thesis is far from being a mere theory of the nature of man. It is corroborated existentially in the experiences of treatment by depth psychology. For this modern branch of the art of healing demonstrates that any harsh repression of the capacity for erotic emotion which is rooted in the realm of the senses makes love altogether impossible. (Pieper, 1962, p. 95)

One's body, one's physicality, is who one is in the world. Our spirituality, the purest of our prayers, the fullest experience of God is also physical. In depth psychology, if we fear the physical, sensual realm, and repress our erotic experience, we will miss the full healing power of love.

We have come far in one hundred and ten years. In our tradition, Jung did not see his patients intensively; his patients would come and go. Freud's training analysis was three months. We now know that it takes time to develop powerful feelings, yet analytical psychology has not delineated or provided a philosophical framework for handling the erotic energy encompassed in the psychic energy that Jung says crosses between the unconscious of the patient and that of the analyst.

Plato, in his playing with the meaning of experience, offers the first major philosophical presentation of a divine reality beyond the conventional Greek gods. His visions echoed the love, divine goodness and truth in the *Song of Songs*. It is my hope that this study will encourage Biblical and Platonic wisdom to touch the analytic encounter. May we all become more conscious of and comfortable with the platonic meaning of Eros in the therapeutic setting, more able to handle, be present to, just what is. At his or her best, might not the

therapist be an inspired poet, joined with the patient, in creating a beautiful hymn, a *Song of Songs*, to celebrate the moments of finding, telling and knowing of divine madness, Love of Divine *Nous*, including the fantastical and absurd, in human life?

I have used my own experience for the sake of instruction. I am also encouraging a meditation by others on these three pieces of literature. In this study, as a way to deepen our understanding of psychic conflict, I have addressed Plato's rich analysis of why, when patient and analyst, any two people, fall in love, it can so quickly turn to hate. Two lovers are initially in a state of mutually intersecting fantasies.

When reason loses the reins of its primitive horse, and the primitive horse insists on getting his way, the fantasies of true love fall from grace. When the black horse neighs in myself or my patient, when our weakness, fragility, messiness, and whining dominate our good horse, we feel humility before the divine.

In closing, let us remember the words of Goethe quoted by Jung:

> Let now the savage instincts sleep
> And all the violence they do
> When human love stirs in the deep
> The love of God is stirring, too.
> (Jung, 1928/1964, p. 98)

REFERENCES

Addison, A. (2009). Jung, vitalism and 'the psychoid': *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 54,* 123-142.

Allen, R. E. (1991). *The dialogues of Plato* (Vol. 2). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Aristophanes. (2007). *The Birds*. ebooks@Adelaide, The University of Adelaide, Australia. Retrieved March 30, 2008, from http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristophanes/birds/

Aron, L. (1996). *A meeting of the minds: Mutuality in psychoanalysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

Atwood, G. E., Stolorow, R. D., & Trop, J. L. (1989). Impasses in psychoanalytic therapy: A royal road. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 25,* 554-573.

Bair, D. (2003). *Jung*. Boston: Little Brown.

Balint, M. (1952). *Primary love and psychoanalytic technique.* London: Tavistock.

Balint, M. (1968). *The basic fault*. New York: Tavistock.

Band, D. (2005). *The Song of Songs: The honeybee in the garden*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Bataille, G. (1985). *Eroticism: Death and sensuality*. San Francisco: City Lights. (Original work published 1962)

Benardete, S. (Trans.). (1993). *Plato's "Symposium."* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Benedict, Pope XVI. (2005). *First encyclical letter "Deus Caritas Est."* Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est_en.html

Bion, W. (1965). *Transformations*. London: Tavistock.

Bion, W. (1992). *Cogitations*. London: Karnac Books.

Bion, W. (1995). *Attention and interpretation*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Bloch, C., & Bloch, A. (2006). *The Song of Songs: The world's first great love poem.* New York: Modern Library Paperback.

Bloom, A. (Trans.). (1968). *The Republic of Plato.* New York: Basic Books.

Bloom, A. (1993) The ladder of love. In S. Benardete (Trans.), *Plato's "Symposium"* (pp. 55-179). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bollas, C. (1987). *Shadow of the object: Psychoanalysis of the unknown thought.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Bolognini, S. (1994). Transference: Erotised, erotic, loving and affectionate. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 75,* 73-86.

Bono (2004). Love is like a drop in the ocean. On *How to dismantle an atomic bomb* CD. London: Island Records.

Botterweck, G. J. (Ed.) (1978). *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Bradway, K., & McCoard, B. (1997). *Sandplay: Silent workshop of the psyche.* London: Routledge.

Breuer, J., & Freud, S. (1957). *Studies on hysteria.* New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1895)

Brown, N. O. (1953). Introduction. In Hesiod: Theogony (pp. 7-48). New York: Liberal Arts Press.

Buber, M. (1952). *Good and evil.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Cantlie, A. (1993). The non-lover: Desire and discourse in the psychoanalytic session. *Free Associations, 4*(2), 210-240.

Carotenuto, A. (1982). *A secret symmetry: Sabina Spielrein between Jung and Freud.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Carson, A. (1986). *Eros: The bittersweet.* Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press.

Celenza, A. (2007). Analytic love and power. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 27*(3), 287-301.

Cobb, W. S. (1993). *Plato's erotic dialogues: The Symposium and the Phaedrus.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Coen, S. J. (1994). Barriers to love between patient and analyst. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association,* 42, 1107-1135.

Cohen, B. (2008). The trace of the face of God: Emmanuel Levinas and depth psychotherapy. *Jung Journal, 2*(2), 30-45.

Cohen, B. (2009). A model of therapy. *Connected Works.* San Francisco: C. G. Jung Institute.

Colman, W. (1994). Love, desire and infatuation: Encountering the erotic spirit. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 39*(4), 497-514.

Cornford, F. M. (1952). *Principium sapentiae: A study of the origins of Greek philosophical thought.* New York: Harper and Row.

Cristaudo, W. (2008). *Love, power and evil:* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

de la Cruz, J. I. (1994). *The answer/La respuesta* (E. Arenal & A. Powell, Trans.). New York: Feminist Press at the City University of New York.

Curtin, M. E. (Ed.). (1973). *Symposium on love.* New York: Behavioral Publications.

Cushman, R. E. (2002). *Therapeia: Plato's conception of philosophy.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Davidson, J. (2004). *The Song of Songs: The soul and the divine beloved.* Bath, England: Clear Press.

Davies, J. M. (1994). Love in the afternoon: A relational reconsideration of desire and dread in the countertransference. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 4*(2), 153-170.

Davies, J. M. (1998). Between the disclosure and foreclosure of erotic transference-countertransference: Can psychoanalysis find a place for adult sexuality? *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 8*(6), 747-766.

Davies, J. M. (2003). Falling in love with love: Oedipal and postoedipal manifestations of idealization, mourning, and erotic masochism. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 13*(1), 1-27.

De Forest, I. (1954). *The leaven of love.* New York: Harper.

Dimen, M. (1999). Between lust and libido: Sex, psychoanalysis and the moment before. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 9*(4), 415-440.

Donne, J., & Bell, I. (2006). *Selected poems.* London: Penguin Classics.

Ellenberger, H. (1970). *The discovery of the unconscious.* New York: Basic Books.

Etchegoyen, R. H. (1992). *The fundamentals of psychoanalytic technique.* London: Karnac Books.

Fabricius, J. (1994). *Alchemy: The medieval alchemists and their royal art.* London: Diamond Books.

Falk, M. (1973). *The Song of Songs: Love lyrics from the Bible.* Lebanon, NH: Brandeis University Press.

Ferenczi, S. (1980). Confusion of tongues between adults and the child. In M. Balint (Ed.), *Final contributions to the problems and methods of psycho-analysis.* London: Karnac Books. (Original work published 1933)

Ferenczi, S. (1988). *Clinical diary of Sándor Ferenczi* (J. Dupont, Ed.; M. Balint & N. Z. Jackson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1932)

Field, N. (1999). O tell me the truth about love. In D. Mann (1999) *Erotic transference and countertransference: Clinical practice in psychotherapy,* (pp. 99-111). London: Routledge.

Fine, R. (1962). *Freud: A critical re-evaluation of his theories.* New York: David McKay.

Fine, R. (1985). The academy of love. *Current Issues in Psychoanalytic Practice, 2*(1), 25-40.

Fordham, M. (1995). *The fenceless field: Essays on psychoanalysis and analytical psychology.* London: Routledge

Freeman, K. (1948). *Ancilla to the pre-Socratics* (Vol. 2008). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Freud, S. (1910). The future prospects for psychoanalytic theory. In J. Strackey (Ed. & Trans.), The *standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 11, pp. 141-151). London: Hogath Press.

Freud, S. (1920). Beyond the pleasure principle. *Standard edition* (Vol. 18, pp. 1-64).

Freud, S. (1925). Resistances to psycho-analysis. *Standard edition* (Vol. 19, pp, 213-226).

Freud, S. (1940). An outline of psychoanalysis. *Standard edition* (Vol. 23, pp. 139-207.

Freud, S. (1951). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego.* New York: Liveright Publishing. (Original work published 1921)

Freud, S. (1953). Fragments of an analysis of a case of hysteria. *Standard edition* (Vol. 7, pp. 3-122). (Original work published 1905)

Freud, S. (1958). The dynamics of transference. *Standard edition* (Vol. 12, pp. 97-108. (Original work published 1912)

Freud, S. (1958). Observations on transference-love. *Standard edition* (Vol. 12, pp. 157-171. (Original work published 1915)

Freud, S. (1961). The ego and the id. *Standard edition* (Vol. 19, pp. 1-66). (Original work published 1923)

Freud, S. (1961). *Civilizations and its discontents* (J. Strachey, Ed.). New York: W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1930)

Freud, S. (1963). Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis. *Standard edition* (Vol. 12, pp. 157-171. (Original work published 1916)

Freud, S. (1981). *Future of an illusion* (J. Strachey, Ed.). New York: W.W. Norton. (Original work published 1927)

Freud, S. (2000). *Three essays on the theory of sexuality.* New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1905)

Gabbard, G. (1996). *Love and hate in the analytic setting.* North Vale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Gifford, P. (2005). *Love, desire and transcendence in French literature: Deciphering Eros.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Gordon, R. (1993). *Bridges: Metaphor for psychic processes.* London: Karnac Books.

Grotstein, J. S. (2007). *A beam of intense darkness: Wilfred Bion's legacy to psychoanalysis.* London: Karnac Books.

Guthrie, W. K. C. (1965). *The Greeks and their gods.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Guthrie, W. K. C. (1993). *Orpheus and Greek religion: A study of the Orphic movement.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hamilton, B. (1995). *Getting started in AA.* Center City, MN: Hazeldon.

Haule, J. R. (1996). *The love cure: Therapy erotic and sexual.* Woodstock, CT: Spring Publications.

Haxton, B. (Trans.). (2001). *Heraclitus.* New York: Penguin Books.

Haynal, A. (1994). Introduction to the correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi. In E. Brabant, E. Falzeder, & P. Giampieri-Deutsch (Eds.), *The correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sandor Ferenczi* (pp. xvii-xxxviii). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haynal, A., & Falzeder, E. (1991). Healing through love? *Free Associations, 2*(1), 1-20.

Heimann, P. (1990). On counter-transference (1949-1950). In *About children and children-no-longer: Collected papers 1942-1980* (pp. 73-79). London: Routledge.

Helmbold, W. C., & Rabinowitz, W. G. (Trans.). (1956). *Phaedrus*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Hesiod. (1953). Hesiod. *Theogony* (N. O. Brown, Trans.). New York: Liberal Arts Press.

Hirsch, I. (1988). Mature love in the countertransference. In J. Lasky & H. Silverman (Eds.), *Love: Psychoanalytic perspectives* (pp. xvii-xxxvi). New York: New York University Press.

Horst, P. W. van der. (2006). *Jews and Christians in their Graeco-Roman context*. Tubingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

Hughes, G. (1999). *The politics of the soul: Eric Voegelin on religious experience*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hyland, D. (2008). *Plato and the question of beauty*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jowett, B. (Trans.). (1952). *Symposium*. In *Great books of the Western World* (Vol. 7). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica

Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. New York: Harvest.

Jung, C. G. (1953). Two essays on analytical psychology. In *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans; H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, & W. McGuire, Eds.). Bollingen Series XX, (Vol. 7). Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. (Original work published 1943)

Jung, C. G. (1954). Marriage as a psychological relationship. In *The development of personality. Collected works* (Vol. 17). (Original work published 1926)

Jung, C. G. (1954). Psychology of the transference. *Collected works* (Vol. 16). (Original work published 1946)

Jung, C. G. (1958). Psychology and religion: West and East. *Collected works* (Vol. 11). (Original work published 1939)

Jung, C. G. (1959). Aion. *Collected works* (Vol. 9ii). (Original work published 1950)

Jung, C. G. (1959). The archetypes and the collective unconscious. *Collected works* (Vol. 9i).

Jung, C. G. (1960). On the nature of the psyche. In *Structure and dynamics of the psyche. Collected works* (Vol. 8). (Original work published 1947)

Jung, C. G. (1961) Freudian theory of hysteria. *In Freud and psychoanalysis. Collected works* (Vol. 4). (Original work published 1908)

Jung, C. G. (1961). *Memories, dreams, reflections*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jung, C. G. (1964). Woman in Europe. In *Civilization in transition. Collected works* (Vol. 10). (Original work published 1927)

Jung, C. G. (1964). A psychological view of conscience. In *Civilization in transition. Collected works* (Vol. 10). (Original work published 1928)

Jung, C. G. (1964). Flying saucers: A modern myth. In *Civiliation in transition. Collected works* (Vol. 10). (Original work published 1958)

Jung, C. G. (1989). *Analytical psychology: Notes of the seminars given in 1925*. London: Routledge.

Jung, C. G. (1990). Psychological types. *Collected works* (Vol. 6). (Original work published 1936)

Jung, C. G. (1991). *Psychology of the unconscious: A study of the transformations and symbolisms of the libido*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1916)

Jung, C. G., & Kerenyi, C. (1989). Essays on a science of mythology. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kerr, J. (1993). *A most dangerous method: The story of Jung, Freud and Sabina Spielrein*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kinnell, G. (1973). *The book of nightmares*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Knoblauch, S. H. (1994). To speak or not to speak? How and when is that the question? *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 4*(3), 151-154.

Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.

Kohut, H. (1984). *How does analysis cure?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kojeve, A. (1980). *Introduction to the reading of Hegel: Lectures on the phenomenology of spirit*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Kumin, I. (1985). Erotic horror: Desire and resistance in the psychoanalytic situation. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy, 11*, 3-20.

Lambert, K. (1971). Agape as a therapeutic factor in analysis. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 18*(1), 25-46.

Lambert, K. (1981). *Analysis, repair and individuation.* London: Academic Press.

Langs, R., & Searles, H. W. (1980). *Intrapsychic and interpersonal dimensions of treatment: A clinical dialogue.* Lanham, MD.: Jason Aronson.

Lasky, J., & Silverman H. (Eds). (1988). *Love: Psychoanalytic perspectives.* New York: New York University Press.

Lear, J. (1990). *Love and its place in nature: A philosophical interpretation of Freudian psychoanalysis.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Levinas, E. (2004). *Totality and infinity: An esssay on exteriority.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Mann, D. (1997). *Psychotherapy: An erotic relationship: Transference and countertransference passions.* London: Brunner-Routledge.

Maroda, K. (1991). *The power of countertransference: Innovations in analytic technique.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

McGuire, W. E. (1974). *The Freud/Jung letters: The correspondence between Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Meador, B. D. (1984). *Transference/countertransference between woman analyst and the wounded child.* In N. Schwartz-Salant & M. Stein (Eds.), *Transference-countertransference* (pp. 163-175). Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Morgan, D. (1964). *Love: Plato, the Bible and Freud.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mott, G. W. (2005). *Erotikon: Six remarks on Platonic Eros.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nehamas, A., & Woodruff, P. (Trans.). (1995). *Phaedrus.* Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Nelson, J., & Longfellow, S. (1994). *Sexuality and the sacred: Sources for theological reflection.* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

New World Encyclopedia. (2007). *Septuagint.* Retrieved January 14, 2007, from http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Septuagint

Nietzsche, F. (2008). *Beyond good and evil.* Radford, VA: Wilder Publications.

Ogden, T. H. (1990). On the structure of experience. In B. L. Boyer & P. L. Giovacchini (Eds.), *Master clinicians on treating the regressed patient* (pp. 69-95). Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Ogden, T. H. (1995). The perverse subject of analysis. *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association, 44*(4), 1121-1146.

Ogden, T. H. (2007). Reading Harold Searles. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 88*, 353-369.

Parsons, W. (1999). *The enigma of the oceanic feeling: Revisioning the psychoanalytic theory of mysticism.* London: Oxford University Press.

Paz, O. (1995). *The double flame: Love and eroticism.* Orlando, Fl: Harcourt Brace.

Person, E. S. (1985). The erotic transference in women and men: Differences and consequences. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 13*, 159-180.

Person, E. S., Hagelin, A., & Fonagy, P. (Eds.). (1993). *On Freud's "Observations on Transference Love."* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Pfister, O. (1922). Plato: A fore-runner of psycho-analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 3*, 169-174.

Pieper, J. (1962). *Enthusiasm & divine madness: On the Platonic dialogue* Phaedrus. South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press.

Pringle-Pattison, A. (1922). *The idea of immortality: The Gifford lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in the year 1922.* Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

Rabin, H. M. (2003). Love in the countertransference. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 20*(4), 677-690.

Racker, H. (1968). *Transference and countertransference.* New York: International University Press.

Rappoport, E. 1956. The management of an eroticized transference. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 25:515-29.

Rudnytsky, P. (2002). *Reading psychoanalysis: Freud, Rank, Ferenczi, Groddeck.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

St. John of the Cross. (2008). *A spiritual canticle of the soul and the bridegroom Christ* (D. Lewis, Trans.). Radford, VA: Wilder Publications.

Samuels, A. (1985). Symbolic dimensions of Eros in transference-countertransference: Some clinical uses of Jung's alchemical metaphor. *International Review of Psychoanalysis, 12*, 199-214.

Santos, G. (1988). *Plato & Freud: Two theories of love.* Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Schaverien, J. (1996). Desire and the female analyst. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 41,* 261-287.

Scherman, N. (Trans.). (1977). *Shir haShirim (Song of Songs): An allegorical translation based upon Rashi, with a commentary anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic sources.* New York: Mesorah Publications.

Searles, H. (1959). Oedipal love in the countertransference. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis. 40,* 180-190.

Searles, H. (1965). *Collected papers on schizophrenia and related subjects.* New York: International Universities Press.

Searles, H. (1979). *Countertransference and related subjects: Selected papers.* New York: International Universities Press.

Sedgwick, D. (1994). *The wounded healer: Countertransference from a Jungian perspective.* London: Routledge.

Shakespeare, W. (2001). *The sonnets* (S. Orgel, Ed.). Pittson, PA: Penguin Putnam.

Siegelman, E. Y. (2002). The analyst's love: An exploration. *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice, 4*(1), 19-34.

Silverstein, S. (1981). *The missing piece meets the big O.* New York: Harper Collins.

Singer, I. (1966). *The nature of love: Plato to Luther.* New York: Random House.

Speilrein, S. (1912). Concerning the psychological content of a case of schizophrenia. *Jahbuch der Psychoanalysis, 3,* 329-400.

Sorenson, R. L. (2004). *Minding spirituality.* New York: Routledge.

Stern, D. (1993). Acting versus remembering in transference love and infantile love. In E. S. Person, A. Hagelin, & P. Fonagy (Eds.), *On Freud's "Observations of transference-love"* (pp. 172-186). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sullivan, H. S. (1970). The psychiatric interview. New York: Norton. (Original work published 1953)

Suttie, I. (1952). *The origins of love and hate.* New York: Julian Press. (Original work published 1935).

Sviri, S. (1995). The Song of Songs: Eros and the mystical quest. In J. Magonet (Ed.), *Jewish explorations of sexuality* (pp. 41-51). Oxford, England: Berghahn Books.

Symington, J., & Symington, N. (1996). *The clinical thinking of Wilfred Bion.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Thompson, C. (1943). The therapeutic technique of Sándor Ferenczi: A comment. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 24,* 64-66.

Tillich, P. (1957). *Dynamics of faith.* New York: Harper Collins.

Tresan, D. (1992). The anima of the analyst—its development. In N. Schwartz-Salant & M. Stein (Eds.), *Gender and soul in psychotherapy* (pp. 73-110). Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Tresan, D. (2001). *The pre-Socratics: Dynamics and psychological implications of the leap in being.* Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Meeting, Boston, MA.

Tresan, D. (2004a). This new science of ours: A more or less systematic history of consciousness and transcendence, Part I. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 49,* 193-216.

Tresan, D. (2004b). This new science of ours: A more or less systematic history of consciousness and transcendence, Part II. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 49,* 369-396.

Tresan, D. (2007). Time is a river without banks: A response to Connolly's 'Frozen time and endless analyses.' *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 52,* 47-49.

van der Post, L. (1975). *Jung and the story of our time.* New York: Vintage Books.

Voegelin, E. (1974). *Order and history: Vol. 4. The ecumenic age.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Voegelin, E. (1981). *Collected works* (Vol. 12). Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Voegelin, E. (2000). *Plato.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Walsh, C. E. (2000). *Exquisite desire: Religion, the erotic and the Song of Songs.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2008a). *The four loves.* Retrieved January 16, 2008, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Four_Loves

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2008b). *Thrace.* Retrieved October 23, 2008, from, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thrace

Wikipedia, the free enclyclopedia. (2009). *Symposium*. Retrieved February 19, 2009, 2009, from http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Symposium&oldid=298526505

Winnicott, D. W. (1971). *Playing and reality*. London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1941)

Winnicott, D. W. (1992). Hate in the countertransference, In *Through paediatrics to psycho-analysis: Collected papers* (pp. 194-203). New York: Brunner/Mazel. (Original work published 1947)

Winnicott, D. W. (1992). *Through paediatrics to psychoanalysis: Collected papers*. New York: Brunner/Mazel. (Original work published 1975)

Wrye, H. K., & Welles, J. K. (1998). Erotic terror: Male patients' horror of the early maternal erotic transference. In *The narration of desire: Erotic transferences and countertransferences* (pp. 157-173). Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.

Young, R. M. (1990). *The analytic space: Countertransference and evocative knowledge*. Retrieved May 10, 2008, from http://www.human-nature.com

APPENDIX A: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aquinas, T., & Clark, M. T. (2000). *An Aquinas reader: Selections from the writings of Thomas Aquinas.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Barron, J. (1994). Historical events reinforcing Freud's emphasis on "holding down the countertransference." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 63,* 534-539.

Biale, D. (1997). *Eros and the Jews: From biblical Israel to contemporary America.* Berkeley, CA: University of Callifornia Press.

Boorstin, D. J. (1992). *The Creators: A history of heroes of the imagination.* New York: Random House.

Church, F. F. (Ed.). (1987). *The essential Tillich: An anthology of the writings of Paul Tillich.* New York: Collier Books.

Coen, S. J. (2002). *Affect intolerance in patient and analyst.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Conger, J. (2005). *Jung and Reich: The body as shadow.* Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books. (Original work published 1988)

Dodds, E. R. (1951). *The Greeks and the irrational.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Evelyn-White, H. G. (1936). *Hesiod, Homeric hymns, and Homerica.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gabbard, G., & Lester, E. (1995). *Boundaries and boundary violations in psychoanalysis.* New York: Basic Books

Gabbard, G., & Lomax, J. (2004). Transference love: An artificial rose? *American Journal of Psychiatry, 161*(6), 967-973.

Goldstein, D., Lachower, F., & Tishby, I. (1989). *The wisdom of the Zohar.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Graf, F. (1993). *Greek mythology: An introduction.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Graves, R. (1955). *The Greek myths.* Baltimore: Penguin Books

Graves, R., & Riding, L. (1964). A study in original punctuation. In G. Willen & V. B. Reed (Eds.), *A casebook on Shakespeare's sonnets.* (pp. 161-172). New York: Crowell.

Haule, J. R. (1990). *Divine madness: Archetypes of romantic love.* Boston: Shambala.

Hillman, J. (1960). *Myth of analysis.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Hillman, J. (1985). *Anima: An anatomy of a personified notion.* Dallas, TX: Spring Publication.

Hitschmann, E. (1952). Freud's conception of love. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 33,* 421-428.

Hoeller, S. (1982). *The gnostic Jung and seven sermons to the dead.* Wheaton, IL: Quest Books.

Hoffman, I. Z. (1998). Poetic transformations of erotic experience: Commentary on paper by Jody Messler Davies. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 8*(5), 791-804.

Hutchins, R. M. E. (1952). *Great books of the Western World* (B. Jowett, Trans.). Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Irwin, A. C. (1991). *Eros toward the world: Paul Tillich and the theology of the erotic.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Lear, J. (2005). *Freud.* New York: Routledge.

Mann, D. (1999). *Erotic transference and countertransference: Clinical practice in psychotherapy.* London: Brunner-Routledge.

Osborne, C. (1994). *Eros unveiled: Plato and the god of love.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Reeve, C. D. C. (2006). *Plato on love.* Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.

Reik, T. (1957). *Of love and lust.* New York: Farrar Straus.

Room, A. (1999). *Brewer's dictionary of modern phrase and fable.* New York: Harper Collins. (Original work published 1870)

Rosenberg, R. A. (1992). *The five Megilloth: Vol. 1. Esther, the Song of Songs, Ruth.* New York: The Judaica Press.

Rosenzweig, F. (2005). *Star of redemption.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. (Original work published 1921)

Rosiello, F. W. (2000). *Deepening intimacy in psychotherapy: Using the erotic transference and countertansference.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rutter, P. (1989). *Sex in the forbidden zone.* Los Angeles: Jeremy Tarcher.

Samdashani, S. (2003). *Jung and the making of modern psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Samuels, A., Shorter, B., & Plaut, F. (1986). *A critical dictionary of Jungian analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schaverien, J. (Ed). (2006). *Gender, countertransference and the erotic transference*. London: Routledge.

Schwartz-Salant, N., & Stein, M. (Eds). (1984). *Transference-countertransference*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Schwartz-Salant, N., & Stein, M. (Eds.). (1992). *Gender and soul in psychotherapy*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron.

Shaw, D. (2003). On the therapeutic action of analytic love. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 39*, (251-278).

Singer, J. (1976). *Androgyny: Toward a new theory of sexuality*. New York: Doubleday.

Steinberg, D. (2003). *Where is your heart: Some body part metaphors and euphemisims in biblical Hebrew*. Retrieved August 10, 2008, from http://www.adath-shalom.ca/bodymetaphors_bib_hebrew.htm

Stewart, H., Elder A., & Gosling, R. (1996). *Michael Balint: Object relations pure and applied*. London: Routledge.

Toner, J. (1968). *The experience of love*. Washington, DC: Corpus Books.

Virgil. (2004). *The eclogues* (G. Lee, Trans.). New York: Penguin Classics.

Winnicott, D. W. (1976). *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment*. London: Hogarth Press.

APPENDIX B: PROTECTION OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS APPLICATION

Title of Research Project Eros in Analysis
Principal Investigator: Betsy Cohen
(print name and degree)
Investigator: _____
(print name)

I have read the *Guidelines, Ethics, & Standards Governing Participation & Protection of Research Participants* in research projects of this Institute (in Appendix D of the Student and Faculty Handbook), and I will comply with their letter and spirit in execution of the enclosed research proposal. In accordance with these standards and my best professional judgment, the participants in this study (check one)

X Are not "at risk."

_____ May be considered to be "at risk," and all proper and prudent precautions will be taken in accordance with the Institute protocols to protect their civil and human rights.

I further agree to report any changes in the procedure and to obtain written approval before making such procedural changes.

Betsy Cohen Sept. 18'09
(signature of principal investigator/date)

_____
(signature of investigator/date)

Action by the Committee on the Protection of Research Participants:

Approved ✓ Approved with Modifications _____ Rejected _____

_____, Ph.D. Date 10/22/09
Signature of representative of the Committee on the Protection of Research Participants/date

_____, Ph.D. 9/21/09
(signature of dean & date)

BETSY COHEN Ph.D. 2009