

dyadic bond, then the persevering preoedipal tie becomes alloyed with the sexual passions of the oedipal stage; in other words, the attachment emotions merge with the wish to replace the mother in pleasing the father and to be pleased by him; this can be couched in the wish to have a baby or in its forceful disavowal via overbearing, obstreperous, self-asserting behavior. Under these auspices, a homosexual threat is woven into the ultimate fabric of the boy's post-oedipal psychosexual organization. A dyadic father fixation is not, in my opinion, a precursory condition for the homosexual drive to gain ascendancy; oedipal determinants are too well known as contributory factors which act more decisively for such a lasting outcome to be established. Should the fear of the engulfing mother or the castrating female be regressively and defensively revived at this phase, then the boy's flight to the father or, generally speaking, to a male object choice reveals the preoedipal determinants in his sexual orientation. The forcefulness of the dyadic father attachment loses normally its exclusivity, following the example of mother attachment, with the onrush of oedipal object relations. Before closing this discussion on the discrimination between the boy's dyadic and triadic father relationship, I wish to point out that the preoedipal tie is governed by the fear of loss of object availability (i.e., "love") and a delusional sense of invulnerability; the latter is acquired through attachment to the father and secured by emulation of him. In contrast, the oedipal relationship is governed by fear of retaliation and feelings of guilt. In both stages we observe jealousy and envy, yet with a difference: In the early stage, the libidinal cathexis fluctuates to and fro toward one or both parents in an interchangeable and needful turnabout. In the oedipal stage, it advances to significantly more stabilized and differentiated object ties, specific for father and mother, male and female.

The Influence of the Dyadic and Triadic Stages on the Evolution of Cognitive Thinking

In order to convey my observations relative to the development of relations, I have made use of a conceptual differentiation between the dyadic (preoedipal) and triadic (oedipal) stages in their sequential transition and typical specificities. Both stages in their normal development were described in their decisive but not identical influence on psychic structure formation, on the modulation of affective life generally, on the growing complexity of cognition, comprehension, and creative articulation, and last but not least, on the formation of social, sexual, and self identity formation. That both complexes have been coexistent but qualitatively and quantitatively variable within limits throughout keeps that essential

degree of psychic tension alive without which psychic metabolism ceases and the continuity of psychic homeostasis is in jeopardy. The residual reverberations of both complexes can be traced throughout a man's life even though they have become stabilized in preferential object relations, social role, occupation, hobbies, and character structure. Their reflexive maintenance is analogous to the healthy functioning of the body.

In speaking of the two complexes, I have always emphasized the fact that their incomplete and therefore disequilibrating resolution constitutes the "nucleus of the neurosis." Due to the limited attention extended to the isogender, i.e., "negative," complex and the almost exclusive attribution of neurogenesis to the workings of the allogender, i.e., "positive," complex, a fertile field for analytic exploration lies in front of us. This statement is only relatively correct, because in clinical work the facts to which I have alluded throughout this presentation have never escaped the attention of the discriminative clinician. However, I venture to say that the role of the dyadic father as a factor in male neurogenesis has received only marginal—i.e., case-specific versus case-universal—acceptance in the contemporary theory of the neurosis. In the field of adolescent disturbances of the boy, there has been a marked acceptance of a pathogenicity which is rooted in the dyadic stage.

There is, however, one more thought which I shall relate before closing this essay. It is a digression of a speculative nature. I mentioned earlier in this essay that the dyadic stage operates in polarities which are reflected in the split into "good" and "bad" objects. The cognitive level of thought, when restricted to the exclusive use of polarities, is of a primitive nature and of limited efficiency because complexities are dealt with in terms of simple dichotomies. The advance to the triadic stage lifts the thought process onto a higher level, or, to be exact, it establishes the precondition for this advance. We might say that the triadic complexity of object relations with the implicit rise onto a higher level of conflict formation produces an infinite multitude of possible constellations within its realm; of these, a selected few are retained and stabilized in the process of transcending the triadic stage.

The oedipal complexity of interpersonal experiences is reflected on the cognitive level in the emergence of the dialectic process. We recognize in this process the triadic nature of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The complexity of this thought process permits, by choice or by fortuity, an endless sequence of possible cognitive combinations or permutations, each pressing forward toward a resolution on a higher level of thought. We might speak here of a mental strain or tension in the cognitive sphere as a stimulus to problem solving in thought, or of mental inventiveness analogous to triadic conflict resolution, which was kept in motion by the relentless influx of antagonistic affects, such as pleasurable object