

## “DAY’S RESIDUES”: ONE VERTEX AMONG MANY

The post-Bionian paradigm in psychoanalysis invites us to listen to the session as a waking-dream-thought where unconscious-thinking-in-progress is continuous. The hypothesis put forward here and illustrated using clinical material is that we can use the notion of day’s residues as a metaphor to refer to the incoming narrative of the patient. Whatever the patient brings to the session can be conceived as “day’s residues” in that they are potential instigators of waking-dream-thought in the session. This metaphor helps the analyst place brackets around the outside of the session, deconcretizing what apparently are hard facts, so that immediate contact is made to create a shared perspective, possibly producing in this session “food” for the mind. To create the waking-dream-thought of the session, the analyst may consider listening to the incoming narrative as a metaphor. This is not a new or different concept but a particular kind of elaboration on the metaphoric stance taken by psychoanalysts of all stripes; it is an elaboration that expands the ways we can describe the session and narrow the gap between talking about the session and the experience of the session itself.

Keywords: dreams, Freudian theory, intersubjectivity, day’s residues, metaphors, waking-dream-thought, post-Bionian field theory, transformation in dreaming and play, semiotic index, atmosphere

*Dreams have as much influence as actions.*

—STÉPHANE MALLARMÉ

I am proposing here a new use for an old psychoanalytic concept—day’s residues—as a vertex through which we can theorize the analytic session. I will support with clinical material the hypothesis that we

---

Psychoanalyst, Canadian Psychoanalytic Society.

Submitted for publication August 18, 2019; revised February 23, 2020, June 10, 2020; accepted July 26, 2020.

can use the notion of *day's residues* as a metaphor to refer to the incoming narrative from the patient. No matter what the patient brings to the session, we can conceptualize it as day's residues in the sense that these residues are the potential instigators of the *waking-dream-thought* of the session.<sup>1</sup>

Conceptualizing the session as a dream is no easy task, as catching the transformation in dreaming and transformation in play in action—as post-Bionian field theory proposes—is difficult. The metaphor of day's residues is a new tool that takes a concept from traditional psychoanalysis and assigns it a metaphorical value to help us understand the incoming discourse. It does not deny the historical past or disregard reality outside the session but assists us in reaching the internal state of the patient.<sup>2</sup> It can be listened to as a metaphorical narrative signaling the emotions that are present here and now. “If the analyst leaves past and present concrete reality in the background, he does so to give preeminence to rigorous and all-round listening to the unconscious dimension of the analytic dialogue” (Civitaresse 2019, p. 26). My proposition is uncomplicated: namely, that to create the waking-dream-thought of the session, the analyst may consider listening to the incoming narrative as a metaphor. I propose the metaphor of “day's residues” to help deconcretize what apparently are hard facts, namely, the problematic reality of the patient's life, and to invite the analyst to enter the squiggle game immediately (Winnicott 1941, 1968, 1971).

I am describing a particular kind of elaboration on the metaphoric stance taken by psychoanalysts of all stripes, what might be called harmonic

<sup>1</sup>To distinguish this notion from the day's residues in night dreams and to indicate their diurnal temporality before and during sessions, I place my conception of “day's residues” in quotation marks. It is important to be careful with our language here, and not simply refer to the dream of the session, but to a waking-dream or dreamlike state or para-oneiric state to preserve the integrity of the Freudian concept of the night dream. It is often confusing for candidates when we ignore the differentiation of primary and secondary process without a clear explanation of their simultaneity in waking dream states.

<sup>2</sup>The English word *metaphor* is derived from the sixteenth-century Old French word *métaphore*, from the Latin *metaphora*, “carrying over,” in turn from the Greek μεταφορά (*metaphorá*), “transfer,” from μεταφέρω (*metapherō*), “to carry over,” “to transfer,” and originally from μετά (*meta*), “after, with, across” + φέρω (*pherō*), “to bear,” “to carry across,” as in transferring the characteristics of one thing to another; a metaphor is considered a form of simple analogy (Liddell and Scott 1897). *Metaphor*: “A figure of speech in which one object is likened to another by asserting it to be that other or speaking of it as if it were the other (Funk and Wagnall's *New Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, 1928). Brown (1958) refers to metaphor as “the name for the utterance that suggests its referent through a transfer of meaning” (p. 211).

variations of meaning.<sup>3</sup> Although all analysts listen metaphorically, they don't do so nearly enough, and often they refer their metaphors to a limited body of psychoanalytic knowledge displaying motion but of the rigid variety, rather than listening with the ear of a poet who takes the whole of language as his or her sea. I want psychoanalysts to be more like poets.<sup>4</sup> It is useful to consider the psychoanalytic session as a poem, in the sense that a poem is a sort of micro-dream, an intensification of the associative and projective function of the mind, not unlike what Bion (1965) describes as "projective transformation" (p. 19). I refer to poetry considered not as the lyric exultation of a romantic sublime, but as a place of learning from poets and the construction of their art. The art of the poet is not unknown to the analyst, who fashions with the patient sounds of sense in dreams, desire, and love. It is in the libidinal affair of the psychoanalytic session that the vitality of our expressiveness circulates.

The analyst tries to forge a shared perspective with the patient that will produce "food for the mind" (Bion 1965, p. 38) for both from within *this* session.<sup>5</sup> Conceiving the incoming narrative as day's residues fosters the creation of a language for addressing what happens in the psychoanalytic session. To be able to communicate with colleagues and candidates about the events and undercurrents of the session is to narrow or bridge the gap between the experience of the session and the communication of that experience. "The experience of the session cannot be stated directly . . . ; its existence is conjectured phenomenologically" (Bion 2014, p. 242).

Reflecting on dream formation at night and during the session, I came to a consideration of the ways in which night dreams and "waking-dream-thoughts" might be continuous (Ferro 2002b, p. 602). Do these two situations share any structural similarities or functions, or are they

<sup>3</sup>This does not mean that I adhere completely to a hermeneutic understanding of psychoanalysis, but there is no need to elaborate this point here.

<sup>4</sup>Bion (1965) discusses this issue indirectly when he comments on the notion of "unwelcome fidelity" in the transference interpretation: "At its worst the fidelity of the reproduction tends to betray the analyst into interpretations that have a repetitive quality seeming to suggest that what the patient says about someone else applies almost unchanged to what he thinks and feels about the analyst." He concludes by proposing "to describe this set of transformations as 'rigid motions.' The invariance of rigid motion must be contrasted with invariance peculiar to projective transformations" (p. 19).

<sup>5</sup>According to Bion (1965), truth is the engine behind healthy mental development; it is truth that feeds the mind. "Healthy mental growth seems to depend on truth as the living organism depends on food. If it is lacking or deficient, the personality deteriorates" (p. 38).

incomparable, possessing different structures altogether? Might night dreams and waking-dream-thoughts be structure-preserving/creating but undergo certain invertible transformations? Do they have different structures at different stages of consciousness? And what role do day's residues play, if any, in the waking-dream-thought of the session?<sup>6</sup>

When we attempt in psychoanalysis to bring different theoretical perspectives into dialogue, we are always at risk of a theoretical "confusion of tongues." To counter our tendency to fragment into theoretical and methodological clusters that do not share a common language, I here take on a dialogue between Freud and post-Bionian field theory, carefully maintaining the use of language and definitions whose distinctness must be observed to avoid misunderstanding and resulting confusion.

### FREUD'S AND BION'S PROTECTION OF SLEEP AND WAKEFULNESS

We find twenty different entries for the concept of day's residues in the index of *Interpretation of Dreams*. According to the psychoanalytic theory of dreams, in its most general terms, "Day's residues are elements from the waking state of the day before which are found in the narrative of the dream and in the dreamer's free associations. They are connected, more or less distantly, to the unconscious wish that is fulfilled in the dream" (Laplanche and Pontalis 1967). Freud's consistent descriptor is that day's residues are the "entrepreneur" of the dream, an entrepreneur in search of a capitalist (libidinal urge). Day's residues for Freud play the part of the instigator of a dream (Freud 1900):

the day's residues . . . not only *borrow* something from the *Ucs.* when they succeed in taking a share in the formation of a dream—namely the instinctual force which is at the disposal of the repressed wish—but they also *offer* the unconscious something indispensable—namely the necessary point of attachment for a transference [p. 564].

<sup>6</sup>I am thinking here in particular of the intersubjective aspects of the dream of the session in the works of Ferro (2002a,b, 2006, 2009, 2011, 2013), Ferro and Civitarese (2015), Ferro and Basile (2006), Civitarese (2008, 2011, 2013, 2014a,b, 2018), Civitarese and Ferro (2013), Katz, Cassorla, and Civitarese (2016), and Ogden (2003, 2004, 2005, 2018), among others. Civitarese (2014a), in his review of the history of the concept of the analytic field, emphasizes that from Freud forward, the history of psychoanalysis is the history of the exploration of the intermediate space.

I understand this transference as the place of transition, an in-between place that bridges what is *borrowed* and what is *offered* in correspondence and in the same tenor for the purpose of mastery. Day's residues are a remnant of today's experience that not only provide a means for hiding the unconscious wish from the censor but offer a point of transfer to which the wish may attach.

In Freud's first theory of dream formation, the day's residues are subject to the mechanisms of dreamwork, as are all dream-thoughts—displacements and condensations, "secondary revision," in short, *Entstellung*.<sup>7</sup> As Freud writes, "My supposition is that a conscious wish can only become a dream-instigator if it succeeds in awakening an unconscious wish with *the same tenor* and in obtaining reinforcement from it" (p. 553; emphasis added).

Analogously, the psychoanalytic session provides the opportunity for correspondence, which links the minds of the analyst and the patient; the metaphor of "day's residues" is thus useful for referring to this offer, which has yet to acquire "sojourn in the mind of the analyst" (Bion 1958a, p. 146). We either can try to keep up the correspondence and match the tenor (temperature/distance) or we can fail, thus disconnecting the means of entry into the present of whatever is seeking entry. My proposal is to take day's residues from their strict domain in the oneiric sleeping state and place them in the oneiric waking state, thereby maintaining their entrepreneurial characteristics and locating them as initial instigators in the waking-dream of the session.

I offer here a limited comparison using metaphor and analogy to present similarities between night dreams and the waking-dream of the session. Freud and Bion left us different conceptions of dreamwork, but among their differences one finds commonalities. Addressing the differences, Ferro (2002b) succinctly explains,

[Bion] turns Freud's position on dreams upside down; whereas Freud used the term 'dreamwork' to mean that otherwise incomprehensible unconscious material was transformed into dreams and that the dreamwork had to be undone in

<sup>7</sup>*Entstellung* has unfortunately been translated into English as distortion/deformation, words that do not convey the dialectical movement of hiding-revealing/covering-uncovering that is communicated in German (U. Hock, guest speaker in Dominique Scarfone's seminar *Penser à Freud*, Montreal, October 2019). This movement is like an eternal dance of the "seven veils," where the body is never revealed or, in Kantian terms, a word tries to capture the impossibility of knowing the thing in itself. Walter Benjamin (1925), in his distinction between materiality and truth, speaks to the notion of the inherent unity of the veil and the veiled.

order to make the incomprehensible dream comprehensible again. Bion thinks that conscious material has to be subjected to dreamwork to render it suitable for storing away and for thought [p. 598].

If we compare Freud's and Bion's formulations, Ferro's explanation seems initially to point to a non-isomorphic function of dreams. For Freud, the dreamwork is undone in the session, whereas for Bion it is *done* in the session. However, if we adopt the vertex of the day's residues in night dreams and "day's residues" in waking dreams, there is one aspect that remains isomorphic between the two states of consciousness. The task of both states is to transform and transduce lived experiences into other forms—in this case, a sensory stimulus transduced to a pictograph and subsequently into a narrative to reach a destination, that is, an interpretant.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, dreamwork during night sleep and the session are isomorphic also in the sense of having a similar functionality—the transformation/transduction of the message to master the stimulus through its submission to a process of semiosis. The aim in both cases (night dream and waking dream) is to master the amount of stimulus that is excessive, has broken in, and demands binding—in the psychical sense—so that such stimulus can then be disposed of or used for thinking.

"Day's residues" create an in-between bridge for the session to "transit." Making transit is what metaphors do as they transfer emotional content from one thing to another. As a discursive transporting vehicle that facilitates formation of the waking-dream-thought, "The dream is the epistemological function of the mind, essentially the road to reality. . . . A reality that is always pervaded by the dream of the mind . . . where the plots recited by the characters as internal objects come to life" (Civitaresse 2018, pp. 5, 7). The distortion of the residue is carried over (that is what a metaphor does) to the time-space of the session to be submitted to the session's dynamics of torsion.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup>The etymological origin of the word *transduction* has been attested to since the seventeenth century. It was used in scholarly and scientific contexts based on the Latin noun *transductionem*, derived from *transducere/traducere* "to change over, convert," a verb that originally meant "to lead along or across, transfer," from trans- "across" + *ducere* "to lead." This is the basic description of the process of semiosis in the life sciences. For an introduction, see Sebeok (2001).

<sup>9</sup>Physicists writing on the kinematics of the torsion of space-time find that on a macroscopic level they take general relativity as the appropriate theory of space-time and gravity, but they argue that on a more microscopic level there are good reasons for suspecting the presence of a torsion of space-time, with its own dynamics (see Hehl 1985).

I have tried to respect the differences in the models of Freud and Bion, which describe very different dreamwork processes. Even though they formulated different conjectures regarding the function of dreams, both believed that dreams have a protective function. Sleep and wakefulness need protection: the night dream is the barrier that protects sleep, and the waking-dream-thought protects wakefulness (awareness).

I build on the understanding shared by these two metapsychologies about the "protection" of sleep and wakefulness. Seen thus, Freud's model of *Entstellung* and Bion's model of transformation are not at odds in this aspect, since both understand that sleep (Freud) and wakefulness (Bion) need protection in the form of a night dream and the waking-dream of the session as retrospective ways of mastering the stimulus.

Bion's intuition that there is continuity of activity between sleep and wakefulness is confirmed by contemporary findings in the neuroscience of sleep. For example, "paradoxical sleep" is a term given by neuroscientists to the frequency design of someone who is asleep but shows a pattern of electrical activity like that of wakefulness (Fuller, Gooley, and Saper 2006). I advance the formulation that the notion of Bion's continuity of sleep is a form of "paradoxical wakefulness," a contrasting and parallel architecture that is contrapuntal to "paradoxical sleep" and that describes the opposite of a heightened state of consciousness while asleep. "Paradoxical wakefulness" would then be the term to describe the frequency design of someone who is awake but shows a pattern of electrical activity similar to that of sleep, which reminds me of Bion's observation that the purpose of the session is to wake the patient up.

Turning the incoming narrative into a metaphor helps the analyst with the situation Bion discusses in "Emotional Turbulence" (1976) as the "impenetrability of the caesura": "In analysis we often have reason to think that we cannot penetrate the impressive caesura of resistance or its varieties" (p. 296). Discussing Freud's concept of caesura (1926), Bion (1976) cites him: "There is much more continuity between intra-uterine life and early infancy than the impressive caesura of the act of birth would have us believe" (p. 296). The concept of caesura gives us two vertices through which to observe: one is the impressive cut of birth, and the other is of continuity *despite* the impressive cut. Bion uses the concept of caesura to illuminate the continuity between sleep and wakefulness and to portray a caesura so impressive that it might mislead us into believing that there is an impenetrable caesura between these two states of consciousness.

Caesura is both cut and flow, a binocular concept (Bion 1976): “it depends which way you look at it, which way you are travelling. Psychosomatic disorders or soma-psychotic—take your choice—the picture should be recognizably the same whether you look at it from the psychosomatic position, or from the soma-psychotic position” (p. 306). This way of thinking enables the observation of distinct perspectives or vertices that, in turn, augment our perceptions and contribute to complex thinking denoting real/imaginary, inside/outside parts. To adopt a metaphor that describes the incoming narrative of the patient is a way of transferring information from outside to inside and from one subject to another, yet still allowing for both the cut and the continuity of the patient’s incoming predicament. The metaphor provides both a point of departure and continuity for the psychoanalytic session, thus enabling the “artificial splitting of the total situation to take place,” which Bion views as a necessary step before “an ordering of these elements [in the session] and a reintegration to bring these perceptions together again” (p. 299).

In Bion’s view, the alpha function is the constant, structure-preserving/creating agent that causes the differentiation of the conscious and unconscious, creates the waking-dream in the sense of a barrier, and assigns a protective function to dreaming. “Thanks to the ‘dream,’ he can continuously be awake [and] his mind is not dominated by what are unconscious ideas and emotions” (Bion 1962, p. 15). Hence, the distinction of night dream versus waking dream does not necessarily operate according to the circadian rhythms (night/day) but rather by unceasing efforts to assign an interpretant to the vital signs of life, both while asleep and while awake. Life is semiosis, and, in the life of the human, this includes the mediating force of the unconscious. The psychoanalytic session causes us to focus on a particular kind of semiosis that draws our attention to transferential ways of knowing.

### **IS “DAY’S RESIDUES” A HELPFUL METAPHOR?**

The metaphor of “day’s residues” helps the analyst bracket the “other outside” of the session. The aim is to suspend or neutralize a certain *attitude* toward reality, not to exclude reality but to consider the field of the session as something that questions the very subject/object split. “Day’s residues” is a vertex that creates an opportunity for a transformation in

dream and play.<sup>10</sup> However, this notion of the incoming narrative of the patient as a metaphor should not interfere with the inattention of floating attention; rather, I conceive of it as an internal disposition of the analyst that prizes intuition and uncertainty above reason and knowledge, referred to by Bion, citing Keats, as “negative capability.”<sup>11</sup>

I also propose that “day’s residues” function in an analogous fashion to the operation of day’s residues in the formation of night dreams. Although the mental processes of the night dream and the waking-dream-thought of the session cannot be entirely equated, a metaphor—a form of analogy—seeks only a comparison between two things, in other words, a form of correspondence or a partial similarity, typically drawn to explain or clarify. I argue that at a minimum “day’s residues” is a suggestive metaphor for labeling a way of listening. It can be used as a metaphor to name the incoming narrative of the patient, just as Freud conceptualized the notion of day residues of the waking experience as the *prompting point* of the night dream. Taking this a bit further, one can make a case for an analogous function of day’s residues in night dreams and “day’s residues” in the waking-dream of the session as the instigator and entrepreneur.

I introduce the notion of day residues in night dreams into post-Bionian field theory’s understanding of the session to provide a point of connection with Freudian theory. Freud deconcretized the reality-based value of the day’s residues, conceiving of it as something that appears seemingly innocuous but is capable of instigating the initiation of the dream. In the chapter “The Material and Sources of Dreams” in *Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud (1900) titles Section A “Recent and Indifferent Material in Dreams” (p. 165). He closes his arguments on the source and role of the “recent and indifferent material” of dreams, asserting, “The reader will rightly conclude

<sup>10</sup>Although intersubjectivity is central and widely employed in contemporary psychoanalysis, we do not have an agreed-upon definition that would take into account the important contribution of North American authors and the philosophical origins of this concept in European writers. To distinguish intersubjectivity conceptually as used in relational psychoanalysis and in analytic field theory is a huge task beyond my scope here. However, both traditions move away from a naturalist psychoanalysis toward a psychoanalysis that aims to understand the *constitutive* contribution of the analyst to the lived experience of the session.

<sup>11</sup>This internal disposition is related to the concept of “negative capability”—applied by Keats to those “capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason” and used by Bion to introduce his notion of entering the session without memory or desire (Bion 1970, pp. 106–124). But it is related also to the phenomenological method of *epoché* proposed by Husserl (1913), meaning a suspension of judgment, the act of refraining from any conclusion for or against anything as the decisive step for the attainment of ataraxy, a state of serene calmness. It is the first step in the phenomenological recognition, comprehension, and description of sense appearances, a transcendental reduction.

from the foregoing arguments that I am asserting that there are no indifferent dream-instigators—and consequently no ‘innocent’ dreams. Those are, in the strictest and most absolute sense, my opinions. . . . what we dream is either manifestly recognizable as psychically significant, or it is distorted and cannot be judged till the dream has been interpreted, after which it will once more be found to be significant” (p. 182).

Freud’s *Entstellung* (distortions/deformations) are transformations when understood as new forms within which forbidden wishes are to be metabolized by the mind. There is, in Freud’s dreamwork, a transformation from the body (drive) to the psychic (wishes), just as in Bion. One of the many places where they differ is that Bion describes how that transformation happens in its beginning stage of sensation to image and form, whereas Freud (in his first theory of dream formation) describes a transformation happening at a later evolution of the dream; the wish lends itself to a distortion that is in itself a transformation as another step toward protecting sleep.

Notwithstanding, is this line of reasoning sufficient to create a new metaphor? Sufficiency here depends on just how the use of the metaphor of “day’s residues” as part of the oneiric wakeful state differs from the day’s residues in the session used by contemporary authors. In his preface to Cassorla’s *The Psychoanalyst, the Theatre of Dreams and the Clinic of Enactment*, Jay Greenberg (2018) writes regarding the concept of “dreams-for-two”:

When analysis is going well, Cassorla believes, analysts listen to their patients’ associations and use those associations as a kind of day residue that inspires dreams. . . . In turn, the patient uses the analyst’s interpretation as the day residue around which a new dream can be formed and communicates this to the analyst [p. xi].

My proposition is similar to Cassorla’s description, though the metaphor of “day’s residues” as proposed here has a slightly different extension.<sup>12</sup> The metaphor of “day’s residues” includes whatever the patient brings to the session and may be conceived as “day’s residues” in the sense that they are *potential* instigators of *the waking-dream* of the session, regardless of whether the analysis is going well. I am adding a live

<sup>12</sup>The extension of a concept, idea, or sign consists of the things to which it applies, in contrast with its comprehension, or intension, which consists of the ideas, properties, or corresponding signs that it implies or suggests.

wire, a spark plug to the narrative. I point to (or, in semiotic terms, index) the fact that we have to hear the narrative as though it contains a spark inspiratory that will send us down the path of a knitting, quilting, embroidery project that would transform, if we are lucky, today's session. It is a door operator. As mentioned above, a metaphor is a transporting vehicle, a mover; a metaphor is a portable dream.

The question again arises as to how the metaphor of "day's residues" as the instigator of the oneiric wakeful state is different from Ferro's concept of "narrative derivatives." In what way is there a difference between "day's residues" and "narrative derivatives"?

"Day's residues" is designating, I propose, a specific aspect of what Ferro (2006) called "narrative derivatives": "both the most abstract and the most concrete form of communication can be understood as 'narrative derivatives' of the waking-dream-thought, in the process of being formed at any one time" (p. 989). In this definition, narrative derivatives designate all narratives that result from pictograms (images) with the emotional tenor of the lived experience, but which may give rise to mutable discursive expressions.<sup>13</sup> All, however, are vehicles of the same proto-emotion. "Day's residues" as metaphor adds the situational, entrepreneurial aspects of the narrative and allows the drama to unfold, as day's residues did for Freud.

The most important differentiation is that "narrative derivatives" is a metapsychological concept, whereas "day's residues" simply specifies "narrative derivatives," which are ubiquitous and describe the way the mind works. The metaphor of "day's residues" is not a metapsychological concept; it is a pointer (an index) to the "narrative derivatives" of *today*.

Following Bion, Civitaresse and Ferro (2013) offer a model of mind characterized by Bion's alpha function emphasizing the dreaming process while awake. The narrative elements of the waking-dream-thought are, for Ferro (2002a), "the intersection of the emotions, in the field of the here and now, seen as the locus of the products of history and phantasies generated by the interaction between patient and analyst" (p. 184). "Narrative derivatives" refer then to ground-up phenomena resulting

<sup>13</sup>The idea of pictogram is also beautifully developed by Piera Aulagnier, whom I consider an important author for the comprehension of intersubjectivity in psychoanalysis (Aulagnier 1975).

from what Bion characterizes as the alpha functioning of the mind, whereby the analyst receives “the patient’s communication as emerging from the immediacy of what goes on in the here and now—a real-time response to the emotional impulse of the relational moment. This perspective offers us the opportunity to modulate our interventions continually so as to facilitate an expansion of the capacity to think” (p. 184).

Ferro (2002a) goes on to elaborate on the metapsychological role of “narrative derivatives”:

The alpha element is the way a real time pictograph is made of everything we receive, mediated by sensations from the external and internal worlds. Each emotional sensorial pictograph is then placed in a sequence together with other elements, thus giving rise to the dream-like thought in waking life. The sequence of alpha elements cannot be known except in “narrative derivatives.” . . . These narrative derivatives appear as continual linguistic, emotional text indicators of the session [pp. 185–186].

Thus, the main difference between “narrative derivatives” and “day’s residues” is that the first is a concept that is assigned a metapsychological role in post-Bionian field theory (in other words, is part of how these authors explain the functioning of the mind; it pertains to their understanding of how body and mind relate). I make no such claim for “day’s residues.” I believe that the metaphor of “day’s residues” will be helpful because it brings intelligibility to a possible *prompting point* to the idea of transformation in dreaming and transformation in play in the session.<sup>14</sup>

The reason for introducing this new tool is *to facilitate, not replace*, the understanding of concepts such as “narrative derivatives,” whose epistemological provenance belongs to narratology. Day’s residues, by contrast, is a concept firmly established in the psychoanalytic literature and, as such, more readily allows incorporation into the readers’ understanding.

<sup>14</sup>To claim a metapsychological place for “day’s residues” in the session is possible, but the argumentation would follow different lines of reasoning. Primarily following Ferenczi’s definition of day’s residues in night dreams as “traumatolytic life-residues” and proposing the concept of “traumatolytic life-residues” as “day’s residues” entering the session in search of the mind of the analyst. In Ferenczi’s view, dreams have a traumatolytic function that is anterior to and more primary than the wish-fulfillment function considered by Freud. For Ferenczi, the day’s residues are part of “life residues”—unelaborated traumas that return as sensory impressions or partially elaborated narratives. For Ferenczi, the “sleep state and dreams seek to unburden the psychic system also by re-experiencing traumatic day’s and life’s residues, thus revealing something about the nature of traumatic neurotic dream processes” (Ferenczi 1931). In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud (1920) seems to concur with Ferenczi: “dreams repeat the traumatic situation; they seek to master the stimulus [the pleasure principle . . .] and seem to be more primal” (p. 32). This elaboration would require a separate article.

The concept of day's residues provides a way of speaking about what is brought into the session (narrative derivatives) as something that is seeking transformation and keeping us from focusing on the concrete values of the patient's narrative. This bracketing, which is congruent with Bion's conception of continuous dreaming, is done to sustain attention on the patient's internal reality—that is, on the waking-dream of the session—and our own as analysts.

What I am proposing is not a new and different concept, but rather a poetic way of listening, and consequently a new way of understanding. In addition, the metaphor of "day's residues" allows analysts to speak of "narrative derivatives" in a language that draws us closer to our well-established understanding of night dreams. Finding this doorway might help us with the creation of the waking-dream-thought of the session, as the metaphor creates precision and a temporal "thereness" of the incoming "fiction." In this sense, "narrative derivatives" has an extension of meaning that is greater, while "day's residues" as a metaphor is narrower; but like "narrative derivatives," it captures the fictional, incidental aspects of the lived experience that become available to build the waking-dream-thought of this session today. To conceive of the incoming narrative as a metaphor is a tactical listening technique to help catch the transformation in dreaming and in play in action. This radical way of listening—as though everything is part of a waking-dream—is the kind of radical listening in which we need to engage if we firmly believe that the unconscious is always speaking.

Even if the metaphor of "day's residues" provokes only "second thoughts" about the session we are in or about the one we have just had, I believe it helps us understand important clinical aspects, both theoretical and technical, of field theory (Bion 1967; Baranger and Baranger 1969; Ferro and Civitaresse 2015). Field theory uses the raw material brought into the session and whatever becomes available during the session to create the waking-dream-thought of the session and to produce the opportunity for transformation in dreaming and in play. We go along with what is given to us and treat it as a residue in search of a mind, a waking-dream. This digestive capability of the session is stimulated (or not) from the very beginning of the session.

To speak of "day's residues" makes "narrative derivatives" more understandable. Conceiving of "day's residues" as a metaphor helps the analyst use Ferro's helpful clinical suggestion "I dreamt that . . ."; in my

analogy and my language, borrowing from Freud's and Bion's, it allows the analyst to hear the patient's incoming narrative as saying: "I am bringing you the 'day's residues' (entrepreneur), and I am trying to produce a dream; are you my capitalist? Do we have a 'business venture' here today? Does my 'elevator pitch' engage you sufficiently to invest your capital (alpha function) to allow us together to create a waking-dream-thought that transforms my present predicament? Or is it confusing or distracting?" The emotional communication from the patient to the analyst is "I can't do it by myself; what is it that I am saying/doing that you can transform and give back to me in a way that would help me come out of this para-oneiric state? Can you help me?" I am both circumscribing and making more explicit Ferro's very useful suggestion.

This internal disposition and viewpoint (or vertex) on the part of the analyst toward the incoming narration keeps the analyst firmly within the urgency of the psychoanalytic now and keeps the internal state of the patient away from life events occurring outside this space, temporality, and the singularity of the intersubjective field of today's session.

### **MR. O.: PERAMBULATING THE BORDERLANDS OF PSYCHOSIS**

When one walks for the sake of taking a walk, one perambulates. *Perambulate* also has a second meaning, which also applies to my section subtitle, namely, to make an official inspection of a boundary on foot. I think this second meaning is a fit analogy to what I feel we are doing in our sessions with Mr. O. As we perambulate together, the notion of "day's residues" guides me and helps me maintain contact with our internal psychic states.

The metaphor of "day's residues" helps the analyst remain in the present in a constant effort to make sense of both what the patient is saying and what the patient is making the analyst feel/associate/dream/avoid. What does the patient want from me / the session today? How does this demand modify me / us / the field? How will our contact today modify the patient / me / the field? How do we keep in contact? How do we go from the semantic to the semiotic reception of the message? Ultimately, how do we get better at alleviating the existence of profound emotional suffering?

In this section, I hope to enable the cumulative effect of the clinical material to speak to the reader similarly to how it spoke to me, and I hope

to give "an impression of the experience" (Bion 1965, pp. 1–11). Bion (2013), who felt strongly about our inability to communicate what happens in the session, spoke to this: "For all its appearance, and description, and explanation, there just remains a gap! And there remains a gap because the essentials to it are missing: the actual events themselves about which you are talking" (p. 39). Minding the "gap," "mining it," is our affair, and it might have to suffice to receive only an approximation of the session's experience.

Although there is no lack of analytic theory potentially appropriate to use in the case of Mr. O., my main focus is to use the notion of "day's residues" to help me approximate the session as an immanent field without an outside other, not unlike the indwelling manifestations of the dreamscape of the night dream. I believe Winnicott (1952) is referring to this when he affirms, "The centre of gravity of the being does not start off in the individual. It is in the total set-up" (p. 99). Mr. O. is my last patient on Mondays at 6:00 P.M., my first on Tuesdays at 8:00 A.M., and he then comes back on Thursday at 8:00 A.M.

In the session, I receive the manifest text of Mr. O. as a metaphorization of the latent text of the unconscious/field of the relationship in general and of that session in particular.

Rather than "giving interpretations" or "making interventions" *directed to the patient*, the need is to *attune oneself* to the emotions that are not yet thinkable for the patient and to help him to give shape to them. . . . The essential aim is to weave together the emotional threads making for growth of the patient's capacity to dream/think/symbolize [Civitaresse 2013, p. 139].

With Mr. O., I got better at allowing myself an internal disposition of availability and at inhibiting what comes easily in me. This bracketing of my readily presumed "understanding" brought me closer to the vividness of my mental images and to noting "imaginary variations" as opposed to fixed narratives and interpretations that would place me outside the field of the session in the self-contained individuality of an analyst who observes and interprets the patient's utterances.

In the clinical example that follows, I cite what the patient describes as "cold drafts" in his house as "day's residues," which herald turbulence in the field of the session and further turbulence to come. "Cold drafts" function as "day's residues" from the beginning of the session. "Cold drafts" is the metaphor that brings to light analyst-patient mutually constitutive

meaning as the product of unconscious interaction. That metaphor serves as a pointer to the very atmosphere in the session that the analyst wishes to feel with the patient and to inhabit.

The Greek etymology of “atmosphere” references *atmós* (vapor, steam, odor) and *sphaîra* (ball, globe, planetary sphere). In its figurative sense, atmosphere speaks of a surround suggested by a pervading mood, a distinctive quality of a place, or an essence in the environment. This notion is captured magisterially by a painter like J. M.W. Turner. For example, in his painting *Regulus*, depicting a Roman general captured by the Carthaginians, the general was punished by having his eyelids removed, leaving him blinded by the sun. The dazzling sunlight in Turner’s painting enables the viewer to share Regulus’s plight. This blinding light at the center of the painting could be the pictorial description of the field of the session, or rather the type of field that would manifest were the analyst situated where the patient is and, like the patient (and the painting’s viewer), has no eyelids. The same feature is noteworthy in the painting *Snow Storm: Hannibal and His Army Crossing the Alps*. The figures are barely painted in, as the dominant communication is the menacing conditions of the crossing.

### THREE CONSECUTIVE SESSIONS WITH MR. O.

**Monday, 6:00 P.M.**

The patient starts the session: “She [his girlfriend] is not sleeping well; she can’t feel comfortable. She is not sleeping well. I am finding open windows, burning the furnace too much, constantly, natural gas being burned, and the heat escapes. It is kind of pointless talking to her about the drafts. She cleans the bathrooms constantly and leaves the windows open. The house is cold, my feet are cold, she is hot, and she can’t stand any coffee or food smells, so she opens the windows and the draft is cold.”

Twenty minutes into the session, after he has circled back to the theme of cold drafts more than once, I reflect on the theme of the session so far and say, “It is almost a metaphor for your relationship with her, the warmth that you occasionally feel for her does not accumulate, but is dissipated when these cold drafts come in.” I am thinking here that the “cold drafts” applies to us, the analytic pair, but can take the thought no further; transference interpretations with this patient do not seem to go anywhere at this stage. I am in a state of curiosity—What is this draft that keeps

coming back in such an insistent manner?—and its insistence channels my attention.

The notion of "cold drafts" maintains its presence, and, toward the end of the session, I say, "You want the harmony we talked about" (a recurring theme in our sessions). He responds, "Yes!! Harmony!!! Yes!! Harmony!! . . . It is not knowing about when she is upset, I know I am relatively easygoing. It would be nice to have a relationship with a girlfriend where there is harmony!"

The longing for harmony arrives again more forcefully in this session; it is full of moments of spontaneous connection around the topic of music, which we have never experienced previously. The metaphor of music for relationships starts early in the session, with the notion of rhythm and lament over the absence of rhythmic reciprocity with the girlfriend. Later in the session, music again carries the longing for attunement, which Mr. O. calls "harmony." He speaks eloquently and knowledgeably about music, particularly about the concordance of orchestral instruments, contrasting harmony with cold drafts.

I know I would be of no use to him if I thought he was talking *only* about his girlfriend. After the session, I say to myself that it is perhaps the same with me in the session; every time we feel we connect, we disconnect at the end of the session. As he leaves the room, I keep thinking of the drafts that dissipate the heat. The whole session has been about what is wrong with the partner / myself / the container, and everything is wrong with the partner / myself / the container, who / that keeps opening windows to create a cold draft that takes the heat away: "the cold draft" is the character in the field that is heralding the news to come. I am in the dark but feel the session with him is fraught with *Nachträglichkeit*. He has taught me to be ready for an unexpected *après-coup*. The story of the "cold draft" is pregnant with the message to come, with a "day's residues" pointing like an index.

**Tuesday, 8:00 A.M.**

He opens the session: "Our platform promises to be so cost-effective; it provides low healthcare costs. The vice president [of the U.S.] took hold of our health file. Our discussion regarding technological capabilities is timely. It is encouraging . . . they mentioned Walmart, and Walmart is us, the mobile program. . . . It is nice to focus on the positive. . . . Looking at houses. . . ."

This is accompanied by silent listening on my part, a silence that invites his continuing, punctuated with a variety of communicative “um-hum” sorts of interjections. The session continues with an elaborate narration of imminent funding at the highest levels of his technology start-up, which will bring him, he says, “autonomy.” In the past, I have interpreted to myself the fantasy of “autonomy” as the riches of psychoanalysis to come, more precisely, the arrival of emotional investment. Or is the warmth of harmony a pot of gold, a meeting of the minds, or the creation of an “autonomous” mind?

After Monday’s partial containment of the chilling draft through the metaphor of music (rhythm and harmony), he comes in on Tuesday with his mind intensely involved with the promise of impending riches. He talks without pause about the 3,000 square-foot house near my home, with a fireplace like mine that he will be able to afford, and similar splendid ideas. He describes in detail a two-and-a-half-million-dollar house in my neighborhood. This hope of riches brought into this session feels like the crashing foot of Monty Python, imposing itself over the turbulent message of the swirling headwind of the previous session. No matter what, our fireplace is going to work. The fireplace in the room has been a character frequently present in our sessions. He wants to buy a house with a fireplace like mine, which he calls “the hearth.”

**Thursday, 8:00 A.M.**

He comes in and says, “Ted goes abroad, he will meet with a room full of bankers, all recent prospects . . . who will fund our start-up.” Forty minutes into the session, where he was continuing to describe the riches to come, and without any pause, in tight contiguity to his forthcoming riches, he says, in a flat and distant tone, “My job disappears, I found out last Friday, at the end of next month.”

“This is big news,” I say with a tone of surprise and some alarm. I have lost here my ability to keep contact and provide warmth through my reverie of his account. I feel pulled into an overall sensation of unease, an oscillation into a sense of despair that I have felt with this patient on and off. In particular, when I am unable to say or feel something that would shift us from a windowless space that contracts rather than expands our psychoanalytic dialogue metonymically, we shrink away in front of a cataract of speech that forms a wall of words signifying nothing, but at the same time words that want to mean everything in the sense that stands for the no-thing. I fall off attunement, and my alarm creates a sudden cold

draft that chills my mind. The cold drafts are here in the session, not out there in his house. In my mind, Mr. O. is approaching a breakdown and, without being able to continue psychoanalytic sessions, his conspiratorial mindset, which continuously generates both grandiosity and persecutory thoughts, will go unattended. This would bring us to an uncontrolled crisis (possibly hospitalization, as occurred before he started analysis) rather than "a crisis within the analysis" (Bion 1965, pp. 8–10).

He continues: "Yes, I don't know . . . , yes, this is big news. [unconcerned tone, brief pause]. If we do get funded [referring to his start-up, which will bring the riches], it will come in the nick of time." Again, without much pause, he has turned the bad news around in one flip. This reminded me of Bion's reference to severe cases (1958b), as when the personality hates reality and hates emotions. In these cases the processes of communication and thinking themselves are impaired by the intolerance of frustration preserved by the existence of the patient's destructive impulses, and from the fear of being overwhelmed by the psychotic part of his personality.<sup>15</sup> Bion (1958b) argues that not only do we attack internal objects, but we attack the mind itself. When the mind cannot create links between the idea and the emotion of the lived experience, or vice versa, the emotion to the idea, the mind projects with the hope of finding the links out there . . . in the mother/analyst/other. For Bion, the capacity to bear frustration is what distinguishes health from illness. With little capacity to modify frustration, which is an essential factor in growing the mind, the desperate mind of my patient madly discharges/evacuates experience that cannot be abstracted, that is, thought. The session is "food for his mind" if I expand his ability to modify frustration, but it also becomes "food for my mind" if I find ways to transform my frustration into something he can use.

But with Mr. O., who is cut off from his interiority and the vitality of his emotions (can't dream/think), I have to take into account in responding that in his case the "contact barrier" made up of alpha elements

<sup>15</sup>"The danger which the patient fears is, therefore, one he has good reason to fear. It can be stated in analytic terms as follows: He wishes to love. Feeling incapable of frustration, he resorts to a murderous assault, or a token assault, as a method of disburdening his psyche of the unwanted emotions. The assault is but the outward expression of an explosive projective identification by virtue of which his murderous hatred, together with bits of his personality, is scattered far and wide into the real objects, members of society included, by which he is surrounded. He now feels free to be loving, but is surrounded by bizarre objects each compounded of real people and things, destructive hatred, and murderous conscience. The picture is further complicated because, although it is true to say the patient feels free to love, at least in intention, the violence of the explosion leaves him denuded also of his feelings of love" (Bion 1958b, p. 348).

between the conscious and the unconscious has been replaced by a beta barrier that separates him utterly from his lived experience.

“The news must be worrying you,” I say. I am trying to hang on to the vanishing thin string of our shared experience, but feel I am failing to give any “food for his mind.”

In a flat, matter-of-fact tone, emotionless, he says: “It has been in my mind.”

In these clinical sessions, “day’s residues” expressed the disruption of contact. The signifier “cold drafts” is the “day’s residues,” and it foreshadows the unfolding of the sessions. It is what comes to pass, the found incarnation in the sessions as its meanings unfurl over the course of the week’s sessions. “Cold drafts” points to a loss of dynamic, sensual contact with the reality of the field and the feelings related to that contact and to an excess of intellectual factors taking the place of emotions, which were missing in the time lived together. I had become disinterested in his repetitions, and he was telling me he was feeling it as a “cold draft.” Something in the environment/field of the session was cooling, and it was not helping him tell me his big, disturbing news.

He was describing via his grievance what was actually happening: that the container was leaking, that something was escaping, that cold drafts were taking all the warmth our fireplace could generate, and that the remaining heat was not enough to keep us warm. To work in metaphors requires having faith that the chain of significations (Lacan), the penumbra of associations (Bion), will take us where we need to be to resume contact. As in poetry, psychoanalysis is a case of *verba tene, res sequenter*: Grasp the words, and the subject will follow.

The “day’s residues” offer a semiotic index that points me in the direction of what is in the field of the session; if I would have been able to listen to the “cold drafts” and turn up the temperature of my “fireplace,” reduce the difference between high and low (atmospheric/session) pressure, and attend to any cracks, gaps, or openings where cold air may be coming through. Maybe if I had been able to understand the field function as a basic group assumption in action, in this case, fleeing, I would have been able to discontinue the disruption of contact.<sup>16</sup>

The full message makes its appearance only in the Thursday session of the week. As the corpse is thrown between us, it feels like a sudden

<sup>16</sup>In Bion (1961), fight-flight is one of three basic assumptions, whereby the group creates an enemy to flee from or fight.

gale that rushes in, emptying our room of the warmth accumulated through two long years by patiently rubbing sticks (words/emotions) to light the fire of the session. The icy revelation is that his work project has been terminated and that he will be let go in six weeks, leaving him possibly without money for analysis by the end of the next month. His tone suggests he considers this a *fait accompli*. He was told this news the previous Friday; on Saturday he spent the day in bed with intense diarrhea. The somatic symptom of the runs is transformed on Monday into a persistent "cold draft."

Mr. O.'s account of "cold drafts" ("day's residue") manifests itself with insistence in the un-dreamt of the session, foreshadowing the turbulence at work in the session. A pressing announcement of running filtration, a constant seeping through, enters the session targeting our present inability to keep/contain and transform. The field of the session is not offering a digestive process powerful enough to transform his waking nightmare, which runs through like the wind and escapes like the heat in a serious case of failed semiosis.

I had "got wind" of our collapse early in the week, indirectly and without understanding its message, through the notion of the "cold drafts" (operating as the "day's residues") of Monday's session that was now making its way through the week hopefully to create the waking-dream that would meaningfully interpret how all his life he has been at the mercy of these turbulent wind gods, which escape thought.<sup>17</sup> I am also, like his girlfriend, in an insomniac state. I am searching and not finding a way to seal the drafts and keep the fire alive between us, to dream together.

If you "get wind" of something, you hear about it, especially when someone else did not want you to know about it. The story of the "cold drafts," pregnant with the message to come, opens to us its most serious communication in the third session of the week; it is so devastating that it might blow the room away. This crashing news is spoken in a flat, distant, and unconcerned tone of voice: "I will know next week."

If you are "winded" by something such as a blow, the air is suddenly knocked out of your lungs so that you have difficulty breathing for a time. That is how I felt as he spoke his emotionless words, contemplating the end of analysis and the beginning of a new court battle.

<sup>17</sup>Anemoi (in Greek, Ανεμοί—"winds") were Greek wind gods, subject to the god Aeolus, keeper of winds. Sometimes represented as gusts of wind, they were each ascribed a cardinal direction from whence they came.

As if talking to himself, he says, “I will have to go to court to change the terms of my alimony and college tuition for my children. She will have to pay much more.”

We are sailing close to the wind. If you sail “close to the wind,” you take a risk by doing or saying something that may get you into trouble. The analysis is in trouble; the momentary harmony experienced in the sessions is not sufficient to stabilize the plummeting feeling of an abrupt end. And my patient is getting into trouble “out there” on two counts: the tax collectors are after him (a topic brought up in emotionless fashion in previous sessions, where he mentioned that taxes were accruing); and losing his job means he might have to return to court to renegotiate the terms of his divorce. These two characters—the taxman and the cruel court—had been permanently with us. They entered the session, the taxman as a furtive, vanishing character whom Mr. O. infrequently mentions, always in passing, an unimportant circumstance, as if to say that taxes do not apply to him. The cruel court is at the center of his tribulations. On both counts, he is risking/seeking a court prosecutor.

Here I remembered reading Antonino Ferro’s case “Carla’s Panic Attacks: Insight and Transformation” (2015), in which, after a long stretch of treatment, the patient decides to check herself into a psychiatric hospital for a period of in-depth diagnosis; this action becomes a way to describe to the analyst the seriousness of her pain. Facing the judge, my patient is similarly situated, and this has been the source of his original grievance when he first came to see me. Because of unjust treatment he thinks he has received from the system, he is going back to the system to show me that our sessions are not “prosecuting” his case as he feels it should be. It is too early for me to understand exactly what is going on, but this seems likely the proclamation of a tornado that might blow away the couch and all.

To summarize the temporal frame of this unfolding: Friday—the day he received the news; Saturday—the day of a somatic reaction to the news, violent diarrhea, and he stays in bed; Sunday—he feels a bit better. On Monday—the first session after receiving the news—“cold drafts” arrive and are partially transformed into a search for harmony that escapes him/us, the session’s field proving unable to keep the warmth going fully. On Tuesday he comes in with hallucinated riches that he is on the brink of touching; his/my emotional investment is imminent; hope for the fire/harmony is expected to arrive. On Thursday (more treasures to come), he

starts with intense hallucinatory reassurance of an imminent breakthrough (start-up riches, emotional treasures to come), and then, *en passant* as a small, inconsequential, incidental comment, he mentions he might be without a job in six weeks. Here the "cold draft" announced on Monday turns into a gale-force headwind. It takes us almost a week to build an emotional scaffolding to sustain a transformation in the field of the session before the corpse appeared. Although he is telling me this devastating news, my patient is just speaking the news, not fully experiencing it, *sans dire*. Without the other, you cannot say: you can speak but not say. "*Là où ça parle, ça jouit, et ça sait rien*" (Lacan 1975, p. 95) or "*Si parler va sans dire*" (Jullien 2006). The session was not able to create an object presence to fill the hole, that is, to create an intersubjective nonverbal register before the saying word is uttered. The cold corpse is also the metaphor of the failed harmony of our extinguished fire. As for me, I am still twirling close to the eye of the storm; votive offerings to Aeolus are in order.

### CONCLUSION

Following Bion's idea that dreaming is a continuous process that occurs in waking life as well as during sleep, I am taking a well-established concept from the psychoanalytic literature and assigning it a new meaning within a post-Bionian understanding of the session. The clinical implication of this transfer is that the analyst would be able to think of the session as an all-embracing ubiquitous dreamscape, not unlike the dreamscape of the night dream. By this, I mean that in the same way that the outside world is shut down in our night dreams, so the outside of the session, *if* bracketed, lends an inherent, innate, intrinsic quality to the encounter with the patient. The hope is that the analyst will take the metaphor of "day's residues" as an index, that is, as a sign that points to and assists the analyst in dilating and expanding the *now* of the session and abandoning the temptation to engage with the patient's present from the standpoint of an earlier time. The incoming narrative of the patient interpellates the analyst, an action that interrupts, an entreaty of sorts, a summons to wake up. Herein lie the roots of intersubjectivity as lived immediacy.

Perhaps Bion (1979) was referring to this situation when he observed, "When two personalities meet, an emotional storm is created" (p. 321); from this storm, analyst and patient create the waking-dream of

the session. The overall vertex of the session is the turbulence of the encounter, which encompasses something new each time since we do not see the same patient twice. Bion maintains that the patient we saw at the last session is not the one coming in today; this reversal of perspective is a turn toward wonder, openness to the here and now, to what's new today.<sup>18</sup>

In our psychoanalytic sessions, not everything can be traced back to discrete perceptions and to consciousness. The hypothesis of “day’s residues” offered here allows us to transit from the semantic meaning brought to us by our patients’ narratives to the semiotic signaling of their emotional experience, that is, those aspects of lived experience that have remained unrepresented or partially represented and are seeking the mind of the analyst to be thought/dreamt. It contributes a small aspect of “an affective grammar” (Civitaresse 2014a, p. 11) that may help to translate the speech of the session to the enunciation of the experience. Because now and then, *si dire va sans parler . . . ou parfois s’il parle, il dit qu’obliquement*.

By speaking of “day’s residues” in the session, we gradually develop a vision that helps us break the habit of seeing the patient’s narrative as something we must explain or respond to only through interpretations; rather, we come into the session ready to cross the threshold into the dramatic dimension, ready to explore the ways we interplay with and modify one another. In particular, we develop a disposition for psychic *events*, for what is surprising or unexpected in the course of things. The reason to propose that the analyst receives the incoming narrative through the metaphoric listening of “day’s residues” is to create a tool, a useful shorthand to designate how what arrives today—buoyed up in the form of “day’s residues”—adds to and modifies the storm of the session. The tool points to the true emotional atmosphere of the session, limited not only to acoustic events and their qualities (tone, resonance, rhythm, pace) but to various gestures in their singularity (gazes, pupil dilations, tears, winks, facial expressions, smiles, frowns), which alone or in combination “publicize” today’s session.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup>However, the here and now of the session understood psychoanalytically is not divorced from the notion of *après-coup*; that is, it carries a potential afterwardsness (Laplanche 1999), a mode of belated understanding, or a retroactive attribution of sexual or traumatic meaning to earlier events from the German word *Nachträglichkeit*, translated also as deferred action or retroaction.

<sup>19</sup>Bion gives a specific meaning to the word “publicize” in psychoanalysis: “I wish to reserve the term of operations that are necessary to make private awareness, that is, awareness that is private to the individual, public” (Bion 2014, p. 207).

REFERENCES

- AULAGNIER, P. (1975). *The Violence of Interpretation*, transl. A. Sheridan. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2001.
- BARANGER, M., & BARANGER, W. (1969). The analytic situation as a dynamic field, transl. S. Rogers & J. Churcher. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 89:795–826, 2008.
- BENJAMIN, W. (1925). Goethe's *Elective Affinities*. In *Selected Writings: Vol. 1*, ed. M. Bullock & M.W. Jennings. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996, pp. 297–360.
- BION, W.R. (1958a). On arrogance. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 39:144–146.
- BION, W.R. (1958b). On hallucination. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 39:341–349.
- BION, W.R. (1961). *Experiences in Groups*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- BION, W.R. (1962). *Learning from Experience*. London: Heinemann.
- BION, W.R. (1965). *Transformations: Change from Learning to Growth*. London: Heinemann.
- BION, W.R. (1967). *Second Thoughts*. London: Heinemann.
- BION, W.R. (1970). *Attention and Interpretation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- BION, W.R. (1976). Emotional turbulence. In *Clinical Seminars and Other Works*. London: Karnac Books, pp. 306–311.
- BION, W.R. (1979). Making the best of a bad job. In *Clinical Seminars and Four Papers*. Abingdon, UK: Fleetwood Press, 1989, pp. 321–331.
- BION, W.R. (2013). *Wilfred Bion: Los Angeles Seminars and Supervision*. London: Karnac Books.
- BION, W.R. (2014). *The Complete Works*, ed. C. Mawson & F. Bion. 16 vols. London: Karnac Books.
- BROWN, R. (1958). *Words and Things*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- CASSORLA, R.M.S. (2018). *The Psychoanalyst, the Theatre of Dreams and the Clinic of Enactment*. London: Routledge.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2008). 'Caesura' as Bion's discourse on method. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 89:1123–1143.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2011). Towards an ethics of responsibility. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* 20:108–112.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2013). Metaphor in the analytic field. In *Metaphor and Fields*, ed. S.M. Katz. New York: Routledge, pp.121–142.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2014a). Between "other" and "other": Merleau-Ponty as a precursor of the analytic field. *Journal of the Northern California Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology* 20:9–29.

- CIVITARESE, G. (2014b). *The Necessary Dream: New Theories and Techniques of Interpretation in Psychoanalysis*, transl. I. Harvey. London: Karnac Books.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2018). From distortion to transformation: On Bion's theory of dreaming. Lynkeus and dreamlike deformation. Unpublished manuscript.
- CIVITARESE, G. (2019). Paper read at the Psychoanalytic Center, Pavia, Italy, December 10.
- CIVITARESE, G., & FERRO, A. (2013). The meaning and use of metaphor in analytic field theory. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 33:190–209.
- FERENCZI, S. (1931). Letter to Freud, May 31. In *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi: Vol. 3. 1920–1933*, ed. E. Falzeder, E. Brabant, & P. Giampieri-Deutsch. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- FERRO, A. (1996). Carla's panic attacks: Insight and transformation. In A. Ferro & G. Civitarese, *The Analytic Field and Its Transformations*. London: Karnac Books, 2015, pp. 171–190.
- FERRO, A. (2002a). Narrative derivatives of alpha elements: Clinical implications. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis* 11:184–187.
- FERRO, A. (2002b). Some implications of Bion's thought: The waking dream and narrative derivatives. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 83:597–607.
- FERRO, A. (2006). Clinical implications of Bion's thought. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 87:989–1003.
- FERRO, A. (2009). Transformations in dreaming and characters in the psychoanalytic field. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 90:209–230.
- FERRO, A. (2011). Shuttles to and from the unconscious: Reveries, transformations in dreaming and dreams. *Italian Psychoanalytic Annual* 5(2):89–106.
- FERRO, A. (2013). Vicissitudes of the container/contained and field theory. In *Growth and Turbulence in the Container/Contained: Bion's Containing Legacy*, ed. H.B. Levine & L. Brown. London: Routledge, pp. 79–104.
- FERRO, A., & BASILE, R. (2006). Unity of analysis: Similarities and differences in the analysis of children and grown-ups. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 75:477–500.
- FERRO, A., & CIVITARESE, G. (2015). *The Analytic Field and Its Transformations*. London: Karnac Books.
- FREUD, S. (1900). The interpretation of dreams. *Standard Edition* 4/5.
- FREUD, S. (1920). Beyond the pleasure principle. *Standard Edition* 18:7–64.
- FREUD, S. (1926). Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety. *Standard Edition* 87–174.

- FULLER, P.M., GOOLEY, J.J., & SAPER, C.B. (2006). Neurobiology of the sleep-wake cycle: Sleep architecture, circadian regulation, and regulatory feedback. *Journal of Biological Rhythms* 21:482–493.
- GREENBERG, J. (2018). Preface. In R.M.S. Cassorla, *The Psychoanalyst, the Theatre of Dreams and the Clinic of Enactment*. London: Routledge, pp. xi–xvi.
- HEHL, F.W. (1985). On the kinematics of the torsion of space-time. *Foundations of Physics* 15(4):451–471.
- HUSSERL, E. (1913). *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy—First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*, transl. F. Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982.
- JULLIEN, F. (2006). *Si parler va sans dire: Du logos et d'autres ressources*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- KATZ, S.M., CASSORLA, R., & CIVITARESE, G. (2016). *Advances in Contemporary Psychoanalytic Field Theory: Concept and Future Development*. London: Routledge.
- LACAN, J. (1975). *Le Séminaire, livre XX, Encore*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- LAPLANCHE, J. (1999). Transference: Its provocation by the analyst. In *Essays on Otherness*, ed. J. Fletcher. London: Routledge, pp. 214–233.
- LAPLANCHE, J., & PONTALIS, J.-B. (1967). *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, transl. D. Nicholson-Smith. London: Hogarth Press, 1973.
- LIDDELL, H.G., & SCOTT, R. (1897). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Medford, MA: Tufts University, Perseus Digital Library, 1987.
- OGDEN, T.H. (2003). On not being able to dream. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 84:17–30.
- OGDEN, T.H. (2004). On holding and containing, being and dreaming. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 85:1349–1364.
- OGDEN, T.H. (2005). *This Art of Psychoanalysis: Dreaming Undreamt Dreams and Interrupted Cries*. London: Routledge.
- OGDEN, T.H. (2018). How I talk with my patients. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 87:399–413.
- SEBEOK, T. (2001). *Signs: An Introduction to Semiotics*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- WINNICOTT, D.W. (1941). The observation of infants in a set situation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 22:229–249.
- WINNICOTT, D.W. (1952). Anxiety associated with insecurity. In *Through Paediatrics to Psycho-Analysis: Collected Papers*. New York: Basic Books, 1975, pp. 97–100.
- WINNICOTT, D.W. (1968). The squiggle game. In *Voices: The Art & Science of Psychotherapy* 4(1).

WINNICOTT, D.W. (1971). *Therapeutic Consultations in Child Psychiatry*.  
London: Hogarth Press.

33 Elmdale Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario K1M 1A1  
CANADA  
Email: [cecilia.taiana@carleton.ca](mailto:cecilia.taiana@carleton.ca)