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In *Forms of Intersubjectivity in Infant Research and Adult Attachment*, authors Beatrice Beebe, Steven Knoblauch, Judith Rustin, and Dorienne Sorter use their 10 years of collaborative work to produce an in-depth and well-constructed discussion of verbal and nonverbal forms of intersubjectivity as observed in the treatment setting and as evidenced by data generated from more mainstream child development studies. They move beyond the lack of integration between these related though often dramatically disconnected disciplines and build on infant researchers’ understanding of “prereflexive” caregiver–child interactions to offer a new theory of intersubjectivity that enhances our understanding of the clinical interaction with adult patients.

In recent years, intersubjectivity has emerged as a central concept in the psychoanalytic study of the therapeutic interaction. However, the term *intersubjectivity* has been defined in various, often slightly contradictory ways. In *Forms of Intersubjectivity*, the authors suggest that the lack of a consistent conceptualization has stalled communication and inhibited the potential for building a rich knowledge base with interdisciplinary roots. One has only to read the descriptions of “intersubjective” communication from both disciplines (provided in this text) to see the immense overlap in content and feel the frustration of intellectual worlds failing to meet. To address the concept gap, Beebe, Knoblauch, Rustin, and Sorter present and analyze many of the uses of the term *intersubjectivity*. They argue that because *intersubjectivity* has no single meaning in the literature, it is more useful to refer to “forms of intersubjectivity.” With this solution, they dispel debate and focus on the common ground. The authors are to be commended for synthesizing the disparate definitions and, perhaps more important, for demonstrating how useful interdisciplinary work can be, especially for the advancement of our understanding of the mechanisms of psychotherapeutic action.

The first two chapters compare and contrast several central theorists in psychoanalysis and infant research. From the psychoanalytic community, the authors focus on the work of Theodore Jacobs, Darlene Ehrenberg, Thomas Ogden, and Jessica Benjamin, as well as Robert Stolorow and colleagues George Atwood, Bernard Brandchaft, and Donna Orange. Although these theorists’ respective approaches are quite different, Beebe et al. highlight some important areas where their theories converge. Each stresses the importance of relational themes and, for the most part, relies on the analyst’s and patient’s abilities to symbolize and explicitly verbalize self–other experience in the therapeutic setting. Infant research, on the other hand, focuses on the implicit, nonverbal mode of communication through action sequences or procedural knowledge. The authors examine the work of Andrew Meltzoff, Colwyn Trevarthan, and Daniel Stern. Similar to the psychoanalytic theories, each of their infant theories of intersubjectivity is significantly different. However, Beebe and her colleagues point out that the work of all three emphasizes the centrality of the behavioral transaction in communication. The authors also propose that each of these theories indicates that the ability to communicate through behavior is more fundamental and develops earlier than language. Most important, Beebe et al. argue that theories of infant intersubjectivity suggest that the origin of the mind is dyadic and dialogic, and thus an understanding of this earliest, nonverbal self–other regulation is central to accessing an adult’s inner experience in the self–other interaction of adult treatment.

Building on this assertion, in the third chapter Beebe and colleagues offer a new, integrated theory of intersubjectivity based on a “dyadic systems model of interaction” (p. 10). In this model, interactive regulation and self-regulation exist within the dyadic system, and each form of regulation affects the other. This system emphasizes what Beebe and Lachman defined as the “co-construction” of an individual’s inner and relational process and suggests that the individual’s behavior is created through the interaction with the other within the dyadic system. The authors contend that the preverbal, presymbolic infant forms of intersubjectivity are relevant to the nonverbal and implicit modes of communication in adult treatment. Using the work of Meltzoff, Trevarthan, and Stern as a foundation, Beebe et al. define intersubjectivity as the bidirectional, mutually influencing interaction of two minds, although not necessarily equal in their contributions. Furthermore, infant research concepts of correspondences, matching, and similarities can deepen the understanding of the psychoanalytic process. These
pathways for sensing and responding to the other can give the analyst a window into the patient’s experience of intimacy, affect, and distress regulation.

The new theories put forth by Beebe and her colleagues are aptly illustrated by a clinical case that Beebe presents in the final chapter. Beebe discusses the case of Dolores (an adult patient she treated for more than a decade), which demonstrates the importance of implicit and nonverbal communication as well as the dyadic vestiges of early dyadic life for later functioning. Dolores, a woman who suffered both childhood trauma and multiple early losses of maternal figures, was preoccupied with the idea of faces and repeatedly used the “good face” and the “bad face” as metaphors to describe her loving foster mother and her abusive biological mother, respectively (p. 95). Furthermore, although she wanted to “find her [own] face” in Beebe’s, to develop herself through dialogic interaction, she was too uncomfortable with the immediacy of self–other, face-to-face communication to even look at Beebe, although they sat in opposite chairs. Beebe, using the face as a symbol for wishes for self–other relatedness, built on both the implicit and the explicit processes of their sessions to develop a unique intervention to advance the therapeutic process. On the basis of her research using microanalysis of videotapes of the interactions between mothers and infants, Beebe videotaped Dolores’s and her own faces, or sometimes just her own face, during sessions, which enabled Dolores to begin to see and hear her analyst responding to her — albeit initially in delayed time. According to Beebe, this experience helped Dolores to find that intersubjective interaction and ultimately to “recognize” herself in her analyst’s face.

Beebe’s discussion of this case clearly shows the ways in which various forms of intersubjectivity influence treatment, particularly intersubjectivity as it is informed by infant research; this is extremely helpful for the clinician who seeks to take into account the implicit communication of the therapeutic process. This book is not for those therapists who are interested in learning well-specified, new interventions to use in their psychotherapy practice. It is also not suggested for those clinicians who do not have some background in psychoanalytic theory and practice. It is, however, recommended for those clinicians who work psychodynamically and are interested in developing their awareness of the nonverbal aspects of treatment and the co-construction of the therapeutic encounter. This book would also be useful to those in the field of psychotherapy research as it poses new questions about the nature of the therapeutic process and suggests the importance of examining the role that implicit, nonverbal interactions play in psychotherapy. Beebe, Knoblauch, Rustin, and Sorter’s book is well constructed, persuasively argued, and highly recommended.
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A map is a metaphor for adventure, intended for a potential traveler equipped, perhaps, with nothing more than an urge for going. From the childish scrawls of a treasure hunt map to the precise accounting of a global positioning system–inspired navigational chart, a map is never a story about boundless possibilities, but always a story about possibilities within bounds. Its primary conceit, of course, lies in the fact that it suggests linear, straightforward relationships of time and distance, articulated by particular biases of topography and scale, whereas the impact of any trip will likely result more from the unforeseen, the unexpected, the surprising. A good map anticipates preferred destinations and the best means by which those destinations might be reached. Hence, the choice of map will shape the nature of the trip and, depending on the fit between it and the traveler, will to a large extent determine the success of the sojourn. **Going Sane: Maps of Happiness** is a kind of psychic travelogue exploring the many different kinds of good life—and pitfalls—to be encountered along the way. It will be of interest to any clinician engaged by a thoughtful examination of what is meant by mental health.

Adam Phillips is no stranger to foreign types of travel, having for several years traversed diverse fields in his ongoing pursuit of sacred cows and the underscoring of hypocrisy, paradox, and irony in the so-called mental health professions. Drawing extensively on world literature, philosophy, and cultural studies, in addition to psychology and psychiatry, Phillips enjoys asking probing and provocative questions and wondering aloud about the viability of manifold answers. In **Kissing, Tickling, and Being Bored: Psychoanalytic Essays on the Unexamined Life**, Phillips (1998) addressed the psychopathology of everyday life, highlighting psychoanalytic staples such as repression, denial, defense, and conflict with poignant and charming illustrations that evince more clinical wisdom than most textbooks on the subject. Similarly, in **Terrors and Experts**, Phillips (1997) explored the puzzling fact that experts routinely exaggerate their ability to deliver on what they claim to know. In the case of psychoanalysts, Phillips maintains, the problems arise when they begin to believe in psychoanalysis too concretely; when they