# Toward a Double Bind Theory of Borderline Personality Disorder

Mark L. Ruffalo[1,2,3] and Jerold J. Kreisman[4]

1. University of Central Florida College of Medicine

2. Department of Psychiatry, Tufts University School of Medicine

3. The New Jersey Institute for Training in Psychoanalysis

4. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neuroscience, Saint Louis University School of Medicine

This is the accepted manuscript of an article published in the *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*.

The final version of record is available via the publisher.

Citation: Ruffalo, M. L., & Kreisman, J. J. (2026). Toward a double bind theory of borderline personality disorder. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 90*(2), 168–185.

https://doi.org/10.1521/bumc.2026.90.2.168

Disclosures and Acknowledgements: None

Grant Support: None

Abstract

This paper revisits the Bateson Group's concept of the double bind, originally proposed as an etiological theory of schizophrenia, and reinterprets it as a central framework for understanding borderline personality disorder (BPD). We propose that paradoxical communication patterns in early development, characterized by contradictory and entrapping messages, become internalized and give rise to the structural and interpersonal paradoxes that define BPD. Drawing upon psychodynamic theory, empirical research, and contemporary object relations perspectives, we conceptualize BPD as a "disorder of paradox" in which love and fear, autonomy and dependence, approach and avoidance coexist in irresolvable tension. The double bind provides a unifying model linking developmental origins, phenomenology, and clinical manifestations of BPD, while illuminating the transference dilemmas encountered in psychotherapy. Understanding paradox as the organizing principle of BPD restores coherence and depth to the disorder's psychodynamic formulation and offers guidance for treatment.

*Keywords:* Borderline personality disorder, BPD, double bind, communication theory, paradox

*"God, why don't you love me, oh you do, I'll see you later."- Follies (musical), by Stephen Sondheim and James Goldman*

A paradox is a contradiction that follows correct deduction from consistent premises (Watzlawick et al., 1967). A common form of paradox is the *double bind,* defined by Weakland and Jackson (1967) as "a hostile dependent involvement where one of the parties insists on a response to multiple orders of messages which are mutually contradictory, and the other cannot comment on these contradictions or escape from the situation." These communications trap the recipient in a no-win dilemma. In the 1950s, the Bateson Group at the Palo Alto Mental Research Institute famously theorized that double bind communications were etiological in schizophrenia, hypothesizing that the pre-schizophrenic child was routinely subjected to such dilemmas in early life (Bateson et al., 1956). The authors described how the so-called *schizophrenogenic* mother might verbalize "I love you" while behaving coldly and turning away from the child, then punishing the child for not reciprocating her cryptic affection. After the development of the neuroleptics, interest in these etiological theories waned, and schizophrenia came to be viewed as a predominantly biological disease.

Although the double bind hypothesis fell out of favor as an explanation for schizophrenia, the conceptual framework it introduced remains powerful for understanding disorders characterized by interpersonal dysfunction. Previously, in various writings, we have each applied the double bind theory to an understanding of borderline personality disorder (BPD), proposing that paradox is a key feature of the disorder (Kreisman & Straus, 1989); that the borderline patient routinely engages in double bind communication (Kreisman, 2024; Ruffalo, 2024, 2025a); and that the child who goes on to develop BPD is subjected to paradoxical situations which are internalized and come to define his or her mode of relating to others (Ruffalo, 2025b).

Multiple forms of double bind communication have been theorized to be implicated in BPD (Ruffalo, 2025b), and empirical research demonstrates that patients with personality disorders are more likely to use language that reflects double bind communication (Rucker & Ruffalo, 2025). In this paper, we seek to expand on these notions and provide a more comprehensive account of the nature of double bind paradoxes in the origin and phenomenology of BPD.

It is curious that Bateson et al. (1956) developed their double bind theory of schizophrenia at a time when the basic problems of BPD were thought to represent "latent," (Bleuler, 1911/1950), "ambulatory" (Zillborg, 1941), "pseudoneurotic" (Hoch & Polatin, 1949), "subclinical" (Peterson, 1954), or "borderline" (Knight, 1953) forms of schizophrenia. The syndrome was not recognized as a personality disorder until 1980 in DSM-III. Indeed, BPD was historically considered to occupy a "border line" (Stern, 1938) position between the psychoneuroses and the psychoses. Gunderson, who identified BPD as a distinct syndrome, sought to highlight psychotic symptoms in the diagnostic criteria for BPD (Decker, 2013), writing in his seminal textbook that "transient psychotic experiences are one of the central characteristics that define borderline personality disorder" (Gunderson, 1984). Modern research confirms that psychotic symptoms in BPD are common, disabling, and underappreciated (D'Agostino et al., 2019; Ruffalo et al., in press).

It is against this backdrop that we seek to revisit the double bind hypothesis, not in relation to schizophrenia, but as a more fitting explanatory framework for BPD. By situating BPD within a theory of paradoxical communication, we aim not merely to borrow an older hypothesis but to demonstrate how paradox helps clarify its origins, phenomenology, and persistence across the life course. The double bind framework, we contend, provides a distinctive

lens for understanding the pervasive interpersonal dysfunction that has long represented the hallmark of the disorder.

**Developmental Origins of the Double Bind in BPD**

In their most famous paper, "Towards a Theory of Schizophrenia," Bateson et al., (1956) wrote, "From this theory is derived a description, and the necessary conditions for, a situation called the 'double bind'—a situation which no matter what a person does, he 'can't win.'" This forms the basic essence of the double bind: two contradictory messages are relayed simultaneously, and the recipient is unable to make sense of the communication, becoming trapped in a "heads I win, tails you lose" dilemma. Importantly, communication is not limited to one's verbal remarks; it encompasses all aspects of one's behavior, including so-called "non-behavior," leading Watzlawick et al. (1968) to submit that "one cannot not communicate." Indeed, many double bind situations involve a fundamental contradiction between verbal and non-verbal behavior.

It is worth noting here the difference between the double bind and an ordinary no-win dilemma. Unlike the latter situation, the recipient of double bind communication may have trouble identifying the exact nature of the paradoxical situation in which they are caught. The contradiction may not be apparent in its immediate context and therefore invisible to outside observers, only becoming evident when prior communication is considered (Watzlawick et al., 1967). For instance, a mother who tells her teenage daughter to "be independent and make your own choices," then later criticizes her for spending time with friends instead of at home, creates a (double bind) contradiction that becomes evident only when the earlier message about independence is recalled. Furthermore, the double bind situation is marked by an inability to escape from or comment on the contradiction, which we contend reflects the controlling and

entrapping interpersonal dynamic characteristic of BPD. It is this element of inescapable entrapment that renders the bind "double," capturing the recipient in mutually contradictory injunctions from which no resolution is possible.

The double bind also bears a close relationship to Kernberg's (1975) concept of splitting. In the face of contradictory communications that cannot be reconciled or escaped, the child may defensively separate incompatible representations of self and other into discrete, unintegrated categories—idealized and devalued, loving and persecutory. Splitting can thus be understood as the intrapsychic analogue of the double bind. When contradictory relational messages cannot be integrated at the interpersonal level, the child may defensively separate incompatible representations of self and other into mutually exclusive categories. What begins as an external communicative paradox thus becomes internalized as a structural division within the psyche. Over time, the alternating dominance of these polarized representations may give rise, in those biologically vulnerable, to the characteristic instability of affect, identity, and relationships that define borderline pathology.

The question of how such paradoxes become embedded in the psychic structure of patients with BPD has long preoccupied psychodynamic theorists, though few have used the terminology of communication analysis ("double bind," "paradox," "communication dilemma," etc.). Mahler, for instance, studied mother-child relationships after birth, initially focusing on children who became psychotic (Mahler, 1963; Mahler et al., 1973). She documented the child's developmental phases and focused particularly on the *separation-individuation* phase at around two-years-old when pathology may develop. At this point in life the child has been establishing recognition of himself, others, and the environment as being separate from his mothering figure. If the mother experiences this burgeoning independence as threatening abandonment, she may

either withdraw from the child or engulf him, sabotaging his efforts to achieve autonomy. In either pathological situation the child is faced with contradictory messages and is unable to conjoin mothering love with developing separate identity.

Elaborating on Mahler's work while focusing more on adolescents and adults, Masterson (1976) proposed that the borderline child was raised by a mother who encouraged symbiotic clinging and withdrew her love when the child displayed strivings towards independence. This was further complicated by the passive father's inability to counteract the pathogenic influence of the mother and pull the child toward reality. The child thus faced a painful dilemma: being true to himself meant losing his mother's love, while to retain this love required sacrificing his autonomy. Masterson viewed this dilemma to be at the core of the borderline syndrome, manifesting throughout life in a perpetual pattern of unstable relationships marked by a vacillating between intimacy and efforts to keep intimacy away.

Yet Masterson's hypothesis, formulated in the 1970s before genetic research had reshaped our understanding of personality disorders, does not account for the now-substantial evidence of heritable contributions to BPD (Leichsenring et al., 2023). Building on this, we suggest that the infant's earliest transactions with the mother may themselves constitute a kind of double bind. In this formulation, a temperamental vulnerability, such as an innate interpersonal hypersensitivity (Gunderson & Lyons-Ruth, 2008), leads the infant to reject maternal nurturance. Feeding attempts fail; the breast is refused; crying remains impervious to soothing. The mother, feeling rejected and inadequate, withdraws her affection and engagement. Later, when the infant becomes more capable of responsiveness, the frustrated and wounded mother is no longer emotionally available. (This theoretical paradigm reverses the genetic implication that borderline mothers are more likely to produce borderline children; instead, infants with temperamental

vulnerabilities associated with later borderline pathology may evoke borderline behavior from caregivers.)

However it develops, this tragic sequence sets the stage for the paradoxical dilemma that characterizes BPD. The infant is simultaneously dependent on the mother for survival and yet unable to receive her care. By the time responsiveness emerges, the maternal environment has shifted toward absence and rejection. Thus, from the beginning, the child is caught in a no-win situation: needing nurture yet rejecting it, seeking responsiveness but encountering withdrawal.

Burnham et al. (1969) described this basic conflict as the "need-fear dilemma": a simultaneous longing for closeness and dread of it, a concept later applied specifically to borderline psychopathology by Adler (1985). The child's first relational template is one in which intimacy is entwined with both comfort and threat, responsiveness and rejection. This paradox becomes internalized and forms the groundwork for later interpersonal functioning. As we propose, the earliest double bind may not be external alone but internal, as the infant comes to embody contradictory impulses of need and refusal.

It is important to emphasize that early psychoanalytic formulations often placed disproportionate emphasis on maternal influence, a tendency that has been widely criticized. Winnicott (1965), for example, famously argued that the goal of parenting is not perfection but the provision of a "good enough" environment that allows the child to develop gradually. From a contemporary perspective, paradoxical communication should be understood as potentially arising within the broader family system rather than being attributed to one caregiver alone. Fathers, siblings, and other attachment figures may either exacerbate contradictory relational patterns or help buffer them. A caregiver who recognizes and clarifies contradictory messages

may mitigate the effects of a double bind, whereas a passive or disengaged figure may inadvertently allow such patterns to persist.

Importantly, exposure to paradoxical or contradictory communication in early life cannot by itself explain the emergence of BPD. Many children experience inconsistent or confusing parental communication without developing the disorder. Contemporary research suggests that temperament and biological vulnerability play an important moderating role (Gunderson & Lyons-Ruth, 2008; Paris, 2025). Traits such as heightened emotional reactivity, interpersonal hypersensitivity, and difficulty regulating affect may predispose certain children to experience contradictory communication as particularly destabilizing. In this view, the double bind is best understood not as a sufficient cause but as one developmental pathway through which an underlying vulnerability may be expressed.

**Paradox and the Need-Fear Dilemma**

We submit that paradox represents a central organizing theme in the interpersonal and communicative life of patients with BPD. From its earliest clinical descriptions, contradictory behaviors were seen as a central defining characteristic. Stern (1938) emphasized the patient's position "on the border" between psychosis and neurosis. Burnham (1966) described the "special-problem patient" who vacillated between helpless dependence and exaggerated self-sufficiency. Grinker (1979) likened the borderline patient to a "yo-yo," teetering back and forth in relationships. Deutsch (1942) described the "as if" aspect she observed in schizophrenia, but is more accurately part of the BPD repertoire of behavior. This chameleon-like tendency alters internal and external emotional experiences to fit the current person or situation, and then can be abruptly withdrawn and directed elsewhere, even to a conflicting position. The pattern is familiar to clinicians: the patient longs for intimacy appearing needy, yet recoils with indignant fury when

it is offered, fears abandonment but provokes it, and pursues closeness only to retreat in panic once closeness is achieved. As Gunderson and Lyons-Ruth (2008) confirmed, "The adult borderline patient's interpersonal style is characterized by a paradoxical, seemingly contradictory combination of intense needs for closeness and attention alternating with equally intense fears of rejection or abandonment."

In a classic paper in *The New England Journal of Medicine,* Groves (1978) captured this paradox eloquently, writing, "Pathologic dependency presents in one of its extremes as *manipulativeness*—an intense, covert, contradictory, self-defeating attempt to get needs met. It is the behavioral manifestation of a need by the patient to get close to but at the same time to maintain safe distance from sources of emotional support. (Occasional patients feel so empty that, paradoxically, to get needs met threatens them with engulfment; they are so famished that closeness may actually make them feel merged with someone else and therefore not really alive.) Such patients seem to have a deathly fear of that which they most crave" (emphasis in original).

Sheffield and colleagues (1999), in a qualitative investigation of patients with BPD, highlighted two central paradoxes: the first being that "both closeness and distance are desired and intolerable" (the intimacy paradox), and the second that self-destructiveness can serve as a form of self-protection. With respect to intimacy, they observed that "closeness was consistently undermined deliberately, sometimes as a way of self-sabotaging in order to punish self, but more often as a way to protect the self from the possibility of being abused, controlled, or abandoned." At the same time, they noted, "closeness was greatly desired while distance was associated with loneliness and depression." What is striking in their account is the conclusion that patients *"typically manifested the dilemma in a way that made it impossible to resolve"* [emphasis in original]. Under the broader heading of self-destructiveness, they described additional paradoxes:

"bad things can be prevented (or minimized) by causing them to happen"; "pain is comfortable but also intolerable"; and "numbness relieves pain and pain relieves numbness." This suggests that the borderline individual is convinced that abandonment with pain is inevitable and while waiting for the other shoe to drop provokes it in a kind of "*hurry up and get it over with already"* behavior. And when the relationship dissolves, combined with the overwhelming sadness is a kind of certifying *"I told you so."*

Allen et al. (2005) approached the paradox of contradictory communication from a different angle. In their study, 100 participants completed a questionnaire assessing parental communication styles across four domains: appropriate, conflicting, polarized, and neglectful. Results revealed that individuals with BPD, along with a subthreshold group, endorsed significantly more conflicting and fewer appropriate communications from their primary parental figure compared to both psychiatric controls and non-clinical controls. A similar though weaker pattern was observed for the second parental figure. These findings lend empirical support to the notion that contradictory communication in early life may be one pathway through which double bind dynamics contribute to the later emergence of BPD.

Allen's (2003) family-systems formulation of borderline pathology provides a complementary clinical perspective on these paradoxical dynamics. Based on extensive observations of interactions between patients with BPD and their families, Allen describes patterns of communication characterized by oscillations between hostility and overinvolvement, criticism and dependency, and demands for both autonomy and submission. These contradictory relational expectations create interpersonal situations in which the patient's behavior is continually invalidated or rendered futile, reinforcing the experience of being trapped in mutually incompatible demands. In Allen's view, such polarized family interactions often persist

into adulthood and continue to trigger the affective instability and interpersonal crises characteristic of BPD. These observations closely parallel the communication patterns described in double bind theory and lend clinical support to the idea that paradoxical relational environments contribute to the development and maintenance of borderline pathology.

The paradoxical nature of borderline behavior is further clarified by Gunderson's (1984) observation that BPD symptoms are mediated by the patient's subjective experience of the object or other person. When the object is supportive, the patient may respond with depression or masochism, driving the other away. When the object is frustrating, anger and manipulation ensue. When the object is absent, panic and transient psychosis emerge. In every instance, the patient's reaction paradoxically undermines the very condition sought: support elicits rejection, frustration elicits rage, and absence elicits clinging.

At the core of these contradictions lies a failure of integration. Kernberg (1975), writing from an object relations perspective, argued that borderline patients cannot form stable representations of self and other that contain both positive and negative elements (object constancy). Instead, they oscillate between polarized images of all-good and all-bad, producing rapid shifts in affect, perception, and behavior. This splitting gives rise to cycles of idealization and devaluation, closeness and rejection, hope and despair. The paradox, then, is not peripheral but structural: it is woven into the basic architecture of the personality. To view BPD as a disorder of paradox is to recognize in its diverse manifestations a unifying theme that accounts for both its clinical complexity and the profound confusion it engenders in others.

Interestingly, despite the enduring clinical relevance of paradoxical interpersonal patterns, relatively little contemporary psychodynamic literature has addressed the double bind explicitly in recent decades. Modern psychodynamic research has focused more heavily on

constructs such as mentalization, attachment insecurity, and affect regulation. While these developments have advanced the field considerably, they may also have contributed to a relative neglect of communication-theoretical formulations such as the double bind. Revisiting these earlier ideas may therefore help reconnect contemporary theory with an important strand of mid-twentieth-century psychopathology research.

## Communication Paradoxes in BPD

Several specific forms of double bind communication in BPD have been described previously (Ruffalo, 2025b), and we wish to expand on these concepts here.

### *The "Be Spontaneous" Paradox*

A common form of double bind, first described by Watzlawick (1966), is the "be spontaneous" paradox. Here, one person demands or requests something that can only be given freely and authentically. A classic example is the person who implores, "Tell me you love me." The partner who complies may be accused of inauthenticity ("You only said it because I asked"), while the partner who hesitates is taken as confirming indifference ("See, you don't care about me"). Borderline patients, plagued by insecurity and fears of abandonment, often resort to such demands. Requests for proof of love, affection, or loyalty are intended to relieve anxiety but inevitably backfire. Each possible response—compliance or refusal—serves to reinforce the patient's preexisting fears. The paradox ensures that no response is satisfactory.

### *The Covert Contract*

A related paradox is the covert contract, a term introduced by Glover (2000). Here, the patient creates an unspoken agreement in their own mind about what another should do. The other person, unaware of this contract, inevitably fails to meet expectations, which the patient then interprets as evidence of rejection. For example, a woman may fantasize that her husband

will bring her a red velvet cake for her birthday. When he arrives instead with a chocolate cake she feels devastated: “You knew this mattered to me. You don’t really care.” In reality, the husband never knew the expectation existed. Yet the wife experiences the disappointment as confirmation of neglect.

A variation of the covert contract is what might be termed the inverse covert contract (Ruffalo, 2025b). In this scenario, the patient explicitly states the opposite of what they want or desire (“Don’t make a fuss about my birthday”), only to become enraged when the other person complies. Here again, the other is placed in a no-win bind: honoring the explicit request confirms insensitivity, while violating it risks accusations of intrusion.

*The Kafka Trap*

The Kafka trap is perhaps the most bewildering form of paradoxical communication. Borrowed from Franz Kafka’s *The Trial* (1925/2012), it refers to a situation in which denial is treated as proof of guilt. When a patient accuses her partner of infidelity, denial is considered merely confirmatory defensiveness, and she concludes: “Of course you would deny it—that just proves you are guilty.”

In BPD, this form of communication reflects projective processes. The patient projects intolerable feelings of betrayal or anger onto the other, then interprets their denials as evidence that the projection is true. The partner is trapped: any defense or reassurance is read as further confirmation of guilt. Clinically, this paradox often emerges in accusations of abandonment or disloyalty, and it can be among the most difficult to untangle.

*The Interpersonal Impact of Paradoxical Communication*

These paradoxes are not trivial quirks. They profoundly shape relationships, placing others in double binds that generate confusion, frustration, and helplessness. As Watzlawick

(1976) noted, repeated exposure to such contradictory communication can make it difficult to know "how one should see reality." In the words of Searles (1959), such exchanges can amount to an unconscious effort "to drive the other person crazy."

For clinicians, these patterns manifest in therapy as pressure to defend, reassure, or prove loyalty, only to have those efforts rebound as proof of insincerity. Recognizing these communications as manifestations of the patient's intrapsychic paradox, rather than deliberate manipulations, is critical. Interpreting them within the transference allows the therapist to illuminate the underlying need-fear dilemma and gradually help the patient develop more integrated modes of relating.

## Discussion

### *Integrating Descriptive and Psychodynamic Perspectives*

The conceptualization of BPD as a disorder of paradox offers a unifying psychodynamic framework for understanding its phenomenology and interpersonal manifestations. While modern psychiatry has emphasized descriptive criteria and symptomatic treatment, the double bind theory restores meaning and coherence to behaviors that otherwise appear contradictory, manipulative, or incomprehensible. Indeed, the double bind dilemma embodies most of the current DSM defining, descriptive criteria of BPD—abandonment fears, self-defeating and self-harming behaviors, unstable relationships and self-image, mood lability, etc. For example, fears of abandonment may reflect the paradox of simultaneously longing for closeness while anticipating rejection. Self-harming behavior can function paradoxically as both an attempt to distract from painful affects and a wish to extract punishment for those guilty emotions. Similarly, the oscillation between idealization and devaluation in relationships reflects the inability to reconcile conflicting representations of the same person, as was modeled by

parenting figures in childhood. From this perspective, the borderline patient's vacillation between love and hate, approach and avoidance, idealization and devaluation represents not willful inconsistency but the enduring imprint of early communicative paradoxes that have become structural features of the personality. The misinterpretation of double bind struggles as mere manipulation, demand, and contradictory behaviors animates the stigmatization that individuals with BPD experience.

The double bind framework situates the pathology of BPD within the individual's internal world, within a personality structure organized around contradiction and conflict, but recognizes that this inner paradox necessarily manifests in interpersonal life. The borderline patient's efforts to connect, seek reassurance, and establish identity are continually subverted by contradictory internalized expectations of others, reflecting the same paradoxes that organize the patient's inner experience (Gunderson, 1984; Masterson, 1976). Thus, what appears interpersonally chaotic is the external expression of an internal dilemma. This view preserves the intrapsychic foundations of the disorder while underscoring that the self can only be understood in the interpersonal contexts through which its paradoxes are enacted.

*Clinical Implications for Psychotherapy*

Clinically, recognizing paradoxical communication as central to BPD has immediate implications for psychotherapy. The therapist's experience of confusion, frustration, or helplessness often mirrors the patient's own internal state and can serve as a guide to understanding the transference. What may appear as manipulation or hostility is more accurately understood as a reenactment of an original double bind in which the patient's expressions of need and autonomy were met with inconsistent, contradictory responses (Mahler et al., 1973; Masterson, 1976). Within the therapeutic relationship, the patient may demand proof of care

while disqualifying it when offered (“You only said that because you have to”), or may warn the therapist not to become too close while simultaneously decrying emotional distance. The therapist who understands these patterns as manifestations of paradox rather than deliberate defiance is better equipped to remain empathically engaged without becoming ensnared in the patient’s contradictory injunctions.

A primary therapeutic task, therefore, is to help the patient recognize and tolerate paradox rather than to eliminate it. Efforts to resolve or correct the contradiction prematurely risk repeating the pathogenic double bind, where the therapist becomes yet another figure demanding impossible coherence. Instead, the therapist’s capacity to hold the paradox, to contain opposing feelings and communications without retreating into defensiveness or counterattack, provides a corrective emotional experience. Over time, this containment allows the patient to internalize a new model of interpersonal experience in which contradiction can be acknowledged, reflected upon, and symbolized rather than enacted.

At a structural level, the paradoxes enacted in borderline relationships reflect the same failure of integration that Kernberg (1975) described as splitting. The therapist’s interpretive stance must therefore address not only the communication itself but also the underlying failure of integration it reflects. In the course of therapy, as contradictory self and object representations are brought into awareness, the patient may begin to experience previously disavowed aspects of self and other as coexisting rather than mutually exclusive. This process, often slow and painful, marks the beginning of genuine structural change and the integration of previously dissociated affective states.

*Implications for Research*

Understanding the double bind as a developmental antecedent of BPD also allows for synthesis with contemporary research emphasizing both environmental and biological contributions. The model aligns with findings that temperamental vulnerability and interpersonal hypersensitivity may shape the infant's early interactions with the caregiver (Gunderson & Lyons-Ruth, 2008; Leichsenring et al., 2023). The double bind may represent the communicative form through which such vulnerabilities are expressed and perpetuated, an early environment in which the caregiver is simultaneously a source of comfort and threat, approach and withdrawal. Thus, the biological and interpersonal dimensions of BPD are not opposing explanations but complementary layers of the same paradoxical system.

*The Intrapsychic and the Interpersonal Experience of BPD*

The double bind framework also restores attention to the communicative aspects of BPD that have been obscured by purely descriptive approaches. It highlights that the patient's contradictory behaviors are not random but patterned expressions of an enduring internal conflict, an intrapsychic paradox enacted in interpersonal form. By understanding these paradoxes as reflections of a deeper psychic structure, the clinician can move beyond behavior management to an appreciation of meaning and function. The therapeutic relationship, with its capacity for containment, reflection, and sustained engagement, provides the arena in which these paradoxes can gradually be transformed into insight.

Finally, this framework underscores the continuing importance of psychodynamic theory in modern psychiatry. While pharmacologic and skills-based interventions have demonstrated benefit for certain symptoms, they cannot substitute for understanding the interpersonal and communicative matrices in which borderline pathology is embedded. Future research should further examine paradoxical communication empirically, through linguistic and observational

methods, to clarify how these patterns develop and change across the course of treatment. Clinically, training programs should emphasize the therapist's ability to recognize double bind communication, maintain emotional steadiness in the face of contradictory messages, and use transference interpretations to illuminate the underlying paradox.

To view BPD as a disorder of paradox is to restore to it a measure of intelligibility and compassion. The borderline patient is not simply self-contradictory or manipulative but caught in an inherited pattern of paradox, formed in the earliest experiences of love and fear. The task of therapy is not to abolish these contradictions but to help the patient recognize and articulate them, so that what was once enacted unconsciously can be thought about and understood. In this way, paradox becomes something that can be reflected upon rather than repeated, allowing for the possibility of integration and psychological growth.

References

Adler, G. (1985). *Borderline psychopathology and its treatment*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Allen, D. M. (2003). *Psychotherapy with borderline patients: An integrated approach.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Allen, D. M., Abramson, H., Whitson, S., Al-Taher, M., Morgan, S., Veneracion-Yumul, A., Kondam, S., Goswami, Y., & Mason, M. (2005). Perceptions of contradictory communication from parental figures by adults with borderline personality disorder: A preliminary study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *46*(5), 340–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2005.01.003

Bateson, G., Jackson, D. D., Haley, J., & Weakland, J. (1956). Toward a theory of schizophrenia. *Behavioral Science, 1*(4), 251-264. https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830010402

Bleuler, E. (1950). *Dementia praecox or the group of schizophrenias* (J. Zinkin, Trans.). New York, NY: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1911)

Burnham, D. L. (1966). The special-problem patient: Victim or agent of splitting? *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 29*(2), 105-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1966.11023457

Burnham, D. L., Gladstone, A. I., & Gibson, R. W. (1969). *Schizophrenia and the need-fear dilemma.* International Universities Press.

D'Agostino, A., Rossi Monti, M., & Starcevic, V. (2019). Psychotic symptoms in borderline personality disorder: An update. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, *32*(1), 22–26. https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0000000000000462

Decker, H. S. (2013). *The making of DSM-III: A diagnostic manual's conquest of American psychiatry*. Oxford University Press.

Deutsch, H. (1942). Some forms of emotional disturbance and their relationship to schizophrenia. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 11,* 301–321.

Glover, R. (2000). *No more Mr. Nice Guy*. Running Press Adult.

Grinker, R. R. (1979). Diagnosis of borderlines: A discussion. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 5*(1), 47-52. doi:10.1093/schbul/5.1.47

Groves J. E. (1978). Taking care of the hateful patient. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *298*(16), 883–887. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM197804202981605

Gunderson, J. G. (1984). *Borderline personality disorder*. American Psychiatric Press.

Gunderson, J. G., & Lyons-Ruth, K. (2008). BPD's interpersonal hypersensitivity phenotype: A gene-environment-developmental model. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *22*(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2008.22.1.22

Hoch, P., & Polatin, P. (1949). Pseudoneurotic forms of schizophrenia. *The Psychiatric Quarterly*, *23*(2), 248–276. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01563119

Kafka, F. (2012). *The trial: A new translation based on the restored text* (B. Mitchell, Trans.). Knopf Doubleday / Schocken Kafka Library. (Original work published 1925)

Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism.* Aronson.

Knight, R. P. (1953). Management and psychotherapy of the borderline schizophrenic patient. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 17,* 139–150.

Kreisman, J. J., & Straus, H. (1989). *I hate you—Don't leave me: Understanding the borderline personality*. Avon Books.

Kreisman, J. J. (2024, May 22). Borderline personality disorder and the double bind. *Psychology Today.* Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/i-hate-you-dont-leave-me/202405/borderline-personality-disorder-and-the-double-bind

Leichsenring, F., Heim, N., Leweke, F., Spitzer, C., Steinert, C., & Kernberg, O. F. (2023). Borderline personality disorder: A review. *JAMA*, *329*(8), 670–679. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.0589

Mahler, M. (1963). Thoughts about development and individuation. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 18,* 307-324.

Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1973). *The psychological birth of the human infant.* Basic Books.

Masterson, J. F. (1976). *Psychotherapy of the borderline adult: A developmental approach.* Brunner/Mazel.

Paris, J. (2025). *A concise guide to borderline personality disorder*. American Psychological Association.

Peterson, D. R. (1954). The diagnosis of subclinical schizophrenia. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18*(3), 198–200. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061349

Rucker, J., & Ruffalo, M. L. (2025). Relationships between language use, working alliance, and personality pathology in an inpatient psychiatric sample. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-025-09694-6

Ruffalo, M. L. (2024). A double bind: Communication in patients with borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatric Times, 41*(5), 1, 9.

Ruffalo, M. L. (2025a). Heads I win, tails you lose: Interpersonal aspects of borderline personality disorder. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 89*(1), 52-69. https://doi.org/10.1521/bumc.2025.89.1.52

Ruffalo, M. L. (2025b). Communication paradoxes in borderline personality disorder. *Psychodynamic Psychiatry, 53*(1), 27-32. https://doi.org/10.1521/pdps.2025.53.1.27

Ruffalo, M. L., Ray, A. M., Rasol, A., & Staal, C. (in press). Psychosis in borderline personality disorder: A neglected clinical phenomenon. *The Psychoanalytic Review.*

Searles, H. F. (1959). The effort to drive the other person crazy. *Psychiatry, 22*(4), 326-334.

Sheffield, M. W., Barlow, S. H., Lambert, M. J., Hoyal, H., Thompson, K. C., & Garbutt, M. (1999). A qualitative examination of borderline personality disordered (BPD) patients: interpersonal dynamics and underlying paradoxes. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *13*(3), 287–296. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1999.13.3.287

Stern, A. (1938). Borderline group of neuroses. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 7,* 467–489.

Watzlawick, P. (1976). *How real is real? Confusion, disinformation, communication*. Random House.

Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Weakland, J. H. & Jackson, D. D. (1958). Patient and therapist observations on the circumstances of a schizophrenic episode. *Archives of Neurology & Psychiatry, 79*(5), 554-574. https://doi.org/10.1001/archneurpsyc.1958.02340050082011

Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment: Studies in the theory of emotional development.* London: Hogarth Press.

Zilboorg, G. (1941). Ambulatory schizophrenia. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 4,* 149–155.