

HANS W. LOEWALD MEMORIAL ADDRESS

Tenth Annual Interdisciplinary Conference of the
International Federation for Psychoanalytic Education,
San Francisco, CA, November 1999

"The Stranger Within Thee": Who Is the Unconscious?

James S. Grotstein, M.D.

[Note: An earlier version of this contribution was presented at The Fifth Annual Mental States Conference: "Changing Concepts of the Unconscious in the 20th Century and Their Influence On Clinical Work," Sponsored by the Extension Division of the Psychoanalytic Center of California, Los Angeles, California, June 19, 1999. Also presented as the Hans Loewald Keynote Address at the International Federation for Psychoanalytic Education, Tenth Annual Interdisciplinary Conference San Francisco, California, November 6, 1999 and at the 21st Annual Spring Meeting, Division of Psychoanalysis (39), American Psychological Association, Santa Fe, NM, April 27, 2001]

"In 1759, in his *Conjectures on Original Composition*, Edward Young gave this counsel to beginning authors:

Nor are we only ignorant of the dimensions of the human mind in general, but even of our own. ...Therefore dive deep into thy bosom; Know thyself....learn the depth, extent, bias, and full fort of thy mind; contract full intimacy with the Stranger within theeí."

[Cited in Cox (1980). *"The Stranger Within Thee": Concepts of the Self in Late Eighteenth-Century Literature*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, p.3.]

INTRODUCTION: THE UNCONSCIOUS AND THE UNKNOWN

From the very beginning of life on earth the human being has found himself consciously interposed between two imponderable mysteries, one within him, which came only recently to become known as "*the unconscious*," and the other that was external to him, the *uniqueness* or *essence* of the other, which came to be known as its "*Otherness*," in other words, "*the unknown*." Both these domains are ineffable and inscrutable, not unlike the deity, with which mankind has unwittingly equated them. In this contribution I shall deal with the first mystery, the unconscious. The idea of the unconscious is ultimately reducible to a concept of a second and more mysterious self, an "alter ego" or second self" (Doppelgänger) (Ellenberger, 1970; Grotstein, 1999).

It is my belief that theologians, shamans, mystics, philosophers, mathematicians, physicists, and others, each from his/her own perspective, have been preoccupied since the beginning of time with the paradoxes and mysteries of existence whose ultimate template can be thought of as the domain of the ineffable or the numinous. In contemplating the awesome mysteries of the preternatural and the divine, they were delving, I now believe, in the twin yet unified realms of mystery, of the two unknowns, one of which Freud ultimately located within as the unconscious. I shall call upon these sources for a broader understanding of the unconscious in this contribution and shall bypass many more well known and relevant psychoanalytic contributions, which, while important in understanding the unconscious technically, do not correspond to the line of approach I am presenting in this contribution.

POSITION STATEMENT:

I picture the unconscious as vitalistic and infused with *subjectivity*, *personalness*, *teleology* and *entelechy* as well, paradoxically, with impersonal indifference, the latter aspect of which Bion (1965, 1970) designates as "O." The unconscious consists of Systems *Ucs.* and *Pcs.*, and can also be subdivided into the *unrepressed* and the *repressed*, dynamic *Ucs.* System *Pcs.* has two frontiers. On its lower frontier it interfaces with System *Ucs.* A similar interface exists on its frontier with System *Cs.* I believe that what is called the repressed, dynamic System *Ucs.* is really housed inside System *Pcs.* within the two frontiers. Further, I think of System *Pcs.* as the "search engine" of Systems

Ucs., as well as *Cs.* (for instance, in dreams in which System *Pcs.* scans the infinite landscape of *Ucs.* searching for appropriate noumena or "things-in-themselves" to link up with the beta elements of actual happenings, Bion's (1965, 1970) "O," so that they can become transformed by alpha-function into alpha elements and ultimately become thoughts.

The Unconscious Can Never Become Conscious

The unconscious can never become conscious. We can never know it, only know *about* it--through its derivatives, i.e., shadows. Pontalis (1999), in a sub-chapter in his book, *The Unconscious and the Id*, entitled "The unconscious: corpse or revenant?" states:

'Identifying a corpse'. [citing Freud, 1915]. Let us say that this phrase tallies well with the distinct lack of optimism in Freud's final chapter regarding the famous movement between unconscious and preconscious that we are seeking. [W]e could say that in these last lines we confront an alternative that offers little comfort. On the one hand, the unconscious is in the position of a *corpse* which must be identified, with on one side the thing, the 'thing-representation', and on the other the word, the two of these together constituting the identification; but there is no sign of the living person--the 'corpse' plus its identification can never give us the unconscious 'in person', as it were (p.25).

The Unrepressed Unconscious versus The Dynamic (Repressed) Unconscious

The clinical as well as theoretical importance of these distinctions is as follows: Classical analysts, as well as self psychologists, interpersonalists, relationists, and many intersubjectivists and object relationists (Independents), when invoking the concept of the unconscious, seem to mean the dynamic, repressed unconscious (what I would call the "secondary unconscious")-- where buried memory is stored. Kleinians, on the other hand, while respecting and utilizing this secondary unconscious, primarily invoke the primary unrepressed unconscious wherein inherent a priori categories are located. Howard Wilkinson (personal communication) related to me his belief that whereas Freud viewed the unconscious from the vantage point of consciousness, Klein did the reverse, i.e., she regarded the objects of consciousness from the vantage point of from within the unconscious. Translated into clinical technique, this means that Kleinians, being Kantian, attribute priority (prime cause) to unconscious *phantasy*, whereas non-Kleinians tend to attribute prime cause to external reality and believe that *fantasy* secondarily alters the picture of this reality.

Further, it is my contention that what is meant by the dynamic, repressed (secondary) unconscious is really constitutive of System *Pcs.*

Who Is the Unconscious?

I also believe that the *Ucs.* is "inhabited" by an *ineffable subject*, which is counterposed to the *phenomenal subject of consciousness* (at the Systems *Pcs./Cs.* frontier). These two subjects constitute a hologram constituting the *supraordinate subject of being* (Grotstein, 2000). I further propose that the unconscious is numinous and can be thought of as the immanent domain of what is generally conceived as the "God experience." Put another way, the unconscious may be the prime source from which notions of the deity have emerged before they were projectively identified skyward to create the sky god.

The unconscious possesses incredible versatility. It behaves as if it were an oracle as well as a philosopher or even an existential registrar of one's on-going being. I believe that the functioning of the unconscious is ultimately separable and inseparable from its "Siamese-twin," System *Cs.*, and that the two must be seen as dialectical counterparts constituting a binary opposition, each being monocular in their inherent nature but, when functioning together (in parallel) binocularly confront "O" (Bion, 1965, 1970, 1992), which is Bion's designation for Absolute Truth, Ultimate Reality, things as they are without the distortions imposed by imagery, symbols, or preconceptions.

The Unconscious and Consciousness as a "Dual-Track"

In this binocular function System *Ucs.* apprehends "O" from the point of view of unconscious phantasy, and System *Cs.* apprehends "O" from the standpoint of logic, each serving as partners in a "dual-track" (Grotstein, 1978, 1986). In order to function binocularly, each system has to be informed by the other. Put another way, Systems *Ucs.* and *Cs.* are not in *conflict*; they are in cooperative, complementary, dialectical *opposition*. In this complementary process, the *ineffable subject of the unconscious* becomes the ultimate, helpless registrar of agony for the individual, and the *phenomenal subject of consciousness* becomes "his brother's keeper," i.e., the latter experiences derived messages of pain from the former and optimally rectifies the situation or seeks help.

The Unconscious as the Home for Numinous Presences

While generally accepting Freud's view of the unconscious, I should like to reconceptualize it from other perspectives. His formulations were made a century earlier and have remained essentially intact up to the present time. To me, the unconscious houses a *numinous presence* or *intelligence*, that is, it is a *preternatural, ineffable subject*, which is also the *agent* of psychic determinism. I elect to use the vitalistic term *entelechy* to describe it (Grotstein, 2001).

Where Is the Unconscious?"

The unconscious is located within us, in the Cartesian sense, but, in the holistic sense (Bohm, 1980), it can also be considered (when it is thought to be one with the Unknown) to be cosmic and to be located in language (culture) as well. It participates dialectically with a *phenomenal subject of consciousness* and the both of them in turn participate holographically within the embrace of a *Supraordinate Subject of Being*, which is my

way of reconceptualizing Freud's (1923) psychic apparatus (Grotstein, 2000). The subjective status of the unconscious is like that of the God of *Exodus*: "Tell them I am that I am. Tell them that I am sent thee." It corresponds to the fire behind the chained subject in Plato's parable of the cave that casts the shadows on the cave's wall. The unconscious, in other words, is ineffable and inscrutable. In another contribution I assigned other names to it: "the dreamer who dreams the dream," the dreamer who understands the dream," and "the Infinite Geometer who wields the calipers of fearful symmetry" (and infinity) (Grotstein, 2000).

The Ineffability and Inscrutability of the Unconscious

The unconscious can never be spoken about directly. When Freud stated that the purpose of psychoanalysis was to make the unconscious conscious, he undoubtedly was thinking of the repressed, dynamic unconscious, which was once conscious. He could not have meant the unrepressed unconscious, for that can never become conscious. Like the deity, it can never be objectified, only subjectively experienced. It is dialectically opposed to and yet connected with its external counterpart, the unknown, which is constitutive of the ineffability of the Other and with which it is destined to rendezvous through the agency of human relations. Nietzsche's (1968) concept of "eternal return" describes the trajectory of one's life between the two. I propose that the unconscious is both God-like in its absoluteness, and preternatural as it approaches but never achieves humanness. The unconscious was once the womb we lived in as well as phylogenetic memory of the race engraved (both by transcription and replication) in our genetic code, along with the code of language, which is culture's receiving blanket that greets us upon our birth because we are born into a language that precedes us and defines us. Thus, what is to be the unconscious was once the womb of the self, mother's womb, the womb of culture, and the womb of the race across phylogenetic time.

The Unconscious as Oracle

The unconscious, according to Freud, is paradoxical and contradictory, a characteristic that one once found in the ancient Greek oracles, whose functionaries were women who were designated as "pythonesses." The contradictory quality of the unconscious has been dealt with mathematically by Matte-Blanco (1975, 1981, 1988) and in terms of its "apophatic" (absolute opposites) mystical qualities by Sell (1994). Perhaps the unconscious unites oppositions as dialectically opposed units of binary opposition, which allow epistemological comparisons of feelings, impulses, and thoughts to take place.

The Immanence of the Unconscious

I conceive of the unconscious as being laden with the quality of *immanence*. As the subject evolves and transforms (from the paranoid-schizoid, through the depressive, and finally achieves the transcendent position), (s)he achieves *transcendence*. I further propose that the unconscious sends us on an eternally spiraling cyclical or helical trajectory of ever loftier reunions with the unknown as immanence transiently reunites with transcendence and then cycles back to continue that odyssey of that adventure

known as lived experience, undisguised reality, Bion's "O," against which most individuals require the veritable "sun-glasses" of images, symbols, phantasies, conceptions, and the like in order to filter the dazzling and unnerving glare of its illumination. The unconscious has impersonal, personal, transpersonal, and cosmic dimensions. It is timeless, spaceless, and absolutely symmetrical and *asymmetrical* at the same time.

The drives and affects of the unconscious are, as Matte-Blanco (1975, 1981, 1988) suggests, of less importance and serve as mediators of a more inner cosmic vastness, Bion's (1965, 1970) "O," made surreal by infinity, infinite sets, and chaos, and is, for all the world, the closest mankind can ever approach his/her experience of God, which to me is what is meant by *immanence* when that numinous state is felt. Furthermore, what are traditionally termed "internal objects" can be more usefully understood as demons or phantoms, preternatural subjective presences of an ilk similar to that of the ineffable subject of the unconscious.

The Unconscious as the Creator of "Thoughts without a Thinker"

In a series of papers comprising a metatheory for psychoanalytic epistemology and ontology, Bion (1962, 1963, 1965, 1970, 1992) conceived of alpha function (dream-work-alpha), alpha and beta elements, maternal reverie, container-contained, L (love), H (hate), and K (knowledge) linkages between self and object(s), and transformations in K and in O. Bion posits a "truth instinct" to supersede Freud's drives, and this "truth" is embedded in constantly evolving "O." "O" is raw experience cast in the garb of infinity and chaos, ever evolving and intersecting the individual in terms of his/her emotional sense organ apposite to these experiences. It is as if our emotions themselves constitute a sense organ that must encompass, transduce (from infinity to finiteness), and transform these "thoughts without a thinker" into thoughts that can be thought about. "O" thus constitutes that portion of System *Ucs.* that is yet uncommitted to thought (non-mental) and at the same time includes the "Unknown," which can be understood as the mystery and ineffability that inheres in the Other. "O" is thus internal and external.

The Unconscious as the Hidden "Registrar of Agony" and the Proper "Analysand" of Psychoanalysis

I should like to add yet another position statement about System *Ucs.* in regard to psychoanalytic technique. Notwithstanding the fact that orthodox/classical and especially Kleinian/Bionian analysts emphasize unconscious phantasies in their interpretations to analysands, the rationale for this line of approach seems to be to expose the unreality of the phantasy, all the while demonstrating how the unconscious phantasy obtruded into and therefore sabotaged the analysand's perception of and relationships to objects in external reality. I believe the opposite. I believe that the fundamental aim of interpreting unconscious phantasies is to repair the "holes" and "rents in the phantasmal container. Put another way, unconscious phantasies represent an ever flowing mythic stream, an unconscious filter and first defense against "O" (infinity, chaos, the Real), and serves as the most elemental container-processor against it.

From this point of view, all psychopathology can be understood as id impairments. Successful interpretations serve to complete and confirm the phantasy and simultaneously release the phantoms from *that* phantasy so that they can return to unconscious repertory in another phantasy. In Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the sphinx, a chimerical imagistic figure who poses a riddle to whomever chances upon her at the crossroads to Thebes. If her riddle is answered (by a correct interpretation), she dies, her death signaling the termination of an imprisoning unconscious phantasy, one that was presented as if by pantomime or even charades so as to induce a correct (verbal) interpretation to end the siege of omnipotent preverbal images—who all the while are hoping that we have the answer that can free them from the parts they were forced to play. In other words, the unconscious contains a numinous dramaturge who directs different phantoms to play different roles in pantomime until someone "*gets it.*"

Images are to the Unrepressed Unconscious as Words are to the Dynamic Unconscious

Recently, a spate of contributions have been published in regard to unconscious communication between the analyst and analysand suggesting, following Freud (1915), that the unconscious of one can directly communicate to that of the other without passing through consciousness (Schore, 2001; Jacobs, 2001; Kantrowitz, 2001; Bucci, 2001, Pally, 2001; Wolf, Gales, Shane, E., and Shane, M. (2001) and Lazar, 2001). Schore and others have implicated the concept of projective identification as the means of this unconscious communication. It is my belief that the mechanism of projective identification is strictly an unconscious and intra-psychic phantasy. The subject can never project into another individual; (s)he can only project into their *image* of that object.

When the object seems to have become affected by the subject's unconscious experience of projective identification, I call *that* phenomenon *protective transidentification*, which consists of the following steps: (a) the subject projects into his/her internal image of the object; (b) the object introjectively counter-identifies with this alien experience; (c) the object then projectively counter-identifies with his/her already introjected counter-identification; (d) thus, two images have been created; one in projecting subject and another in the receiving object; (e) finally, a *resonance* occurs between those two images; (f) this resonance is organized by what Ogden (1994) calls the "subjugating intersubjective third subject of analysis, and by what I call the "dramaturge," usually within the analysand, who organizes, orchestrates, and choreographs the analytic passion play (Grotstein, 2000).

Individuals Occupy the Dynamic Unconscious but not the Unrepressed Unconscious

I believe, following Matte-Blanco (1975, 1981, 1983) and his reading of Freud, that individuals per se do not occupy the *Ucs.* (unrepressed). The *Ucs.* is concerned with categories, symbols, and/or preconceptions. I believe that Freud's "dynamic (repressed) unconscious" actually corresponds to the *Pcs.* at its lower boundary or interface with the *Ucs.* Thus, to me, psychoanalytic technique relates to the analysand and his/her

relationship to the analyst strictly. Dealing with individuals otherwise constitutes psychotherapy, which, albeit, constitutes an important and necessary portion of every analysis and even every analytic session.

In summary, I believe that the unconscious is vitalistic and numinous, is "haunted" by an immanent deity, and is best understood from the vertex of Bion's concept of "O" (infinity, chaos, "deep and formless infinite," Absolute Truth, Ultimate Reality, *Ananke* [Necessity], lived experience) in which the immanent deity (the ineffable subject of the unconscious) becomes the "strange attractor that gives coherence to inexorably evolving "O." Put another way, it is in System *Ucs.* that we experience the daily yet fateful interface between indifferent and impersonal "O" and our personal, subjective counterpart to it as a response.

FREUD'S CONCEPTION OF THE UNCONSCIOUS: A SYNOPSIS

Freud's first mention of the unconscious was in the case of Frau Emmy von N. (*S.E.*, 2: 76) but was greatly elaborated upon in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), especially in Chapter VII. He delineates between the "descriptive," "dynamic," and "systematic" uses of the word

In his topographic model of the mind Freud (1915) conceived of Systems *Ucs.*, *Pcs.*, and *Cs.* He further divided System *Ucs.* into (a) the unrepressed *Ucs.*, and the dynamic and repressed *Ucs.* The unrepressed *Ucs.* is related to the Kantian notion of a priori *noumena* and primary categories that, in effect, anticipate or *format* experiences as they take place. He attributed agency to the System *Ucs.* but not subjectivity, which he later assigned to the ego when he conceived of his structural theory of the psychic apparatus (Freud, 1923). The *Ucs.* is separated from *Cs.* by a repressive barrier which was originally formed by primal repression and subsequently by secondary repression. The characteristics of the *Ucs.* are: (a) exemption from mutual contradiction, (b) primary process (mobility of cathexis, including the activity of displacement and condensation), (c) timelessness (and spacelessness), and (d) the replacement of external by psychical reality.

Freud had already (1905) formulated the theory of psychic determinism and the libido theory, which postulated a notion of primordial unconscious *intentionality* or *will* that, in effect, made us the *unknowing agents* of our unconscious will. This concept of an unconscious will corresponded clinically to Kant's theoretical a priori postulates. Later, Freud superseded his topographic model with a structural model in which he conceived of an *id*, which was totally unconscious, an *ego*, which was juxtaposed to and in conflict with it, and a *superego* on a gradient in the ego, which judged the ego in regard to its mediation of the *id*. What Freud had in effect done was to mechanize and dehumanize the unconscious. He "populated" it with drives, called it a "seething cauldron," and denied it the faculty of consciousness.

As time passed and culture had its way with Freud's conceptions of the unconscious, the orthodox school of id analysis gave way to classical ego psychology with its notion of adaptation to the average expectable environment, which attenuated id analysis in favor of consideration of the importance of real individuals in the analysands lives. As a consequence, most analysts moved away from the unrepressed unconscious to the dynamic repressed unconscious, the alleged burial ground of traumatic memories. Eventually, with the rise in importance of countertransference phenomena, the two-person relationship, and intersubjectivity, the unrepressed unconscious seemingly went into oblivion. The work of Melanie Klein and her followers, particularly Wilfred Bion, paradoxically became the sole defenders of the canons of a now obsolete orthodox analysis and thus stands out in contrast with this trend.

THE UNCONSCIOUS AND THE "SECOND SELF" ("ALTER EGO" OR "DOPPELGÄNGER")

Mankind from his very beginning has been preoccupied with his dual nature, a duality albeit that has undergone many differing conceptualizations across time. Man's awareness of a second self or alter ego originated in the mists of time but found expression in the pre-Socratic Greek philosophers and in Plato, and we have glimpses of it in ancient Egypt, particularly in regard to their theories of dream interpretation (Szpakowska, 2000). Perhaps it was to be intuited by him from the dim and ancient memory of his first other, the placenta, which he must mourn upon birth or his second other, the one whom he cannot distinguish between the m(o)ther who cares for him and whose departing ghost becomes mysteriously conflated with the Other within him who preemptorily and mysteriously inserts *its* desires into him as if he is to be its proverbial procurer, and its emotional promptings for him to recognize and alleviate.

Freud, following in the tradition of German Romanticism but under the guise of scientific logical positivism, reconceptualized the heritage of the second self which surfeited nineteenth-century fiction as the "alter ego" or mysterious "double" and the "double conscience" (which actually meant "double *ë*consciousness") of hysteria to create first the topographic and then the structural model of the mind, in which conscious man became conflictually juxtaposed with his mysterious counterpart. Yet Freud somehow missed the subjective nature of the numinous "stranger" within, preferring instead to dehumanize him as id and preemptory instinctual drives.

Yet Freud (1915) did seem to intuit some notion of the alter ego at times:

All the acts and manifestations which I notice in myself and do not know how to link up with the rest of my mental life must be judged as if they belonged to someone else: they are to be explained by a mental life ascribed to this other person...This process of influence ...leads logically to the assumption of another, second consciousness which is united in one's self with consciousness one knows" (p.169).

But, after this intuition, he goes on to say:

What is proved is not the existence of a second consciousness in us, but the existence of psychological acts which lack consciousness" (p.170).

His conception of the unconscious is stated thus:

The nucleus of the *Ucs.* consists of instinctual representations which seek to discharge their cathexis; that is to say, it consists of wishful impulses (p.186).

[I favor Freud's first assessment over his second one. In another contribution I respectfully take issue with Freud in this matter and opt for the idea of numinous subjective presences in the unconscious, principal amongst which is the "*ineffable subject of the unconscious*" (Grotstein, 2000)].

In other passages the subjective nature of the unconscious can be inferred:

The *Ucs.* is...affected by experiences originating from external perception" (p.194).

And :

It is a very remarkable thing that the *Ucs.* of one human being can react upon that of another, without passing through the *Cs.* (P.194).

[If the *Ucs.* can be "affected by experience" and if the *Ucs.* of one person can affect that of another, it must have some subjective quality].

Just as we now realize that Freud had not been the first to discover the unconscious (Ellenberger, 1970; Whyte, 1978), we are also beginning to realize that all cultures had immemorially been sensitive to the presence of the unseen, the numinous, the ineffable, the inscrutable aspects of the self that were on the other side of our comprehension-- but not of our intuition. Prereflective man, according to Julian Jaynes (1990), to whom I have already alluded, was essentially "bicameral" (two rooms or spaces), that is, abjectly submissive as a non-conscious self, in one space, to "god-voices" and images speaking preternaturally from a higher room in another, was generally felt to be external. These hallucinated "god-voices" probably constituted one significant portion of what later was to be called the unconscious and was first to course through the medium of the second self, which itself was to be confused variously with gods, then God, and Fate, before it found its final resting place within the self. Heward Wilkinson (personal communication), citing Jaynes, states: "Freud viewed the unconscious from the perspective of consciousness, not the other way round (i.e., not consciousness from the perspective of the unconscious), the way Julian Jaynes does." I find that observation profound.

When some intuitive geniuses, messiahs, or mystics attempted to return man's god-moiety to himself as an immanent deity within, they were branded heretic because of the blasphemy that was imputed in such an idea that man was both human and god-like in his basic nature. In psychoanalysis Bion was to become a heretic, such a heretic in fact that those portions of his contributions beginning with *Transformations* have been purposely neglected by his London Kleinian colleagues, to whom he has become a pariah. His heretical thoughts were, as held by the Neoplatonists, the Gnostics, and the mystics (Hebrew, Christian, and Islamic), that "God" is immanent within man himself and that this "God" is associatively equivalent to "O," the ground and apotheosis of our being, evolving through such noms de plumes as primary categories, beta elements, things-in-themselves, noumena, Absolute Truth, Ultimate Reality, the Real.

BACKGROUND OF THE SECOND SELF IN FICTION AND IN PSYCHIATRY

In fiction the second self emerged as the concept of the "alter ego," the "mysterious double," or the "Doppelgänger," which dominated the literary scene on both sides of the Atlantic in the nineteenth century, as witnessed by such works as Dostoevsky's *The Double*, Stevenson's *Dr. Jeckyll and Mr. Hyde*, Mary Shelley's *Dr. Frankenstein and His Monster*, von Chamisso's *The Wondersome Tale of Peter Schlemhyl*, E.T. A. Hoffman's "The Story of the Lost Reflection," Henry James' *The Jolly Corner*, Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Sharer*, and so many others.

Simultaneously, there was a similar development in psychology and psychiatry. Mesmerism and animal magnetism were fashionable in the last century and paved the way for the development of hypnosis and the consequent emergence of the second self under its spell. At the same time psychiatrists began studying hysterical states. While Charcot was exploring the hypnoid state of hysterics at le Salpêtrière, he was closely monitored in his observations by a young neuroanatomist from Vienna, and the rest is the history that is more well known to us. Freud then consulted Breuer and worked together with him in studying hysteria. In their *Studieren des Hysterie*, they listed many consistent findings, one of which was that all hysterics incurred "double conscience," which today would be called "double consciousness." Freud would later take this vertical split of the personality and rotate it to the horizontal, thereby creating a vertical topography based on the prominence or lack of prominence of consciousness, postulating that a censorship stood as a barrier between them.

QUASI-"DIVINE" ORIGIN OF THE UNCONSCIOUS IN THE BICAMERAL MIND

At the same time, however, and on another level there exists another putative origin of the unconscious. We now have reason to believe, thanks to a prescient hint from Julian Jaynes (1976) and his concept of the bicameral mind, that the infant is not only right-hemisphere dominated early on but also experiences a state of hierarchic subservience to "God-voices" from the right "camera," a notion that has also been explored by Cath (1982) and which now strikes a surprising chord with neuro-developmental brain

research, as explicated by Ramachandran and Blakeslee, 1998) and Schore (1999 and personal communication). The view of the origin of the concept of the unconscious I alluded to above can be thought of as phenomenal or empirical. This new view is that man is born with an in-house pantheon of deities if not the deity itself. Perhaps the intimidating forces of an indifferent Nature could be thought of as resonating with an already constitutionally installed internal intimidating Nature to create experiences such as awe, wonder, apocalypse, and the like. Man thus found himself entrapped between two peremptory natures which he reconciled into one, then redivided and reprojected one aspect back into Nature as the transcendent "God" and retaining for himself its divine counterpart, the immanent "God," as his unconscious. The former can be thought of as the "indifferent God" and the latter as the personally involved one. "It seems apparent to me that theology and psychoanalytic psychology have been studying the ineffable along parallel paths.

WHO IS THE UNCONSCIOUS?

The personalness or subjectivity of the now submerged second consciousness disappeared in Freud's oeuvre and instead became the System *Ucs*, which later became the home for what Freud would, following Nietzsche and Groddek, call the "id." The personalness, subjectivity, and humanity of the second self, the alter ego (the "other I"), the mysterious double, vanished altogether until years later when Lacan was to revive it as the "Other," the "subject of analysis." Interestingly, it was Roger Sperry (1968, 1969, 1985) at The Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena who, along with his colleagues Gazzaniga and Ledoux (Sperry et al., 1969), would give hard-science evidence that human beings contain no less than two personalities and probably more, if mental modules were to be counted. The "other I" was back on the map. In short, the unconscious topographically, or the id structurally, had become the "kidnapped preternatural orphan" of the last century who became dehumanized by the ontic zeal of Freud's logical positivism. I seek to rehabilitate it to its proper once and future station as the *numinous and ineffable subject of the unconscious*, not to be confused with its fraternal twin, the *phenomenal subject of consciousness*, the one that has hitherto been solely thought of as the subject.

WHERE IS THE UNCONSCIOUS?

For a long time, even up to the present time, there is a tightly held belief, especially among psychoanalysts, their brethren, and their analysands, that the unconscious is synonymous with the "internal world." Sartre, Lacan, and Bion, among many, seem to suggest that the internality of the unconscious is a fiction of our *Zeitgeist*, which owes its origin to Descartes' distinction between "*res cogitans*" and "*res extensa*," and has descended to us as modern logical positivism.

This transition has been made more nearly apparent by post-modern relativistic philosophy, of which the ideas of Husserl (1931, 1962) are especially cogent. Let me sight a single metaphor, that of figure and ground. We all know that figure stands out from ground but at the same time is defined by the very ground from which it springs, as

if the two were permanently conjoined twins, separate and yet paradoxically connected at the same time. In other words, the Cartesian dualism of inside/outside must now yield to inner/outer cosmic relativism.

Klein (1946, 1955), while a steadfast proponent of the concept of the *internal world*, she paradoxically laid the groundwork for the externality as well as the internality of the unconscious in her conceptualization of projective identification. While postulating the initial origins of projections as emanating from within the subject, she goes on to show that after several iterations of projective identifications into objects, followed then by introjective identifications with them and then, in turn, rejections of them again into external objects ad infinitum, the subject eventually finds himself ensconced in a world in which internality and externality have lost definition as he confronts alien "rogue subjectivities" of himself which, at any given moment, are utterly indistinguishable from what he has projectively reidentified in the other. We walk in a sea of transferences in which we all too frequently encounter those "strange/familiar" experiences with objects known as "déjà vu." This confusion begins at birth, I believe, when the infant projectively reidentifies his/her inherent Kantian categories and a priori noumena into his/her world of objects in order to format them for himself (Grotstein, 1997, 1999).

Bion implicitly, as did his contemporary Lacan (1966) explicitly, proffered the notion that the unconscious was not confined to a subterranean "internal world" but was ubiquitous, was Heaven, Hell, Purgatory, Limbo, and Circumstance combined. But I shall return to that theme later. Lacan, in his monumental "rereading" of Freud, posited that the unconscious was socially, culturally, and linguistically founded (structured like a language) and therefore was more of a communal than a private unconscious because it descended from Hegel's (1807) "World Spirit," a notion which was not to be lost on another Hegelian, Karl Marx. This idea owes its provenance to Husserl as well. Lacan's cultural-linguistic conception of the unconscious belongs to the school of social constructivism (Hoffman, 1992, 1994; Boghossian, 2001) in which the self becomes knowingly and/or unknowingly transformed by its interaction with the other.

SOME OTHER VIEWS OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

Henry (1985) contends that Freud never resolved two differing notions of the *Ucs.*, the ontic (scientific, i.e., the drives) and the ontological (existential). Masi (2000), in his review of the literature on the *Ucs.*, points out that different authors impose differing perspectives on the subject: Freud posited the dynamic unconscious based on repression; Klein added the notion of the unconscious phantasy based on splitting; Bion added the idea that the unconscious was a mental function that can "formulate thoughts and metabolize emotions" (p.1). Masi then appends the neuroscientific view, which distinguishes between those cognitive aspects of the *Ucs.* of which we are inherently unaware and those that are dynamically repressed. Masi ultimately distinguishes between the dynamic and the emotional unconscious and between "unconscious" and "unaware."

Bollas (1987, 1995) proffers the interesting ideas of the "unthought known" and of "cracking up" in regard to the *Ucs.* Bollas (1987) states:

The concept of primary repression does not address early intersubjective contributions to the infant's knowledge of being and relating. It is because we must give room to the infant's internalization of the parent's paradigmatic operational logic that I think a new term, such as the *unthought known*, is called for. We need a term to stand for that which is known but has not yet been thought. (p.280).

I understand Bollas to be talking about the infant's experiences with objects in the non-lexical, pre-verbal stage of infancy. In regard to his concept of "cracking up," he states:

To dream is to be dreamed is to be part of a dreaming, which carries on endlessly in a pairing of two quite different mental processes: bringing unconscious ideas together into a dream event and breaking them up through free association. Together they reveal to a psychoanalyst certain latent unconscious themes. But, equally important, they provide evidence of the freely moving work of the unconscious, which I term "unconscious freedom." This freedom is found in the necessary opposition between the part of us that finds truth by uniting disparate ideas (i.e., "condensation") and the part of us that finds the truth by breaking up those unities (Bollas, 1997, p3.).

Bollas's concept of "condensation" and "cracking up" corresponds to a construct of unconscious creativity. I proffered a similar idea, "metathesis," which can be analogized to a chemical equation as follows: Na OH (sodium hydroxide) in solution with H Cl (hydrochloric acid) ÷ (yields) Na Cl (salt) and HOH (H₂O) (water) (Grotstein, 1981). Bion (1963) thought similarly in his concept of the dialectical reversibility of Klein's positions: P-SØD, in which D collects and P-S disperses.

RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVES OF THE UNCONSCIOUS

Suzanne Kirschner (1996), in her *The Religious and Romantic Origins of Psychoanalysis*, traces the origins of contemporary psychoanalysis back to the foundations of Judaeo-Christian culture, and challenges the prevailing view that modern theories of the self mark a radical break with religious and cultural tradition. She argues instead that they offer an account of human development, which has its beginnings in Biblical theology and Neoplatonic mysticism. Most commonly the unconscious was conjoined to religion and cosmology, the latter being the older of the two, because individuals from the morning of time have always sought to attribute personal agency, meaningfulness, and coherence to the wild, chaotic unpredictability of nature. The ancient Greeks, so vulnerable to natural disasters from earth, sea, and sky, attributed preternatural agency to the Titans and then to the Olympian gods, on one hand, and the Fates on the other. Above them and cosmically indifferent to them, however, was "Ananke," ("Necessity"), which we can translate today as "Circumstance" or "Inevitability," or with Lacan (1966) as "The Register of the Real" and with Bion (1965, 1970) as "O," as the ultimate non-human, quintessentially unfair, unreasonable, indifferent, and immovable Presence within both outer and inner mental life. As Fitzgerald made his Omar Khayyam say, "Pray ye not to heaven for heaven rolls on as impotent as you and I."

BACKGROUND OF THE UNCONSCIOUS IN PLATO

In *The Republic* and elsewhere in his *Dialogues*, Plato changed the contemporaneous Greek notion of "the gods" into "God" as the supreme arbiter of "Justice." He also puts forward the notion of the Ideal or Eternal Forms, those pure, perfect, abstract thoughts which Bion much later is to call "inherent preconceptions" and "thoughts without a thinker." He posited three distinct principles in man: (1) passion or spirit; (2) love of knowledge; (3) love of money. "But the question is not quite so easy when...we ask whether these principles are three or one; whether...we learn with one part of our nature, are angry with one another, and with a third part desire the satisfaction of our natural appetites; or whether the whole soul comes into play in each sort of action to determine that is the difficulty" (436), p.699, Vol 1.) Plato's parable about the cave is remarkable. It has been said that all western epistemology is but a footnote to Plato's *Dialogues*. His parable of the cave almost justifies that commendation. Briefly, it is as follows:

"And now...let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened: -- Behold! Human beings living in an underground den, which has a mouth open towards the light and reaching all around the den; here they have been from their childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chains from turning round their heads. Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.

"And do you see...men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels, and statues and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials which appear over the wall? Some of them are talking, others silent.

"...they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave.

"And if they were able to converse with one another, would they not suppose that they were naming what was actually before them?

"And suppose further that the prison had an echo which came from the other side, would they not be sure to fancy when one of the passers-by spoke that the voice which they heard came from the passing shadow?" (515, pp.773-774).

What Plato excluded from his parable, however, were the two interlopers, him and Glaucon, his foil for the moment, who could so omnisciently observe this all too human epistemological predicamentóas if they were themselves gods. I mention this in order to anticipate my later discussion of Bion's (1965, 1970) concept of "transformations in O" and my concept of the "transcendent position." I shall argue that the unconscious reigns from the transcendental to the transcendent, the first being the inherent template of "hardwiring" and the latter the sublime state of our ultimate emergence.

Plato added yet another component for us to deal with in terms of the unconscious, that of *God* as being distinct from the *demiurge*, as I have already alluded to. The former is pure essence, whereas the latter is the "workman-God," the one who fashions the world in his image. I can only allude to the fascinating history of the *demiurge* as the Gnostic conception of the immanent deity residing within us, a notion to which Bion and I both subscribe and also the descent of the *demiurge* as God's scapegoat, as it were, as the devil. What this means is that we can no longer assign prime agency to the drive repertoire. Once we would have stated, albeit half-seriously, that "the devil made me do it." That explanation may yet turn out to be closer to actuality than we may have thought if we consider that one theory of the devil's origin lies in the Gnostic conception, following Plato, that the *demiurge*, the lesser form of God, the creator and architect of the world, was vulnerable to criticism and thereby became God's and man's immemorial scapegoat. Suffice it to say, Plato's contribution to our conception of the unconscious deserves further study.

TRANSCENDENTALISM AND THE UNREPPRESSED UNCONSCIOUS

Although Freud made brief but sparse mention of Kant, it was not until Bion's seminal works that Kant's role in psychoanalytic epistemology became manifest. In brief, Bion spelled out the Kantian, as well as the Platonic, basis for psychoanalytic epistemology ranging from the inherent transcendental givens to transcendent teleology--how the infant is inherently prepared to learn from experience and is enabled to undergo transformations so as to achieve its optimum possibilities. Kantian transcendental idealism and the transcendental dialectic constitute the template of Freud's *unrepressed unconscious*. This entity has always been an enigma for psychoanalysts. How can something be unconscious and yet be excluded from repression? One recalls that Freud spoke of the ego's defense mechanisms in a similar way that they repress but were themselves unrepressed.

Kant's ideas included the things-in-themselves, *noumena* (which anticipated their materialization in phenomena), and primary and secondary categories (including time, space, and causality). The significance of these Kantian ideas for psychoanalytic epistemology is their putative use as formatting agencies which prepare the individual to anticipate future events by possessing the *noumenal* model for it and having space-time-cause categories in which to consider them. An example from physical medicine may help to illuminate how this principle works. The human infant is born with approximately four-hundred inherited antibodies, which, to use Bion's poetic term, have a "memoir of the future." That is, they know the antigen they have been programmed to encounter before they encounter it. From the Kantian point of view, especially if we throw in Plato's Theory of Ideal Forms (models of ideas and objects that are older than their host), we never really perceive anything for the first time. All perception, consequently, ranges along different degrees of apperception.

Thus, the unrepressed, as well as the repressed unconscious, levies a formatting influence

on all that we see and think. Operationally, this means that we are born prepared to anticipate every encounter with the object world and make mental models or maps (Bowlby, 1980) of these encounters, which thereupon become secondary preconceptions. We inescapably find ourselves in a world whose "innocence" and novelty almost immediately upon confrontation disappear into a constantly reconstructed and iterated world of quasi-predictability. May this not have been what St. Paul, in his "First Letter to the Corinthians" meant by "Now, through a glass darkly, then face to face"?óor what Bion (1962, 1963, 1965) refers to when he exhorts us as analysts to "abandon memory, desire, preconception, and understanding?"

We are inherently constrained to view objects and stimuli along a narrow range of receptivity. By and large, psychoanalysts, particularly in the United States, seem to be clinically responsive to the effects of the dynamic or repressed unconscious but not to the transcendental or unrepressed unconscious. Further, once one acquires an appreciation of the functioning of this latter entity, Klein's (1946, 1955) concept of projective identification begins to take on new meaning, especially when we conjoin her concept with what Subbotsky (1992) calls the "unusual logic of infancy" and what I have termed "autochthony" or solipsistic thinking (Grotstein, 1997, 1999), a concept that Winnicott (1971) illuminated under the rubric of creative play, illusion, transitional phenomena, and the subjective object. In brief, the infant "creates" as he discovers objects. The experience of trauma occurs when one is so surprised that they feel robbed of the opportunity to have "creatively prepared" for the event (Grotstein, 1997, 1999).

Orange, Atwood, and Stolorow (1997), following Husserl, Lévi-Strauss, and Piaget, posit a "*prereflective unconscious*," as well as a "*dynamic*" and an "*unvalidated unconscious*." They state:

The prereflective unconscious" is the home of those organizing principles, or emotional convictions, that operate automatically and out of awareness. They arise as emotional inferences a child draws from intersubjective experiences in the family of origin (p.7).

They portray the dynamic unconscious as one in which there is "sequestered" information (feelings and narratives). They consider the unvalidated unconscious to be one of untapped potentiality. This category is consonant with Bion's (1970) concept of "thoughts without a thinker," and Bollasí (1987) "unthought known." Sandler and Sandler (1984, 1987) put forth the idea of a *past-* as contrasted with a *present unconscious*, but it is my impression that their delineation applies solely to System *Pcs.* since the unconscious that Freud explicated is timeless.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SYSTEM *Pcs*

The functioning of System *Pcs.* may have been undeservedly underestimated by psychoanalysts, at least until recently (Hamilton, 1996; Kantrowitz, 1999, 2001); Grotstein, 1999). Freud (1915) suggested that two frontiers exist within the System *Pcs.*

that between it and System Ucs. and the one between it and System Pcs. He also suggested that System Ucs. is generally inert, implying that it comes alive only when it receives cathexis from System Pcs. , but this idea contradicts his other thesis, that of the spontaneous irruption of the drives into consciousness. System *Pcs.* is the "mixing room" of the psyche and the "search engine" for System Ucs. as well as System Cs. It is probably the domain of unconscious thinking, planning, creativity, and phantasy. At its more northern frontier it is responsible for creative thinking, art, intuition, and illusion.

Freud (1915) states:

...[I]t devolves upon the system *Pcs.* to make communication possible between the different ideational contents so that they can influence one another, to give them an order in time, and to set up a censorship or several censorships; reality-testing too, and the reality principle, are in its province. Conscious memory, moreover, seems to depend wholly on the *Pcs.* (p.188).

Yet he goes on to say:

It would nevertheless be wrong to imagine that the *Ucs.* remains at rest while the whole work of the mind is performed by the *Pcs.*...The *Ucs.* is alive and capable of development and maintains a number of other relations with the *Pcs.*, amongst them that of co-operation (p.190).

THE TWO SYSTEMS UCS

The archetypal, pre-conceptual, unrepressed unconscious, the unconscious which is older than the individual, was first adumbrated by the pre-Socratic philosophers, then Plato, and later, Kant. The ubiquitous unconscious is the one that is embedded in language and culture, some of whose roots are also internal and inherent. This is the unconscious of primeval human history which Lacan (1966) reformulated. The former is a private and personal unconscious, the one that corresponds to our true psychic twin, the Cain to our Abel and the Abel to our Cain. The latter, the one conceived by Lacan, the unconscious that inheres in language, can be understood as the unconscious as "matrix" or "background." Bion's (1965, 1970, 1992) "O" seems to embody both in such a way that one can imagine oneself caught within the embrace of inner and ubiquitous "O" while at the same time "O" all the while.

HOW DO WE EXPERIENCE THE UNCONSCIOUS?

When caught in moments of rare, exquisite clarity and unconcealment, we come to *realize*, from one cosmic-ontological perspective, that we are pre-determined, that we are orchestrated and choreographed as ontological puppets. In the moment that we think that we speak, we are spoken. Yet we must claim our sense of purpose and personal destiny as a self by claiming our sense of agency as sole author of our lives, all the while unconsciously aware that we are agents of an Other--and Others ad infinitum. In the

mystical fabric of being we are but ants in ant colonies subject to the unpredictable will of the "World Spirit." We are all determined and willed by ineffable, inscrutable, and numinous agents within the Zeitgeist, present and past. We are self-determined subjects who are simultaneously and paradoxically imprisoned "channels" caught between the Weltgeist and the Zeitgeist. Our instinctual endowment supplies the spice of pleasure--and unpleasure--to the equation.

Thus, we wind up impelled and compelled to desireóas if for ourselves, all along unaware that we have been assigned, according to Freud, to the unconscious work-force for propagating the species. We are given sexual pleasure as "perks," all the while serving the Darwinian greed of an invisible, numinous master. We are imbued with a destructive instinct in part so as relentlessly and ruthlessly to shape the species for the potential of future survival. "Get rid of weaklings!" is its atavistic litany--or re-categorize them in a clearly designated caste of evolutionary inferiority, i.e., unipolar or bipolar depression. Let me cite Fernando Pessoa, the mystical Portuguese poet:

It is not I whom I depict. I am the canvas, a hidden hand
Colours somebody on me.
I placed my soul within the bond of losing it,
And my beginning flowered as an End.
Stations of the Cross, XI; 1914-16,
Emissary of an unknown king,
I fulfil unformed instructions from beyond
And on my lips brusque phrases sound
As if they have an alien, other meaning...

I divide myself unknowingly,
Between a mission that my being has, and me,
And the glory of my King enables me to flail
The human-beings amongst whom I travel...
Stations of the Cross, XIII,; 1914-16).

I am like a room with innumerable fantastic mirrors that distort into false reflections a unique previous reality; which isn't in any and is in all of them (Frontispiece, Pessoa, 1987)/

WHO IS THE UNCONSCIOUS? (RESUMED)

Who is the unconscious? Who is the dreamer who dreams the dream? Who is the dreamer who understands the dream? Who is the scriptwriter of our life scenario whose invisible script we are destined to live out as we unconsciously receive direction in the dramatic play known as our lifeóimprovisational to us, scripted, choreographed, and orchestrated by an Otheróand Others. The unconscious is everyone who has ever lived. A primeval savage can be like a butterfly, the flapping of whose wings sent invisible echoes that continue to ricochet down the corridors of our unconscious atavistic memories. The unconscious is mother's body, which was our unconscious phantasy's erstwhile

playground, the sacred place to be defiled by the exploratory zeal of budding sadism and epistemophilic efforts. Klein (1931) states: "... [I]t is essential for a favourable development of the desire for knowledge that the mother's body should be felt to be well and unharmed. It represents in the unconscious the treasure-house of everything desirable, which can only be got from there..." (p.211).

Although Klein did not explicitly state so, it is my impression that the toddler repeats his sadistic-epistemophilic exploration of the insides of father's body as well (Grotstein, 1995, 1999). These dangerous and endangering explorations are all part of the toddler's rites of passage, necessary existential obstacle courses imposed upon him so that he can achieve a well-earned sense of heroism as "he-who-can-dare--before he is properly able to accept the oedipal covenant. At that point the toddler becomes even more aware of his own private internal domain (Winnicott, 1963). He now has an unconscious of his own but one which exists together with those of mother and father. The maternal unconscious will become the source of *blessing* and *protection* on one hand and of *repression* on the other. The father-unconscious bestows *courage* and *perseverance*.

The unconscious is the imponderable home for the Ineffable Subject of the Unconscious, the agent of record and the ghost behind the incarnation of our Being. The Ineffable Subject is preternatural yet mute and blind, consummately sensitive beyond our contemplation and consequently dependent on the phenomenal subject to forage for its survival in the Forest of Experience. It is our Other. It is "O." Though not omnipotent, it is preternatural and depends on its secular, earthly counterpart, the Phenomenal Subject of Consciousness in collaboration with the other, the object and/or the analyst for self-actualization, self-revelation, unconcealment, and transient completion. I state that the unconscious lacks omnipotence but is preternatural. I suggest further that the psyche is holographic, or holistic *and* implicate (particulate) (Bohm, 1980); that is, the psyche can be thought of as a *supraordinate subject*, which is collectively constitutive of the *ineffable* and the *phenomenal subjects*. They are all dependent on each other. The collectively holistic supraordinate subject functions holographically, much like an ant colony in which the individual ants seem inseparable from the collectivity of the colony.

The purpose of psychoanalysis transcends understanding. Disciplined attempts to avoid understanding by attuning to one's ancient inner emptiness permits the analyst to tune in both to the agony and the genius of the Ineffable Subject of the Unconscious, which is our sacred Sensor, our sacrificial sense organ which continuously assesses the welfare of our Being through undisguised experience. The moment-by-moment agony, anguish, despair, pleasure and the whole naked gamut of raw feeling are its narrative. It addresses us as if by oracle in misleading paradoxical pantomime or charade for us to decipher.

Thus, in summary, when I ask "who is the unconscious?" I am suggesting that the unconscious is personified as a *preternatural presence*, as a *numinous subject* which is the personified home of legacies from object experiences which allowed for modulations of encounters with "O" or uncompleted experiences in the form of internalized objects ("rogue subjective objects" awaiting completion and repatriation via psychoanalytic "exorcism" [Grotstein, 1996a, 1996b, 1999]). The unconscious is not only personified; it

is thus preternatural and holographic, the latter in so far as it embraces and unifies with all that it contains so as to be both implicate (particulate) *and* holistic at the same time.

THE UNCONSCIOUS AND "O": THE UNKNOWN AND THE UNKNOWABLE

In a series of works which radically revised our psychoanalytic approaches to epistemology and ontology, and phenomenology, Bion (1959, 1962, 1963, 1965, 1970, 1977, 1992) conceived of "O," an empty sign, one devoid of prior associations, to designate the ineffable, unknowable, inscrutable domain, a parallel (virtual) reality without categories that permeates our existence, much as invisible "dark matter" permeates galactic space. It represents Ultimate Truth, Absolute Reality, Ananke (Necessity, Inevitability), "brute reality." It also evolves. Rabbi David Cooper's (1997) *God Is a Verb* pithily expresses this idea. I have written about Bion's conception of "O" elsewhere (Grotstein, 1993, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1999). Let me restate briefly how Bion's "O" alters our conception of the unconscious.

Freud's (1915) conception of the unconscious is characterized by the primacy of the instinctual drives, which seek peremptorily to irrupt into consciousness. Whereas Freud (1920) discovered the death instinct, he seems to have emphasized the functioning of libido. Klein (1935) on the other hand gave primacy of original function to the death instinct. With the postulation of "O," however, we have a new and more cosmic entity to consider. Absolute Truth and/or Ultimate (unknowable) Reality constantly evolves and intersects with our consciousness, thereby compelling us, as inherent "scarlet pimpernels," to enfold our leaves of awareness and become unconscious to "O"'s intersection with us; i.e., to become "unconscious" of the unconscious.

What does this mean, "to become unconscious of the unconscious? Perhaps we can suppose that once we were a unitary psyche, which had to divide in our consciousness as we "shrank" from our cosmic selves. This shrinking of the self finds parallels in the creation myths within the *Upanishads* and the *Zohar* and *Lurianic Kabbalah*. In more prosaic psychoanalytic conceptualization this shrinking would occur in terms of shedding one's infantile omnipotence as one accepts reality. Thus, two consciousnesses become dissociated from one another and one, sits, as it were, on the lap of the other no longer aware of the consciousness of the Other from whom it has been forever dissociated. Only of the derivative sign-language of gestures, images, symptoms, and dreams from the Other, who speaks to it in paradox.

The "lap consciousness," which we call the unconscious, emerges as the ineffable subject, but it is interpenetrated by the transcendental a priori's of the primal unconscious and with the "dark matter" of evolving "O." In other words, "O"'s constant evolutions create a chaotic atmosphere with which the ineffable subject is attuned, but not the phenomenal subject of consciousness. Freud thought that the drives were primary. We can infer from Bion that the evolutions of "O" are primary and organizing/disorganizing for the psyche and that the drives and affects seek to embrace, regulate, mediate, and transform, not "O," per se, but one's *experience* of "O." Bion (1965) speaks of "transformations in *ö*Ö." I

differ with him. "O" is never transformed; it is immutable. What transforms is our *experience* of "O" in regard to our intersection with it.

Put another way, the unconscious is experienced as chaotic, not because of the peremptoriness of the drives, but because of the constantly surging evolutions of infinite "O" as it intersects our finite presence. Put yet another way, The unconscious irrupts as inexorable Truth and Reality for us to accept and contemplate. The drives and affects seek to modulate them.

Bion (1965, 1970, 1992) lists "Godhead" as one of the synonyms of "O" along with "beta elements," "*noumena*," "Ideal Forms," "Ultimate Reality," "Absolute Truth," etc. His use of this synonym conveyed to me, first of all, that there could be no such thing as an "unmentalized element" as a "beta element" per se. The beta element is mental all along, Our failure to realize it is the problem of our human blindness that awaits analysis. Second of all, it conveyed that the unconscious can be thought of as a "*resident Deity within us*," an *immanent Godhead*," as it were, a concept that accords, as I stated earlier with the ideas embedded within Gnosticism, mystical Judaism and Christianity, Neoplatonism, and Zoroastrianism. From this point of view, consequently, perhaps it can be suggested that *the unconscious is as close to God as any mortal is likely to approach*. Perhaps the human conception of God may ultimately derive from a protective identification of the unconscious skyward to create the illusion of the sky God, but whose essence lies within us and behind us, as Plato long ago suggested. Recall Voltaire: "God created man in his own image, and man repaid him in kind."

NEWER CONSIDERATIONS OF THE UNCONSCIOUS FROM NEURO-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES: THE COGNITIVE UNCONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS COMMUNICATION

Opatow (1997) distinguishes between that unconscious that is characterized by wish-fulfillment and the cognitive unconscious, which he characterizes as the "real unconscious." Bucci (1997, 2001) proffers the notions of dual and multiple code models of unconscious mental functioning. She states:

Dual coding postulates separate channels of verbal and non-verbal processing rather than dominance of one code.... The new multiple code theory ...incorporates representations and processes in all sensory modalities, as well as motoric and visceral information. As contributing to the human information-processing system.... The psychological meaning of an external event, a verbal or perceptual stimulus, is defined by the total set of modality-specific verbal and non-verbal reactions that it typically evokes... (Bucci, 1997, p.81).

In a later work she states:

The phenomena that have been characterized clinically as "unconscious communication" may be accounted for systematically as *emotional communication*, which occurs both

within and outside awareness. The new formulation is based on current work in cognitive science, extended to account for emotional information processing, not for information processing alone, and emphasizes the structure and organization of the multiple modalities of mental processing, rather than the dimension of awareness (Bucci, 2001, p.40).

Pally, also speaking from the neuro-developmental perspective in regard to unconscious communication, states:

Just as mother-infant interactions are innate, unlearned, automatic, and generally unconscious, so too are many of the non-verbal interaction patterns between adults. How the patient impels the analyst to feel and behave may be as important a factor in the analysis as what patient and analyst say...People are "designed by nature" to interact non-verbally at all times (Pally, 2001, p.91).

Neuroscience, particularly its emphasis on unconscious cognition and the phenomenon of consciousness (e.g., Damasio, 1994), has added a new dimension to Freud's (1915) concept of the unrepressed unconscious. When the combination of emotional and cognitive processing of stimuli are considered, we can all the more realize that true "thinking," as Bion (1962, 1963) maintained, is unconscious, and what we have traditionally called "thinking" is really an "after-thought."

THE CONTENT OF THE REPRESSED: CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Finally, let us consider what the analyst must consider in the clinical situation when (s)he interprets the unconscious to the analysand, i.e., what is the essential content of the repressed. "Repressed" memories, to *my* way of thinking, belong to System *Pcs.*, but certainly they constitute one important aspect of the content of the unconscious. Do the drives constitute important content? "Yes and no," I answer. I consider them as mediator-components of a vaster system that constitutes the major content of the unconscious, that of *entelechy*, an ineffable and numinous vitalistic entity that is characterized by constant actualization and evolution within us, whose forward teleological trajectory we must be ready to harness or risk forfeiting. In the course of development we may develop chronic defense organizations or pathological retreats (Steiner, 1993). It is my belief that these pathological organizations behave as if we have given them life, i.e., personified and animated them with their own *entelechy*, thereby setting up contrary (regressive) trajectories that handicap us and eschew our progress.

Side-by-side with normal developmental *entelechy* lies Bion's (1965, 1970) "O," which is his way of talking about the infinite dimensions of the Absolute Truth about Ultimate Reality, both within and without, which is also in a constant state of evolving, thereby

committing us constantly to maintain our balance as we are confronted by its relentless evolutions.

"ALL THE UNPUBLISHED VIRTUES OF THIS EARTH.."

One must consider System *Ucs.* as a virtually infinite reservoir of undiscovered wisdom just as one must consider Mother Nature as an infinite source of material discoveries. Man's genius either locates the hidden treasure of knowledge or is able to conceive of combinations and permutations of existing data to create ever-evolving ideas and discoveries. The "unpublished virtues of this earth," both internal and external, are always awaiting us. Some geniuses can intuit incredible combinations. Mozart allegedly did not compose his music in the traditional way. He "received" the final score and merely was the scribe for an ineffable composer within him. It has been reported that Michelangelo could visualize the finished form within the marble and "cut away what he didn't need" in order to release the "prisoner from the marble." And there must be awe and wonder about the unconscious as if it were a deity in its own right, but a handicapped deity that needs man to receive and incarnate its message so that its mysterious mission can be accomplished..

World, world, I am scared
and waver in awe before the wilderness
of raw consciousness, because it is all
dark and formlessness; and it is real
this passion that we feel for forms.
But the forms are never real,
Are not really there. Are not.

From W.M. Bronk (1956) *Light and Dark*. Origin: New York

SUMMARY

I believe that the *Ucs.* is numinous, is "haunted" by an immanent deity (the ineffable subject of the unconscious) which is dialectically counterposed to and communicates with the phenomenal subject of consciousness. The *Ucs.* is both the seat of the truth instinct "evolving "O") and is also the first line of defense in containing "O." The *Pcs.* is the "search engine" which illuminates and retrieves elements from the *Ucs.* and corresponds to what Freud called the dynamically repressed *Ucs.* The content of the unconscious can be ultimately reduced to one's inherent evolving entelechy and evolving "O," each of which can be experienced in terms of surging, irrupting internal objects.

REFERENCES

- Beres, D. (1965). Structure and function in psycho-analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46:53-62.
- Boghossian, P. (2001). What is social construction? *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 5108, February 23, 2001.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. London: Boston & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bollas, C. (1987). *The Shadow of the Object: Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known*. London: Free Associations.
- _____ (1995). *Cracking Up: The Work of Unconscious Experience*. London: Routledge.
- Bradley, H. (1960). Human potentialities. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 41:642-643.
- Bucci, W. (1997). *Psychoanalysis and Cognitive Science: A Multiple Code Theory*. New York: Guilford.
- _____ (2001). Pathways of Emotional Communication. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 21:40-70.
- Bychowski, G. (1956). General aspects and implications of introjection. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 25:530-548.
- Cooper, D.A. (1997). *God Is A Verb: Kabbalah and the Practice of Mystical Judaism*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Damasio, A.R. (1994). *Descartes' Error*. New York: Putnam.
- De Masi, F. (2000). The unconscious and psychosis: some considerations on the psychoanalytic theory of psychosis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 81:1-20.
- Ellenberger, H. F. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fonagy, P. (1981). Meister Eckhart on the fourfold path of a Creation- centered spiritual journey. In: *Western Spirituality: Historical Roots, Ecumenical Routes*. Ed. Matthew Fox. Santa Fe, NM: Bear and Co., pp. 215-248.
- Fonagy, P. (1991). Thinking about thinking: some developmental and theoretical

considerations in the psychotherapy of a borderline patient. *IJP-A*, 72:639-656.

Fonagy, P. (1995). Playing with reality: the development of psychic reality and its malfunction in borderline patients. *IJP-A*, 76:39-44.

Fonagy, P.; Steele, M.; Steele, H.; Moran, G.S.; & Higgitt, A.C. (1991). The capacity for understanding mental states: The reflective self in parent and child and its significance for security of attachment. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 13:201-218

Fox, M. (1980). *Breakthrough: Meister Eckhart's Creation Spirituality in New Translation*. New York: Image Books [Doubleday], 1991.

Freud, S. (1911). Formulations of the two principles of mental functioning. *Standard Edition*, 12:213-226. London: Hogarth Press, 1958.

_____ (1915). The unconscious. *Standard Edition* 14:159-215. London: Hogarth Press, 1957.

Grotstein, J. (1986). The dual-track: A contribution toward a neurobehavioral model of cerebral processing. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 9(2):353-366.

Grotstein, J. (1999). The alter ego and déjà vu phenomenon: Notes and reflections. In: *The Plural Self: Multiplicity in Everyday Life*. Eds. J. Rowan & M. Cooper. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 28-50.

Henry, M. (1985). *Généalogie de la psychoanalyse*. Paris: Presses Univ, France [in de Masi, 2000].

Hoffman, I. (1992). Some practical implications of a social constructivist view of the psychoanalytic situation. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 2:287-304.

ÖÖÖ.. (1994). Dialectical thinking and therapeutic action in the psychoanalytic process. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 63: 187-213.

Joseph, R. (1992). *The Right Brain and the Unconscious: Discovering the Stranger Within*. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Jung, C.G. (1928). *The Relations between the Ego and the Unconscious*. Collected Works, Vol. 7, paragraphs, 202-220. New York: Bollingen Series XX.

Kaku, M. (1994). *Hyper Space: A Scientific Odyssey Through Parallel Universes, Time Warps, and the Tenth Dimension*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1788). *Critique of Pure Reason*. New York: Bobs Merrill, 1956. [ALSO:

Translated by J.M.D.
Meikeljohn, 1958. New York: Modern Library]

Kantrowitz, J. (1999). The role of the preconscious in psychoanalysis. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 47:65-89.

_____ (2001). The analysis of preconscious phenomena and its communication. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 21:24-39.

Lacan, J. (1966). *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc.

Laplanche, J. (1999). *The Unconscious and the Id*. Trans. L. Thurston and L. Watson. London: Rebus.

Lewis, M. and Granic, I. (1999). Who put the self in self-organization? A clarification of terms and concepts for developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11:365-374.

Matte Blanco, I. (1975). *The Unconscious as Infinite Sets*. London: Duckworth Press.

_____ (1981). Reflecting with Bion. In: *Do I Dare Disturb the Universe? A Memorial to Wilfred R. Bion*. (Ed.) J.S. Grotstein. Beverly Hills: Caesura Press, 1981, pp.489-528.

_____ (1988). *Thinking, Feeling, and Being: Clinical Reflections on the Fundamental Antinomy of Human Beings*. London/New York: Tavistock and Routledge.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *Ecce Homo*. In *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. (Ed./Trans.) W. Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library.

Opatow, B. (1997). The real unconscious: psychoanalysis as a theory of consciousness. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 45:865-890.

Orange, D.; Atwood, G.E.; and Stolorow, R.D. (1997). *Working Intersubjectively: Contextualism in Psychoanalytic Practice*. Hillsdale, NJ and London: Analytic Press.

Pally, R. (2001). A primary role for nonverbal communication in psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 21:71-93.

Peirce, C.S. (1931). *Collected Papers*. Eds: Charles Hartshore and Paul Weiss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, Vols. I-VIII

Ricoeur, P. (1970). *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. (Trans.) D. Savage. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Riker, J.H. (1997). *Ethics and the Discovery of the Unconscious*. Albany, NY: State

University of New York Press.

Sass, L.A. (1994). *The Paradoxes of Delusion Wittgenstein, Schreber, and the Schizophrenic Mind*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Schore, A. (1999). The right brain, the right mind, and Psychoanalysis. *Neuropsychanalysis*. In press.

Sells, M.A. (1994). *The Mystical Language of Unsayings*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Shlain, L. (1998). *The Alphabet versus the Goddess: The Conflict between Word and Image*. New York and London: Penguin/Arcana.

Szpakowska, K.M. (2000). The perception of dreams and nightmares in ancient Egypt: Old Kingdom to Third Intermediate Period. A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wilkinson, H. (1999). Schizophrenic process, the emergence of consciousness in recent history and phenomenological causality: the significance for psychotherapy of Julian Jaynes. *International Journal of Psychotherapy*, 4:49-66.

Wurmser, L. (1984). Goethe's relevance for psychoanalysis—some timely reflections on analysis, synthesis and form. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 4:533-554.

END NOTES

¹ I am aware that Freud and Jung, on occasion, employed "the unknown" for both domains and that Lacan more explicitly employed "the Other" both for the unconscious and for the unattainability of the other.

² I am aware that Freud and Jung, on occasion, employed "the unknown" for both domains and that Lacan more explicitly employed "the Other" both for the unconscious and for the unattainability of the other.

³ Teleology is an Aristotelean concept, related to entelechy, that designates the ultimate destiny of a living form when realized.

⁴ Entelechy, according to Aristotle, is that vitalistic capacity dormant within all living forms, which when activated, seeks teleologically to actualize itself by achieving its ultimate fulfillment as a life form. It may be understood as the vitalistic aspect of development. For other references on entelechy see: (Beres, 1965; Bradley, 1960; Bychowski, 1956; Maslow, 1968, 1970, 1971, and Wurmser, 1984).

⁵ An agreement was reached at the "Controversial Discussions" in London in 1943 that Kleinians would use the spelling *phantasy* and (Anna) Freudians would use *fantasy* (King and Steiner, 1992).

⁶ Space limitations unfortunately do not permit my including such relevant mystical works of Jorge Luis Borges as "The Book of Sand," "the Aleph," "The Library of Babel.," and "The Lottery of Babylon," amongst others.

⁷ A "*numen*" was originally the local deity of a place.

⁸ In ancient matriarchal Greece the snake was sacred to Mother Earth. It constitutes the totem of the medical caduceus.

⁹ Bion's conception of "O" is associated with Absolute Truth, Ultimate Reality, Direct Experience, beta elements, the analytic object, Peirce's (1931) "brute reality," Ricoeur's (1970) "*Ananke*" (Necessity), Lacan's (1966) the "Register of the Real," and Kant's (1798) things-in-themselves and *noumena*. It is also associated with "thoughts without a thinker and the godhead.

¹⁰ James Strachey, the editor of the *Standard Edition*, states in a footnote: "Oddly enough it was Breuer, in his theoretical contribution to the *Studies*, who was the first to make a reasoned defence of unconscious ideas (*Standard Ed.*, **2**, 222f.)."

¹¹ In another footnote Strachey states: "For English readers...there is a further ambiguity in the word 'unconscious' which is scarcely present in the German. The German words *ëbewusstí* and "*unbewusstí* have the grammatical form of passive participles, and their usual sense is something like 'ëconsciously known' and 'ënot consciously known.'"

¹² I "translate" "representations" into "presences" in order to convey their preternatural nature.

¹³ As a matter of fact, this reversal of perspectives whereby System *Cs.* is viewed from the vantage point of System *Ucs.* characterizes the perspective of Melanie Klein and her followers.

¹⁴ See Grotstein (1998), "Bion, the Pariah of *Öf.*"

¹⁵ I wonder if Masi would agree that this latter distinction could otherwise be understood as that between the unrepressed *Ucs.* and the dynamically (after-)repressed *Ucs.*

¹⁶ Italics are mine.

¹⁷ Three subsets within the concept of cosmology are the myths of *creation*, *apocalypse (end-of-the-world)*, and *eschatology*, each comprising a mythical dimension of circumstance or Necessity and a cyclical cultural response to it.

¹⁸ Freud (1923) also told us that the Oedipus complex itself is inherited along with the drives. This strongly suggests that it too is one of the anticipatory Kantian *noumena*. In fact, he states: "The id contains everything that is inherited, that is present at birth, that is laid down in the constitution" (Freud, S. [1940], p.145).

¹⁹ I formerly thought that the toddler must "*submit*" to the oedipal covenant, but thanks to Marilyn Charlesí clarification, I now chose "*accept*."