

Mag. pth. Mariia Lenherr¹

Between hypnosis and psychoanalysis - the forgotten links

Med hipnozo in psihoanalizo - pozabljene povezave

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to examine the connection between psychoanalysis and hypnosis, with particular emphasis on the concepts of transference and suggestion. This examination applies the hermeneutic method to the relevant texts of Freud, Ferenczi and many others. The main hypothesis is that psychoanalysts today still utilize Freud's hypnotic technique and its understanding of human communication, but use different professional jargon. This is a consequence of the repression within the analytic movement itself; this defense mechanism has its reasons that are discussed in the article. Freud painstakingly created deliberate boundaries between psychoanalysis and occult practices. However, he also acknowledged that psychoanalysis has inherited much of its practice and theory from hypnosis, which, in turn, connects with the transference phenomena. Over the last century, hypnosis has evolved in its role and position with regards to psychoanalysis. From Freud's acknowledgement above, it is evident that psychoanalysis is derived from hypnosis. Thus, one of the theoretical goals of this article is to investigate "the genealogical tree" of hypnosis to psychoanalysis with its "modern fruit". Freud and, later, his pupils, such as Jung, Ferenczi, and Stekel carried out a psychoanalytical dissection of the "older sister" hypnosis, illuminating the path for the generations of analysts to come. The results of the scientific research address two levels: the level of ideas and the level of personages; and the interrelationship between them.

Keywords: transference, suggestion, magnetism, psychoanalysis, hypnosis, group, crowd, history of psychotherapy

POVZETEK

Namen tega članka je s hermenevitično metodo v tekstih Freuda, Ferenczija in drugih avtorjev raziskati povezave med psihoanalizo in hipnozo, s posebnim poudarkom na konceptih transferja in sugestije. Glavna hipoteza je, da psihoanaliza danes še vedno uporablja Freudovo hipnotsko tehniko in njegovo razumevanje človeške komunikacije, vendar uporablja drugačen strokovni besednjak. To je posledica potlačevanja znotraj psihoanalitičnega gibanja; ta obrambni mehanizem ima razloge, o katerih je govora

¹ Mag. pth. Mariia Lenherr, MSc., Sigmund Freud University Vienna, contact@psychotherapeutin.work, +43 650 881 89 44

v članku. Freud je skrbno in premišljeno začrtal meje med psihoanalizo in okultnimi praksami. Vendar je hkrati priznal, da je psihoanaliza prevzela veliko iz prakse in teorije hipnoze, kar je povezano s fenomenom transferja. V zadnjih sto letih se je hipnoza v odnosu do psihoanalize razvila glede na svoj položaj in vlogo. Od Freudovega priznanja zgoraj je jasno, da psihoanaliza izvira iz hipnoze. Tako je eden od teoretičnih ciljev tega članka raziskati "rodovnik", ki se razteza od hipnoze do psihoanalize kot "sodobnega sadeža". Freud in kasneje njegovi učenci, kot so bili Jung, Ferenczi, in Stekel, so izvedli psihoanalitično seciranje "starejše sestre" hipnoze in tako osvetlili pot generacijam psihoanalitikov, ki so sledile. Rezultati proučevanja v tem članku naslavlajo dve ravni: raven idej in raven osebnosti ter odnose med njimi.

Ključne besede: transfer, sugestija, magnetizem, psihoanaliza, hipnoza, skupina, množica, zgodovina psihoterapije

Introduction

The past is never dead. It's not even past.
Faulkner (1951)

This article aims to investigate the correlation between hypnotic suggestion and transference in psychoanalysis on two major levels: historical and theoretical. In the historical overview, the relationship between 'early' Freud and his first students is investigated, and how their relationships influenced their ideas and vice versa.

Neurotic conflict can be dealt with in two ways: by increasing or reducing the defense. The first approach can be represented by the old usage of hypnotic suggestion in which a doctor, using his or her authority, prohibits the production of symptoms. The second approach is psychoanalytic, where repression is reduced by means of interpretation (Fenichel, 1945: 556). These two ways might seem opposite but both use the transference phenomenon. Freud stated that the development and establishment of "the transference neurosis" is a necessary step in the therapy. This type of neurosis gives the patient a chance to experience a reincarnation of his / her early objects and a relation to them (benign or threatening) in the analytic situation (Fenichel, 1945: 559).

Early Freud and the story of Aesculapius

"... there was something seductive in working with hypnotism. For the first time there was a sense of having overcome one's helplessness; and it was highly flattering to enjoy the reputation of a miracle-worker."
(Freud, 1925: 17)

Medicine and magic are deeply interrelated. Man is bound by the belief that when there is a need for help, there is someone who can provide relief (Zilboorg & Henry, 1941). Yet, when the problem is solved and the wound is healed, how do we know for certain, what really worked - professional intervention or faith?

From the phenomena of 'a royal touch', a cure in the form of the laying on of hands on a person suffering from scrofula, performed by English and French monarchs (Bloch,

1924; Finley-Crosswhite, 2003) to the recent studies of a placebo effect that proved that patients' improvements are independent of their awareness of the placebo treatment, the power of a human's faith in the healer and a readiness to believe, which doubtless has an infantile basis, was and remains impressive (Kaptchuk, 2010; Peciña, 2015). This is also relevant for psychotherapy. As Fenichel justifiably writes: "The more a psychotherapist succeeds in giving the impression of having magical powers, of still being the representative of God as the priest-doctors once were, the more he meets the longing of his patients for magical help." (Fenichel, 1945: 562). In modern desecularized societies psychotherapists are not seen any more as possessing some super powers in a religious sense, but if we scrutinize religion in Freud's terms, to see god as a mighty father, then a modern psychotherapist still possesses the features of a 'soother-through-the-knowledge', as any suffering unavoidably facilitates psychic regression.

This inevitably invites other associative dichotomies: reality versus fantasy; inner world versus outer life; knowledge versus belief; science versus religion. They are like Siamese twins in the history of mankind, and it is worthwhile reflecting on some peculiar curvatures of time and geography to establish which is in favour now. It is probably a proper time and loci to remember a story, which is so old that it is impossible anymore to extricate truth from the myth, the story of medicine.

In ancient Greece, healing practices that later developed into the science of medicine were closely connected with the name of Aesculapius (Asclepius), the son of Apollo and the Nymph Koronis. He was a pupil of Chiron, in the arts of healing and hunting. All of these characters have their own fascinating stories, each worth separate scrutiny. It is remarkable, that Chiron was not just a healer and a teacher, but also a magnetiser and astrologist (Smith, 1870). Hence, the myth of medicine has magic in its origins. 'Magic', as described here and further in this article, is based on the definition from the Merriam Webster Dictionary, i.e., the use of means (such as charms or spells) believed to have supernatural powers over natural forces. After having finished his education, Aesculapius founded a chain of healing centres, temples (prototypes of modern hospitals), which were very popular and remained high in demand even after his death. The temples of Aesculapius were supposedly situated in places of natural beauty, which provided a psychotherapeutic atmosphere.

It is believed that priests and monks worked in these temples. To ascertain the right treatment, the patient had to spend the night in a sleeping room in the expectation that the god Aesculapius would appear in a dream and prescribe the cure. On the following day, the patient narrated his dream to the priest of Aesculapius and was given a treatment, according to the explanation in the dream. There is good evidence that in many cases the temple priests impersonated Aesculapius in describing the cure to the dormant patients (Veith, 1965). It is highly plausible that priests may have used hypnosis (Edelstein, 1945). Patients could also exercise in the nearby gymnasiums and take baths in healing water. These procedures resemble the practices of treating hysterics just a few centuries ago - with suggestion, spooks and thermal baths. Glover once suggested that these prescriptions were an artificial external conversion, in a way - exaggerated expressions of the patient's conflicts (Glover in Fenichel 1945: 557). If one looks at the story of Aesculapius on the metaphorical, or symbolic level, one finds there all the attributes of the psychoanalytic method: the tranquil scenery, dreaming / dormant / trance-like / hypnotic state of mind, focus on the unconscious material (dreams), couch, which induces relaxation and

regression and the priest-interpreter, “the Big Knowing Other.” Thus, the ball of threads known as psychoanalysis may be rolled far back in the timeline.

In his *Short Account of Psychoanalysis*, published in 1924, Freud explicitly stated that “although psychoanalysis is believed to be born in the 20th century, any history must begin with an account of influences which determined its origin and should not overlook the times and circumstances that preceded its creation» (Freud, 1924: 191). Apparently, that ‘early Freud’ was the Freud with a keen interest in hypnotism. Hypnotism is understood in this article as the art of inducing hypnosis, an altered state of mind, in comparison to (animal) magnetism, which did not use the second signal system (speech) that much, whereas in hypnosis the speech and persona of the hypnotizer were of the utmost importance. Very early in psychoanalytic history Freud (1893, 1895, 1901), a believer in ancient European civilizations and mythology, pointed out that (hysterical) symptoms, dreams and myths are organized by the same principles as in unconscious life. Modern researchers of the history of psychoanalysis state that “theories of animal magnetism and somnambulism proved to be the most significant antecedents of modern hypnosis research.” (Gyimesi, 2017)

Freud (1925) asserted that from the very beginning of its history, the only aim of psychoanalysis was to understand so-called ‘functional’ nervous diseases, in order to overcome the professional impotence of classic medicine. At that time, psychology and psychic phenomena were outcast from the materialistically oriented health system, left to be a relative of art, philosophy and mysticism. Hysteria was the first riddle that proved that the health professionals could be helpless despite all the medical procedures deemed modern for that time.

In his Autobiographical study Freud (1925) explains that his therapeutic arsenal for treating nervous patients consisted of electrotherapy, which was totally worthless, as he found later, and hypnosis: “It thus came about, as a matter of course, that in the first years of my activity as a physician my principal instrument of work, apart from haphazard and unsystematic psychotherapeutic methods, was hypnotic suggestion.” (Freud, 1925: 16-17). While in his student years Freud was already convinced by the phenomena he observed during public exhibitions given by Hansen, the ‘magnetist’, following which, he obtained further practical experience in Paris and Nancy. By all accounts, he was ‘mesmerized’ by hypnotic sessions, which fueled the further development of his ideas. He wrote: “I was a spectator of Bernheim’s astonishing experiments upon his hospital patients, and I received the profoundest impression of the possibility that there could be powerful mental processes which nevertheless remained hidden from the consciousness of men.” (Freud, 1985: 25).

It is common knowledge that many of Freud’s ideas were moulded in his letters to Wilhelm Fliess. On December 28, 1887 he wrote: “I have thrown myself into hypnosis and have achieved all sorts of small but noteworthy successes.” (Freud, 1985: 17). Nevertheless, for him, the foggy aura of suspense surrounding hypnotism, was irritating and intolerable. He wanted to explore its depths and to have a scientific explanation for what he had discovered. However, he did defend hypnotic-suggestive therapy, in his little-known unpublished article which was mentioned in the “*Internationale klinische Rundschau*” (6 (1892): 814-818) . At that time hypnosis was criticized for being a purely symptomatic treatment. Freud argued that this definition would apply to most of the treatment methods. He was aiming to develop a causal therapy: “In hysteria, there is however a case in which

hypnosis enables us (to carry out) a real treatment, but the speaker does not wish to speak further of it at this time.” Here we read another limitation of hypnosis - resistance in a post-hypnotic state observed in the patients, which resulted in Freud moving away from hypnosis. He carefully considered hypnosis and adapted its techniques for a ‘young’ psychoanalytic science. Strachey writes: “I have found a previously unnoticed source in “*Neue freie Presse*”, 6 (1904):10. Th. Thomas, writing on ‘magnetische Menschen’, makes the following observation : “Professor Freud says: ‘Mankind has always harboured the longing to be able to open all secrets with a single key. Such a “key-word” has always been magnetism. It was and remains a word of great suggestive meaning. And it is also understandable that the mysterious power of the magnet, which has distant effects, should also have an effect on our fantasies. A factual effect of the magnet on man, or of man on the magnet, is of course out of the question.”

In *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921: 26) Freud was impressed, though expressing his antipathy to suggestion: “Such, too, was the opinion of Bernheim, of whose astonishing arts I was a witness in the year 1889. But I can remember even then feeling a muffled hostility to this tyranny of suggestion. When a patient who showed himself unamenable was met with the shout: ‘What are you doing’, I said to myself that this was an evident injustice and an act of violence. For the man certainly had a right to counter-suggestions if people were trying to subdue him with suggestions.” This statement could be interpreted as a ‘reverse echo’ to the ‘active technique’ of Ferenczi, which brought him to an uneasy estrangement from Freud.

As early as in *The studies of Hysteria* (1893) Freud began to look skeptically at the theory of hypnoid states. Finally, in his five lectures Freud writes: “Breuer’s theory of hypnoid states turned out to be impending and unnecessary, and it has been dropped by psychoanalysis today.” (Freud, 1985: 411). The first successful attempts to treat hysterics were undertaken by hypnotists, and as a consequence, doctors could no longer ignore hypnotic phenomena. The work of Bernheim and Heidenhain should also be mentioned. The crucial point here is that the phenomena of inner reality was recognized. Freud gives further credits to hypnotism in the next passage, which is worth quoting in full:

“Two fundamental and unforgettable lessons could not fail to be drawn from hypnosis. First, one was giving convincing proof that striking somatic changes could after all be brought about solely by mental influences, which in this case one had oneself set in motion. Secondly, one received the clearest impression - especially from the subject after hypnosis - of the existence of mental processes that one could only describe as ‘unconscious’. The ‘unconscious’ had, it is true, long been under discussion among philosophers as a theoretical concept; but now for the first time, in the phenomena of hypnosis, it became something actual, tangible and subject to experiment. Apart from all this, hypnotic phenomena showed an unmistakable similarity to the manifestations of some neuroses.” (Freud, 1924: 192)

Here Freud explicitly states that the unconscious was first shown and proved to exist during hypnotic séances. It is plausible that the history of psychoanalysis as we know it started when unconsciousness was determined as an inevitable part of the human psyche and as an object for scientific research. Along with a mechanism of repression, the invention of the concept of unconsciousness allowed Freud and his first followers to develop other crucial analytical concepts: psychic structure of the human mind, defense

mechanisms, transference. The latter, however, will be discussed later in this article.

Freud translated into German two books by Hippolyte Bernheim. His translation of *De la suggestion et de ses applications a la therapeutique*, appeared in 1888 with a title in German *Die Suggestion und Ihre Heilwirkung*. The second book was *Hypnotisme, suggestion, psychotherapie: Études nouvelles*, with a preface by Bernheim dated Nancy, August 20, 1890. The book was published in German as *Neue Studien über Hypnotismus, Suggestion und Psychotherapie* and contains just one footnote by Freud, on page 121 of his translation. Commenting on Bernheim's phrase, "In short, the brain of the newborn is uncompleted anatomically as well as psychologically," Freud writes: "This section contains some statements which are not on the level of present-day science, although correcting them does not interfere with the author's reasoning. Numerous experiments, most recently by Exner and Paneth, prove that the cerebral cortex responds to stimulation even in the newborn animal. Whoever believes that the brain of the newborn 'barely contains a few rudimentary neural tubes' underestimates the structure of this organ to an extraordinary extent." It seems, that in this short footnote, is reflected the quintessence of why Freud, deeply versed in the scientific tradition of radical rationalism in which he had grown up, gradually lost interest in occult practices and abandoned hypnotism in the early years of psychoanalysis. Hypnotic method was not modern and scientific enough for Freud, which perfectly exemplifies Oedipal logic: to reach a father and to go beyond the father's capabilities, to strive for separation and individuation. This schemata was repeated later by Freud's disciples, when Freud himself played the role of the father.

Freud improvised with the technique himself and also learned a great deal from another medical doctor, who practiced hypnosis, Josef Breuer. At that time Breuer was treating Bertha Pappenheim, a young and intelligent Jewish woman, probably more known as Anna O. Freud intuitively felt that success and regression in Anna O.'s therapy depended strongly on the relationship between the doctor (Breuer) and the patient. In his essay, Freud asserted, "to cure the patient Breuer utilized the most intensive rapport which may serve as a prototype of that which we call "transference" (Freud, 1914: 5). Obviously, Breuer was overwhelmed by the intensity of the unconscious sexual component on both sides and terminated the treatment. Psychodynamically, Breuer took the place of Anna O.'s beloved and lost father, and the erotic transference that she developed towards her doctor was a poli-dimensional defense: against the acceptance of loss of her father and the guilt connected with his death; and as a resistance to analyze her unconscious aggressive impulses, both object-oriented and narcissistic in nature. Back then, the phenomena of transference and countertransference were still largely unknown.

Freud creatively used the knowledge he had gained from his respected and admired teachers, Bernheim and Breuer, but eventually he abandoned them and their ideas to 'make it his way.' It would not be an exaggeration to suggest that, today we use free association and interpretation tools, where hypnosis was once applied.

First generation researchers beyond Freud: Stekel, Jung and Ferenczi

A considerable number of the early pupils and followers of Freud were interested in and researched other topics besides psychoanalysis. Some fields were complementary to each other: telepathy and suggestibility, dreams and hypnosis. It is useful to mention here

Wilhelm Stekel, Sandor Ferenczi, and Carl Gustav Jung, among others. However, the topic of innovation in the inventive approach of psychoanalysis came to be very sensitive for Freud. Many splits occurred because of the topic of hypnotism. Freud, as a teacher was known to have imposed a choice between submission and rebellion on his scholars. It is a known fact, that after a schism took place, Freud would not shake hands or, even, notice, his ex-pupils (Rudnytsky, 2002: 111).

In 1913, Wilhelm Stekel, one of the earliest disciples of Freud, published an article on his research of telepathic dreams, which he collected during the Great War, where he 'had proved' the existence of telepathic dreams (Stekel, 1950). Indeed, dreaming and hypnosis could be seen as related, members of one phenomenological family. In both cases, the common denominator is an altered state of mind, regressive, when the material from the unconsciousness is accessible. The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines hypnosis as "a trance-like state that resembles sleep but is induced by a person whose suggestions are readily accepted by the subject." Stekel published his essay in the journal *Psychische Studien* dedicated to parapsychological issues, which was founded by the Russian spiritualist Alexander Aksakov in 1874 (Gyimesi, 2017: 41-68). Stekel was Freud's analyst for eight hours, before changing his role to become one of the Freud's first colleagues. They disagreed on the setting of psychoanalytic treatment, Stekel insisted that its duration should be much shorter and the position of the analyst should be much more active (Goddemeier, 2015: 318-319).

It is a known fact that another early disciple of Freud, and later dissident, Carl Gustav Jung was very much involved in spiritualism; several of his family members were practicing spiritualists. In his dissertation, Jung examined a young woman, who was a medium and a member of his family. He combined his interest in parapsychology with his psychological interests, but he could not combine it with Freud and his psychoanalysis. Jung's taxonomy of archetypes, highly appreciated by many artists and writers, has indisputably inherited mystical traits, whereas Freud was engaged in what Max Weber has called 'the disenchantment of the world' (die Entzauberung der Welt) which he saw as a necessary step, for the individual and for humanity, in the development of greater maturity and necessary inhibition of drives, especially of the aggressive ones. In his work *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* Freud states: "I am sorry to confess that I belong to that class of unworthy individuals before whom the spirits cease their activities and the supernatural disappears so that I have never been in a position to experience anything personally that would stimulate belief in the miraculous." (Freud, 1901: 312). Jung, for his part, was in search of enchantment, a Holy Grail, a healing vision, fantasy or, even, illusion, which could undo or compensate for the ills of the world, for all the ugliness, misery, and triviality of human life and human weakness. (e. g. Jung, [1934-1954] 1967; 1948; 2009).

Sandor Ferenczi suggested many innovative ideas in understanding the theory and technique of psychoanalysis. Karen Horney later revived his feminist critique of "the master". Analysing his experience with both suggestion and psychoanalysis, Ferenczi presumed that hypnosis can operate because the hypnotizer awakens in the hypnotized subject the same feelings of love and fear she/ he had for the parents of his/ her childhood. A suggestion is, for Ferenczi, a form of transference. The medium feels for the hypnotizer the same unconscious love s/he had felt as a child for his parents. Ferenczi's paper (1952: 92-93) concludes: "...the application of suggestion and hypnosis consists in the deliberate

establishment of conditions under which the tendency to blind belief and uncritical obedience present in everyone, but usually repressed by the censor may unconsciously be transferred to the person hypnotising or suggesting.” Unfortunately, Ferenczi’s ideas cost him membership in the psychoanalytic society and Freud’s favour.

We would have had a different psychoanalysis today if Freud could have let himself be more open with his followers. To be addressed was the fact that the experiments of the early psychoanalysts with suggestion and hypnotism constituted fruitful soil for exploration in the fields of transference and others. As André Haynal has pointed out, it was through the experiments of Freud and Ferenczi in the field of thought-transference that ideas on intersubjectivity, transference, countertransference, introjection, and projection emerged (Haynal and Falzeder, 2003: 467-478). In this sense, the interest of early psychoanalysts with the so-called ‘occult’ was an important component in the evolution of psychoanalysis. ‘Occult’ is understood here as a synonym to ‘magic’.

Other psychoanalysts, like György Hidas also emphasized the intersubjective dimensions and the significance of Ferenczi’s telepathy experiments in the development of his ideas on countertransference (Gyimesi, 2017). Hypnotism was a highly stimulating and controversial topic for psychoanalysts of the first generation. Dynamically it served as space for separation-individuation processes from ‘the mighty father’, Freud, and ‘his’ psychoanalysis, which was the psychoanalysis at the time. The topics of telepathy, occultism, and hypnosis were relatively soon used (and, probably, misused) by early psychoanalytic theoreticians as a litmus test for their interpersonal relationships, which bring us back once again to intersubjectivity. For example, Freud’s paper *Psychopathology of everyday life* (1901) is full of references to examples and cases from Jung and Ferenczi.

In his later essay, Ferenczi suggests ‘an anxiety-provoking idea’, when he writes, “that the Father must die when the son grows up, explains (Freud’s) fear of allowing any of his sons to become independent” (Ferenczi, 1985: 184-185).

The fields of interest of his pupils certainly influenced the direction of Freud’s own scientific interests. But it was this circulation of reciprocal ideas which might have endangered the hierarchy in the early analytical ‘family’, where Freud needed to preserve his position at the top of the pyramid. Some researchers, like Gori (1996) have analyzed this situation in terms of the transference relationships between disciples and master. He explains Ferenczi and Jung’s interest in thought transference as “acting out” towards Freud in the absence of a real didactic framework (Gori, 1996).

If we step out of the rigidity of historicism, we may think of the analytical constellation, psychoanalytically, as of a problem of borders. Magic and supernatural powers know no borders, and this, by and large, constitutes their dread and appeal. Whereas ghosts were often the guardians of the margins and boundaries, they had respect for structure. This brings us to the novel of “Vij” (1835), written by Ukrainian author Mykola Gogol, where, to protect himself from the dead witch, the main protagonist drew a white circle around himself, so the witch could not catch him, she could not get through the drawn, symbolic and yet, real, border.

Freud had a double mission: to differentiate the young psychoanalysis from parapsychology and to guard the hierarchy of the power dissemination within the institute of psychoanalysis, on both Oedipal and sibling levels. He himself had to become ‘a Gargoyle’ of Notre Dame de Psychoanalyse to protect his temple. But, without doubt, other gifted

individuals, who elaborated on both clinical and theoretical psychoanalysis, have the right to tell their stories.

By all accounts and in the long run, the hypnosis research of early psychoanalytic history has helped psychotherapy to accept ambiguity and embrace constructive pluralism. From the ‘Nachträglichkeit’ point of view, the vast parapsychological research conducted by the pioneers of psychoanalysis enriched both psychoanalysis and hypnosis.

Suggestion, transference and hypnosis

As was discussed in a previous section, a considerable number of early transference theoreticians were simultaneously researching hypnosis and suggestion. This section investigates the way in which the theoretical concept of transference evolved. It is significant that transference as a concept was not part of the psychoanalytic corpus of knowledge at its inception (Freud, 1893, 1905; Etchegoyen, 2005). It was long referred to as a suggestion or suggestibility. Having learnt the lessons of hypnosis, Freud gradually developed the free association method, which is still the main technique of psychoanalysis today. In his work *A Short Account of Psychoanalysis* Freud highlights “the great importance” of the patient’s emotional transference towards the analyst. (Freud, 1924: 198).

It is axiomatic that the concept of transference together with the concept of resistance constitute two great pillars of psychoanalysis. But it was not always so. The idea of transference had undergone numerous transitions and metamorphoses. As early as 1895 in the *Studies of Hysteria*, Freud conclusively incorporates in his theory the idea of internal reality, which was of enormous importance for the coming theory of transference. He asserted that the essence of the transference (Übertragung) is an erroneous, false connection, which stems from the timeless unconscious to be actualized, repeated and as a resistance to genuine contact with the object here and now. The predecessor of transference can be called suggestion, although there are different views on their interdependence. Some scientists see transference as well as hypnosis as a derivative of suggestion (Ferenczi, 1952).

In some of his essays, Freud (1910, 1921, 1925) accepts, that psychoanalysis ultimately operates through suggestion if suggestion is meant as the influence of one human being on another by means of the transference. It is appropriate to mention here the work written by Ferenczi in 1909, where he scrutinizes the position of the transference in hypnosis and suggestion. He also supports the Bernheim theory that hypnosis is only a form of suggestion (Ferenczi, 1952: 92-93).

Remarkably, it was in the case of “Dora”, written in 1901 and published in 1905, which was an example of the not-too-successful therapy process (and not before), where Freud’s ideas crystallized into a comprehensive theory of transference. He suggested that during a successful course of psychoanalysis, new symptoms start to appear and proposed the following definition of transference: “... the productive powers of the neurosis are by no means extinguished; they are occupied in the creation of a special class of mental structures, for the most part unconscious, to which the name of ‘*transference*’ may be given.” (Freud, 1905e (1901: 116, my italics)). Further, in this essay, Freud places transference in a dialectical position as an obstacle and, simultaneously, as an agent of cure. Later, Ferenczi suggested that neurosis is defined as a passion for transference: the person flees from his/her suffering and, in a submission to the pleasure principle, transforms reality to satisfy his/ her desires (Ferenczi, 1952: 84). Thus, transference can be situated as contrasting

to genuine contact with another subject. By the same logic, one can regard the case of a “Ratman”, in which Freud concluded that transference could be used as a defense against memory (Etchegoyen, 2005: 87).

After thirty years of psychoanalytic studies, Freud came back to his early interest in suggestion and hypnotism. When he made the phenomenon of hypnotism the object of psychoanalytic inspection. In his essay *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921) Freud reflects on individual man as a member of a race, of a nation, of a caste, of a profession, of an institution, or as a component part of a crowd of people who have been organized into a group at some particular time for some definite purpose. Interestingly, the original title in German is *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (1921). The most precise English translation of the German word “Masse” is the English word “crowd”. Strachey’s translation of the word Masse with the word group is misleading so the word crowd will be used here. After Le Bon, McDougall and Bernheim, Freud defines “suggestion (or more accurately - suggestibility) as actually an irreducible, primitive phenomenon, a fundamental fact of the mental life of man” (Freud, 1965: 88). In this paper, he introduced a special instinct that is not further reducible - the social instinct (‘herd instinct’, ‘group mind’). He aptly scrutinizes the book of Le Bon on crowd psychology and highlights the special feature characterizing the crowd as contagion: “... It must be classed among those phenomena of a hypnotic order. In a crowd every sentiment and act is contagious, and contagious to such a degree that an individual readily sacrifices his personal interest to the collective interest. This is an aptitude very contrary to his nature, and of which a man is scarcely capable, except when he becomes part of a crowd.” (Freud, 1965: 74).

Fenichel proposed that both under hypnosis and under the influence of group suggestion “the parasites of the superego” are created, which “usurp the functions of the superego” (1945: 109). The projection of the superego happens in many circumstances, especially where groups are involved and are evolving: many people simultaneously externalize their superego on the same person - the leader of the group, this mechanism undermines the group formation. Suggestibility is an expression of the patient’s readiness and ability to reactivate and revive infantile types of object relations (Fenichel, 1945: 528).

Fenichel’s criticism of hypnosis as a method presumes that hypnosis only has any success when the passive-dependant position of the patient towards the doctor is preserved, instead of enhancing the patient’s gradual maturation. It can be argued that even today many professional situations still function with the same logic. If one zooms out, it is quite apparent that many large groups such as the army, church, some old-fashioned schools and radical parties are ruled analogously.

Another characteristic of the crowd that Freud (1965: 78, my italics) dissects from Le Bon’s understanding is the special relationship of the crowd member towards the crowd leader. Le Bon admits the high suggestibility of a crowd member, which he explains as “*either in consequence of the magnetic influence given out by the crowd, or from some other cause of which we are ignorant—in a special state, which much resembles the state of ‘fascination’ in which the hypnotized individual finds himself in the hands of the hypnotizer.*”

Le Bon continues advocating that under the influence of a crowd, an individual becomes a kind of automaton, which is no longer guided by his/ her will, which is identical to hypnosis. Further, Freud (1965: 80) proceeds with his own ideas about crowd psychology

and claims that “... crowds have never thirsted after truth. They demand illusions and cannot do without them. They constantly give what is unreal precedence over what is real; they are almost as strongly influenced by what is untrue as by what is true.” This corresponds to an early model of neurosis, in particular hysteria, where inner reality, or fantasy was predominant in constituting the symptoms.

Nevertheless, Freud admits that the group mind is capable of creative genius in the field of intelligence, as is shown above with language, as well as by folk-song, folklore and literature. It remains an open question, however, how much the individual thinker or writer owes to the stimulation of the group of which he is a part, and whether he does more than perfect the mental work of which others have had a simultaneous share.

The situation regarding suggestion can be summarized: The object has been put in the place of the Ego Ideal. Being in love is like the state of being under suggestion. The similarities between them are obvious. There is the same humble subjection, the same compliance, the same absence of criticism, towards the hypnotist as well as towards the loved object (Freud, 1965: 80-82, 112-113). Freud goes on further to compare being in love, being hypnotized and being in a group: “The hypnotic relation is the unlimited devotion of someone in love, but with sexual satisfaction excluded; (...) we may also say that the hypnotic relation is (if the expression is permissible) a group formation with two members.” (Freud, 1965: 114). This connection is of the utmost importance for understanding the psychodynamics of any group, including a large one (e.g. nation). Identification with a leader, ‘primal father’ and regression are other significant traits of the functioning group.

Freud’s germinal ideas about hypnosis were used and expanded by his early disciples. Ferenczi for instance elaborated on different types of hypnosis. He distinguished between “maternal” and “paternal” hypnosis, based on a soothing caring approach or fear and admiration respectfully. Ferenczi stated that the gender of the hypnotist was not that important, instead the transference link played and still plays the crucial role. Ferenczi shared Freud’s view that the early libidinal cathexis was at the very root of hypnosis. Ferenczi was persuaded that hypnosis was essentially a transference phenomenon.

Some important features of suggestion and transference evolved from scrutinising the phenomenon of hypnosis with analytical tools, which also allow us to better understand today the nature of human relationships, and especially groups.

Concluding remarks

It is evident that throughout their history although the paths of hypnotism and psychoanalysis have been running mainly in parallel they have at times also crossed to enrich each other. In this article, it has been maintained that transference and suggestion despite their relatively rapid divergence in the early history of psychoanalysis, both maintain a close relation to each other. Psychoanalysis has learned a lot from the early hypnotists of the Fin de Siècle. Many of the ‘first-wave’ disciples of Freud were scientifically and personally interested in hypnotic processes. The fine line between medicine and the power of (self-) suggestion throughout the history of mankind has proved to be relative. It was sometimes the reason for radical divergences from psychoanalysis and ‘its father’ Freud struggled to differentiate psychoanalysis from the spooky, magic shows known as stage hypnosis.

On the level of personalities and subjective estimation of the theoretical insights, some

personal ambitions and Oedipal strivings often had decisive importance over the ideas. Traces of hypnosis can still be seen today in different therapeutic approaches (EMDR, systemic hypnotherapy, relaxation, meditation, concentration focused stress regulation, trauma release technique etc.) and altered consciousness states (daydreaming, trance, somnambulism, self hypnosis, autosuggestion, etc.)

At the beginning of the 20th century it was strategically important for Freud to make psychoanalysis a medically respected science. Technically, in his work he was disappointed with hypnosis. His free association method that followed, helped him to reach better treatment results.

It should not be forgotten that medicine also started with a mythos that included a great portion of magic. Furthermore it is precisely through hypnosis that Freud first witnessed the unknown power of the human psyche that he later called 'unconsciousness', notwithstanding the fact that suggestion and suggestibility used in hypnosis were the only successful tools in the early psychoanalytic technique. After thirty years Freud turned to hypnosis again, this time to scrutinize it under the bright light of analytic theory. He proved that it had the same organizing principles as in a functional neurosis, dreams, groups and love couples. Additionally, he identified major micromechanisms at work in suggestion - regression, identification and contagion, which were later used to expand our understanding of transference. These principles are still relevant in understanding how groups evolve, through the externalization of the superego on the group leader, which was called "parasite of the superego." This fascinating element can be traced back to the infantile sexuality phase, where merging with an 'omnipotent' parent of the pre-narcissistic phase is the aim of a regression. Freud postulated that this formula is the same in hypnosis, in the group, in love and in the dream, provoking further investigation.

The ideas of early transference researchers have caused a lot of scientific debate in both modern psychoanalysis and hypnosis. They continue to inspire researchers from different fields and this text is further proof of that. The enthusiastic work that took place over a hundred years ago is compared to what Rudnytsky called "to blaze the trails down which succeeding generations have travelled." (Rudnytsky, 2002:112)

Historically this article focuses mainly on the early Freudian epoch and the first pupils. Although psychoanalysis and hypnosis developed into two independent disciplines, their ways have continued to cross. For example, Wolberg and Lindner combined psychoanalysis and hypnosis in the clinical approach called hypnoanalysis (Lindner, 1951 and Wolberg, 1945/1964 in Barnes, 2002: 153).

A whole new era started for hypnosis with Milton H. Erickson. "His use of hypnosis was experimental, utilizing the resources of each individual patient. His psychotherapy was not theory-centered. He conceptualized hypnosis and psychotherapy as communication. Dismissing Freudian and other theory-centered psychotherapies, he invited psychotherapists to turn away from theory and to return to practice with a theory of no-theory, cautioning psychotherapists against putting people in theoretical frames of reference." (Barnes, 2002: 151) The common ground of psychoanalysis and hypnosis is that both occur within communication and are healing through the ideas that are applied, interpreted and understood (Barnes, 2002:155).

REFERENCES

- Barnes, G. (2002). Hypnosis as a Condition for Psychotherapy. *Hypnos*, Vol. XXIX, 4: 149-163.
- Bloch, M. (1924/1990). *Les Rois Thaumaturges*. Translated as *The Royal Touch: Monarchy and Miracles in France and England*. Doctoral dissertation. Paris: Librairie Istra.
- Edelstein, E. J. & Edelstein, L. (1945). *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Etchegoyen, H. R. (1951/2005). *Fundamentals of Psychoanalytic Technique*. London: Karnac.
- Faulkner, W. (1951). *Requiem for a Nun*. New York: Random House, .
- Ferenczi, S. (1952). Introjection and transference. In Ferenczi, S. *First Contributions to Psycho-Analysis*. London: Hogarth.
- Ferenczi, S. (1950). Introjection and transference. In Ferenczi, S. *Sex in psychoanalysis*. New York: Basic Books: 35-58.
- Ferenczi, S. (1985). *The Clinical Diary of Sandor Ferenczi*. Edited by Judith Dupont. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Freud, S. & Breuer, J. (1893). *Studies On Hysteria*. S. E. Vol. 2. London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. & Breuer, J. (1893). *On the Psychological Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena*. S. E. Vol. 2. London: Hogarth Press: 1-19.
- Freud, S. & Masson, J. M. (1985). *The complete letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887-1904*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Freud, S. & Jung, C.J. (2012). *Briefwechsel*. Edited by William McGuire and Wolfgang Sauerländer. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag GmbH.
- Freud, S. (1895). *A Project for a Scientific Psychology*. S.E. Vol. 1. London: Hogarth Press 283-295.
- Freud, S. (1924). *A Short Account of Psychoanalysis*. S.E. Vol. 19. London: Hogarth Press: 191-213.
- Freud, S. (1925). *An autobiographical study*. S.E. Vol. 20. London: Hogarth Press: 7-71.
- Freud, S. (1905 (1901)). *Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*. S.E. Vol. 7. London: The Hogarth Press: 1-123.
- Freud, S. (1921). *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. S.E. Vol. 18. London: Hogarth Press: 65-145.
- Freud, S. (1925). *Mourning and Melancholia*. S.E. Vol. 14. London: The Hogarth Press: 23-258.
- Freud, S. (1895). *On the Psychological Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena: Preliminary Communication*. S.E. Vol. 2. London: Hogarth Press: 3-17.
- Freud, S. (1901). *Psychopathology of everyday life*. S.E. Vol. 6. London: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1909). *Some general remarks on hysterical attacks*. S.E. Vol. 9. London: Hogarth Press: 227-235.
- Freud, S. (1923). *The Ego and the Id*. S.E. Vol. 19. London: Hogarth Press, 1923: 1-66.
- Freud, S. (1914). *The History of the Psychoanalytic movement*. S.E. Vol. 14. London: Hogarth Press: 7-61.
- Freud, S. (1900). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. S.E. Vol. 4. London: The Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1921). *The Occult Significance of Dreams*. S.E. Vol.18. London: Hogarth Press: 173-194.
- Gay, P. (1988). *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Goddemeier, C. (2015). "Wilhelm Stekel. Technik der "aktiven Psychoanalyse"", *Deutsche Ärzteblatt*, 7: 318-319.
- Gogol, M. (1835). Vij. In Gogol, M. *Mirgorod*. St. Petersburg.
- Gori, R. (1996). *Pensées de transfert ou transfert de pensée. La preuve par la parole: Sur la causalité en psychanalyse*. Paris: PUF: 51-73.
- Gruenwald, D. (1982). Psychoanalytic View of Hypnosis. *American Journal of Clinical Hypnosis*, 24: 3; 185-190.
- Gyimesi, J. (2009). The Problem of Demarcation: Psychoanalysis and the Occult. *American Imago*, 66: 457-470.
- Gyimesi, J. (2017). From Spooks to Symbol-Formation: Early Viennese Psychoanalysis and the Occult. In Hödl, H. G. & Pokorny, L. (eds.). *Religion in Austria 3*. Wien: Praesens Verlag: 41-68.
- Hartmann, H. (1958). *Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Haynal, A. & Falzeder, E. (2003). Ferenczi and Jung some parallel lines. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 48: 467-478.
- Kris, E. (1952). *Psychoanalytic explorations in art*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kubie, L. S. & Margolin, S. (1944). "The process of hypnotism and the nature of the hypnotic state." *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 100: 611-622.
- Luckhurst, R. (1999). Something Tremendous, Something Elemental: On the Ghostly Origins of Psychoanalysis. In Buse, P. & Stott, A. (Eds.). *Ghosts: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, History*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Pausanias (1918). *Description of Greece*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Philostratus.(1910). *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Semkiv, R. (2016). *How did the classics write*. Kyiv: Pabulum.
- Rudnytsky, P. L. (2002). *Reading Psychoanalysis: Freud, Rank, Ferenczi, Groddeck*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, W. (1870). *Dictionary of Greek and Roman biography and mythology*. Boston: Little.
- Stekel, W. (1950). *The Autobiography of Wilhelm Stekel*. New York: Liveright.
- Tylor, E. B. (1964). *Researches into the Early Development of Mankind and the Development of Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Veith, I. (1965). *Hysteria: The History of a Disease*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- White, R. W. (1941). A preface to the theory of hypnotism. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, (36): 477-505.
- Zilboorg, G. & Henry, G.W. (1941). *A History of Medical Psychology*. Volume 1. New York: W.W. Norton.

INTERNET SOURCES:

- "Asclepius. The god of medicine." Accessed on September 27, 2017.
<http://www.greeka.com/greece-myths/asclepius.htm>.
- "Definition of Hypnosis". Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Accessed on October 28, 2017.
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hypnosis>.
- Placebos without Deception: A Randomized Controlled Trial in Irritable Bowel Syndrome
Ted J. Kaptchuk, Elizabeth Friedlander, John M. Kelley, M. Norma Sanchez, Efi Kokkotou, Joyce P. Singer, Magda Kowalczykowski, Franklin G. Miller, Irving Kirsch, Anthony J. Lembo
Kaptchuk PLOS ONE 2010) <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0015591>
- JAMA Psychiatry. 2015 Nov;72(11):1087-94. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.1335.
- Association Between Placebo-Activated Neural Systems and Antidepressant Responses: Neurochemistry of Placebo Effects in Major Depression.
- Marta Peciña et al. Bohnert AS, Sikora M, Avery ET, Langenecker SA, Mickey BJ, Zubieta JK).