

- nication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Spiegel, H., & Spiegel, D. (1978). Trance and treatment: Clinical uses of hypnosis. New York: Basic Books.
- Watzlawick, P. (1985). Hypnosis without trance. In J. K. Zeig (Ed.), *Ericksonian psychotherapy*: Vol. I. Structure (pp. 5-14). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Weitzenhoffer, A. M. (1953). Hypnotism: An objective study of suggestibility. New York: Wiley.
- Weitzenhoffer, A. M. (1989). *The practice of hypnotism* (2 vols.). New York: Wiley.
- Zeig, J. K. (1985). Experiencing Erickson: An introduction to the man and his work. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Zeig, J. K. (1987) (Ed.). *The evolution of psychotherapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

This paper borrows liberally from the author's previous work, including:

- Zeig, J. K. (1988). An Ericksonian phenomenological approach to therapeutic hypnotic induction and symptom utilization. In J. K. Zeig & S. R. Lankton (Eds.), *Developing Ericksonian therapy: State of the art*, (pp. 353-375). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Zeig, J. K. (1990). Ericksonian therapy. In J. K. Zeig & W. M. Munion (Eds.), *What is psychotherapy?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zeig, J. K. (1992). The virtues of our faults: A key concept of Ericksonian therapy. In J. K. Zeig (Ed.), *The evolution of psychotherapy: The second conference* (pp. 252-69). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Zeig, J. K. & Rennick, P. (1991). Ericksonian hypnotherapy, a communications approach to hypnosis. In S. Lynn & J. Rhue (Eds.), *Theories of hypnosis* (pp. 275-300). New York: Guilford.

Sections also are included from a work in progress:

- Zeig, J. K. (in progress). *Choice points: A model of Ericksonian hypnotherapy*.

Note:

- 1 The author is grateful to Brent Geary, Ph.D., and Julia Rubens for their editorial assistance.
 - 2 One additional caveat: This paper is a philosophical position statement; it does not purport to be an academic dissertation or a scholarly review of previous work about the nature of suggestion per se. Moreover, it is not meant as a polemic to argue that Ericksonian methods are better than direct suggestions. Actually, such polarizations have little value. Again, the question, "Are indirect suggestions better than direct suggestions?" has little utility. Rather, the purpose of this paper is to prod clinicians into a better understanding of implication in hypnosis.
- Erickson demonstrated throughout his career how people respond constructively to implication - how such guiding of associates can elicit constructive mental and physical responses. This aspect of human behavior remains unchecked - there is still much to be learned. Erickson pioneered an approach whereby implication and response could be fostered. Thinking about direct or indirect suggestion is not productive in the consulting room. Rather, it behooves the therapist to study the injunction in his communication and in its larger context. What differentiates an Ericksonian approach is not the use of forms of suggestion per se - be they "direct" or "indirect" - (clearly Erickson used both); rather it is an orientation of the Ericksonian clinician of being especially alive to constructive use of implication and response to injunction.

An Ego Psychological Theory of Hypnosis and the Research Evidence Supporting it

Erika Fromm¹

I will present my Ego Psychological Theory of Hypnosis. It is a cognitive theory based to a great extent on a number of concepts developed in classical and neo-classical psychoanalysis.

Psychoanalysis was started by Freud as the Libido Theory, a theory of the unconscious and the instincts. Other psychoanalytic theories were added later, namely, Ego Psychology, Object Relationship Theory, and the Theory of the Self. Freud himself (1923) originated Ego Psychology. Object Relationship Theory began in England in the late 1940s (Fairbairn, 1946) and in the United States in the 1950s (Jacobson, 1954). And the Theory of the Self started in the United States in the 1960s (Kohut, 1966, 1971). These four theories form the broad braid of four strands of theories that currently constitute the fabric of psychoanalysis. My theory of hypnosis rests on concepts stemming mainly from the ego psychological strand of psychoanalysis.

The ego is that conglomeration of functions that comprise perception, cognition, defenses, decision making, judgment, memory, attention, imagery, sensations, and affect. The ego organizes and structures all of the above in conscious and in unconscious awareness, in relationship to the outside world as well as to the individual's inner world.

Theoretical concepts and principles

In the early 1880s Freud became familiar with hypnosis through attending the lectures of Charcot at the Salpêtrière in Paris. After his return to Vienna, working with Breuer [1955], he used authoritarian hypnosis. He demanded from his patients that they go deep down

into their unconscious and bring up with them memories not available in the waking state. Frequently in the hypnotic state they would remember incestuous experiences which, however, when brought up to the waking state, they would deny ever having had as well as having talked about in trance. Freud therefore felt that hypnosis "circumvents the ego" and gave it up.

I contend that hypnosis does not circumvent the ego, quite the contrary. The hypnotic subject or patient can hear, see (if his/her eyes are open), smell, produce imagery, thoughts, and even defenses. All of these are ego functions.

In the following I shall discuss ego psychological concepts and principles which I feel explain important aspects of hypnosis. Put together as a whole, they form my theory of hypnosis.

1. *Hypnosis as a regression in the service of the ego*

Letting go of some of one's usual activities and controls, and going backward a step on the developmental ladder in order to be able to take two steps forward, in the psychoanalytic literature is called a "regression in the service of the ego" (Kris [1934], 1952) or an "adaptive regression" (Hartmann [1939], 1958). For instance, instead of running around with a fever and continuing to work, a person with light pneumonia curls up in bed like a child, looks for hours at lightweight TV programs, and lets himself be taken care of by others. He allows himself childlike dependency in order to become independent again faster. Taking a nap or a vacation in order then to return to work with greater vigor and joy are other examples of regression in the service of the ego. Regressions in the service of the ego are non-pathological, healthy regressions.

Gill and Brenman (1959), and I (1977, 1978-79, 1979) and my collaborators (Fromm & Gardner, 1979; Fromm & Hurt, 1980) have theorized that hypnosis is an adaptive regression or a regression in the service of the ego. Hypnotic relaxation, they and we felt, causes an ego modulated relaxation of defensive barriers with a return to earlier, less realistic, primary process thinking. It is temporary, i.e., limited to the time of a relatively deep hypnotic trance.

2. *Ego activity, ego passivity, and ego receptivity*

In 1953, Rapaport initiated a psychoanalytic theory of Ego Activity and Ego Passivity. The issue of ego activity is tied to the concepts of choice, free will, defense and mastery; that of ego passivity to feeling overwhelmed and failing to cope.

I define ego activity with regard to the hypnotic state as a volitional mental activity during trance. It can be a decision by the subject not to go along with what the hypnotist is suggesting, or to go along with it because one wants to do it (Fromm, 1972). In self-

hypnosis it can be the act of giving oneself a self-suggestion or of deciding to break off the trance (Fromm, Brown, Hurt, Oberlander, Boxer & Pfeifer, 1981; Fromm, Lombard, Skinner & Kahn, 1988; Fromm & Kahn, 1990).

Ego passivity is a state in which the person feels overwhelmed or helpless and is unable to handle the situation. Except perhaps in highly masochistic people, this is always accompanied by unpleasant affect. The ego dystonic, the unacceptable demand may come from the instincts, from the external world, or from the superego (Stolar & Fromm, 1974). The person goes along with the demand -- as, e.g., the drug addict or the person who runs amok does -- even though he does not want to, or because he feels overwhelmed and experiences that he has to submit. In hypnosis, ego passivity could occur when an authoritarian hypnotist forces a patient into doing, feeling or experiencing things he definitely does not want to experience (Fromm, 1972).

In 1971 Deikman, a psychoanalyst interested in meditation, added to Rapaport's scheme the exciting concept of ego receptivity. In ego receptivity voluntarism, critical judgment, and deliberate control of internal emotional experiences are temporarily relinquished, and the patient allows unconscious and preconscious material to emerge freely. I have applied this concept to the field of hypnosis and found that in hypnosis ego receptivity occurs when the generalized reality orientation (GRO) has faded into the background of awareness. Then there exists a greater openness to experience stimuli that arise from within or stem from just one outside source, the hypnotist, on whom the patient's attention is concentrated and to whom he has a special transference relationship. Active, goal-directed thinking and strict adherence to reality orientation are temporarily relinquished, and the subject or patient allows himself to 'just let go.' The hypnotist's suggestions as well as the patient's own unconscious and preconscious material float effortlessly into his awareness (Fromm, 1976, 1977, 1979).

With regard to self-hypnosis, I hypothesized that ego receptivity would be an important variable. When the ego is receptive, defenses are supposed to be relaxed, allowing into consciousness the emergence of fluid thoughts, associations and images, phenomena that in the waking state usually are below the level of conscious awareness. In heterohypnosis ego receptivity is encountered primarily as suggestibility, i.e., increased openness to stimuli coming from the hypnotist (Fromm, 1979). Ego receptivity to stimuli arising from within, of course, appears in heterohypnosis, too, and has highly beneficial consequences for hypnotherapy and hypnoanalysis. It aids in speeding up the processes of uncovering and reintegration.

Ego receptivity in hypnosis is basically the same as what Patricia Bowers (1978, 1982-3) has called "effortless experiencing." She found this to be an important aspect of hetero-

hypnosis and creativity.

3. Primary process and secondary process imagery

Imagery is thinking in pictorial forms. It has been well researched with regard to hypnosis by J.R. Hilgard (1965; 1970; 1979). Primary process (Freud, [1900]1953) is the mental functioning typical of early childhood, that is, before reality orientation and the ability to delay immediate gratification have developed. In primary process the form of thinking is that of pre-verbal imagery. Functioning is still fluid and undifferentiated, and several ideas are often represented by a single image, or a word that contains a double entendre. Primary process thinking, to a great extent, is non-sequential and does not follow the rules of logic.

Secondary process thinking occurs in words and in sentences, in language rather than in imagery, pictures and symbols. It results from the impact of reality, and is reality-oriented. It is goal-directed, verbal thinking and operates by logically ordered, practical or abstract concepts. It is the dominant, everyday, cognitive mode of the adult in the waking state. When primary process occurs spontaneously in the healthy adult, it represents an input from the drives or from the unconscious ego, both of which can creatively enrich waking logic and ordinary modes of thought.

Primary process thinking is not given up when secondary process thinking has developed. Even in the adult waking state, our thoughts are hardly ever devoid of some minor form of imagery; and even in the deepest stages of trance or in the state of nocturnal dreaming, some elements of realism and logic can be found.

Primary and secondary processes range themselves along a continuum (Fromm, 1978-79), and no sharp line of distinction separates one from the other. The primary process end is drive-dominated, characterized by vivid, healthy imagery, or by hallucinations; the secondary process by step-by-step logic and reasoning and by full reality orientation.

Healthy primary process is particularly characteristic of the inspirational phase of the creative act and of intuitive thought. Examples of pathological primary process are schizophrenic hallucinations and psychotic thinking. In the psychotic, primary process overwhelms and drowns out secondary process logic and reality orientation.

Either primary or secondary process energy can be invested in imagery. For instance, when one plans to drive from Jerusalem to Tel-Aviv and pictures in one's mind the highway along which one will drive, one uses reality-oriented, secondary process type of imagery. It can be produced voluntarily (but not equally vividly by all people). Primary process imagery usually arises spontaneously from within. It has fantastic and non-realistic qualities. But both primary and secondary process imagery and thinking are products of the ego, because only the ego can perceive, think and produce imagery. Voluntarily pro-

SECONDARY PROCESS

- full wakefulness
- daydream
- waking entranced; fascination
- inspirational phase of creativity
- light trance
- medium deep trance
- deep trance

PRIMARY PROCESS

Table 1: Primary/secondary process in waking and hypnotic states

duced fantasy represents an ego active process. Imagery that arises spontaneously from within - as e.g. in dreams - is an ego receptive process.

4. Attention, absorption, and the GRO

Three other concepts that play a role in my theory of hypnosis are Attention, Absorption, and the GRO (Shor, 1959). Attention and absorption are concepts that stem from cognitive psychology. Absorption and the GRO have long been recognized as important characteristics of hypnosis. The former has been researched by Tellegen and Atkinson (1974); the latter by Shor (1959, 1962).

With regard to attention, I differentiate between concentrative or focused attention on the one hand, and expansive, that is, free-floating attention on the other (Fromm, 1977, 1979). In expansive attention the subject 'lets go,' and a wide variety of thoughts, feelings, memories, etc., are picked up consecutively and momentarily in the attentional field.

While attention and absorption are not concepts first described in the psychoanalytic literature, I have looked at them from a psychoanalytic point of view of my own and conceive of both of them as ego functions -- in the same way in which perception and cognition are ego functions. Attention is a cognitive function, and cognition is a function of the ego. Absorption is a result of both concentrated attention and ego receptivity. It denotes the extent to which a subject's concentrated attention has been gripped at a given moment by an outside event or by an ongoing inner experience.

5. Structural and content categories

In the studies done in my laboratory we have come to differentiate between Structural and Content variables that separate hypnosis from the waking state. Structural factors are those

that essentially characterize the nature of the state. They are: absorption-fascination, concentrative and expansive attention, ego activity and ego receptivity, the disruption of the GRO, and trance depth. Content categories comprise the phenomena of increased imagery production (Lombard, Kahn & Fromm, 1990; Fromm & Kahn, 1990), memories (particularly hypermnnesia), strong affect, enjoyable or conflictful thoughts, hypnotic dreams, working on personal problems, and self-suggestions of sensory and motor phenomena (Fromm et al., 1981; Fromm, 1988).

Shaping my theory of hypnosis

I have developed my theory of hypnosis by applying to the understanding of the phenomena of hypnosis the above-described and some other psychoanalytic concepts as well as the three others stemming from cognitive psychology. At times I made theoretical formulations first and followed them up with experimentation which would prove or disprove the theory I had made. At other times experimental findings came first and led me to add to, modify or discard parts of the theory I was building.

Pertinent research evidence

1. Adaptive regression and primary process imagery

Gill and Brenman's theory that hypnosis is a regression in the service of the ego had become a cornerstone of our thinking, but it had never been tested experimentally. In the late 1960s I found an opportunity to do this. Holt and his collaborators (1963, 1969) at that time developed a Rorschach scoring method that measures three dimensions of perceptual-cognitive functions and their implications for regression in the service of the ego: 1) degree and kind of primary process manifestations and defenses; 2) their fluctuations; and 3) content and structure of thought processes.

In the healthy individual, adaptive regression consists of a short-term going backwards for one step on the developmental ladder in order to take two steps forward. It often results in a creative act. In contrast, psychotic regression is a pathological process, a long-term breakdown of reality testing and secondary process thinking: it is not adaptive. With the Holt method one can score the increase in primary process and the ego-modulated relaxation of control and defense on the Rorschach, as well as healthiness or pathology of the content of the responses. So I decided to use this method to test whether hypnosis indeed is a regression in the service of the ego.

In the late 1960s, we gave the Rorschach (1954) to 32 subjects, in the waking state as well as in the hypnotic state. It was administered in counterbalanced order with a four-week interval between the two administrations. The subjects were selected from a healthy

normal student population who demonstrated good or excellent hypnotizability. Each subject went through both conditions with the same examiner and served as his or her own control. Our results show that in hypnosis there is a significant increase ($p < .01$) of primary process mentation. However, contrary to expectation, a concomitant increase in defense and coping functions was not uniformly present. Hypnosis had no significant effect on Holt's Adaptive Regression Scale. Only the totally well-adjusted subjects engaged in predominantly flexible and far ranging ego activity in the hypnosis condition, with a preponderance of higher level coping mechanisms. Male subjects with strong ego controls, the somewhat more rigid subjects, tended to become more constricted and to produce more maladaptive defenses in the hypnotic than in the waking state. Instead of comfortably accepting hypnosis and 'letting go,' they defended themselves against what they must have feared was a potentially disorganizing influence of hypnosis by clinging to realistic features and to more rigid intellectual functioning. They, too, produced significantly more primary process in the hypnotic state than in the waking state. But in them the expected increase in healthy defense effectiveness during trance did not occur.

I still find myself clinging to the hypothesis that hypnosis is an adaptive regression. I hope some day other researchers will pick up again where my research group and Levin and Harrison (1976?) left off. New indices of primary process mentation and creativity have yet to be applied to the question of adaptive regression in hypnosis (Dudek, 1980; Martindale, Covello, & West, 1986).

2. The modes of the ego

Other pertinent research evidence for various facets of my ego psychological theory of hypnosis stems from a research project on self-hypnosis (SH) in which my students and I have been engaged over many years (Fromm et al., 1981; Fromm & Kahn, 1990).

In this longitudinal study of self-hypnosis (SH), 33 subjects selected for high (hetero-hypnotic) hypnotizability were asked to practice SH for an hour per day for four weeks. Only highly hypnotizable subjects were selected to participate in the study. Subjects practiced SH alone, in a small, quite stimulus-free room of my laboratory, for one hour daily. No hypnotist was present or watched them. The subjects had been instructed beforehand to make daily journal entries immediately after each session, describing their self-hypnotic experiences. At the end of the four weeks, their diaries were collected and only then were they given three large questionnaires (Fromm, et al., 1981) containing questions about their SH experiences. Thus what they wrote into their diaries about the phenomena they experienced in SH was not influenced or distorted by questions we asked based on our own hypotheses. The questionnaires and the diaries were analyzed separately and

carefully. They form our data base.

One of the studies based on our analyses of the SH diaries was a study on the modes of the ego (Fromm, Lombard, Skinner & Kahn, 1987-88; Fromm & Kahn, 1990). We had postulated three modes of the ego: ego activity, ego passivity, and ego receptivity. And we had also wondered whether something like ego inactivity, a suspended state in which nothing at all happens, does at times exist in SH. We had hypothesized that people in hypnotist-absent SH would naturally open themselves up to stimuli that arise spontaneously from within, i.e., that they would demonstrate a high degree of ego receptivity in hypnosis. We also expected that subjects in SH would show ego activity in giving themselves self-suggestions. In our healthy population we did not expect to find much ego passivity, that is, a feeling of being overwhelmed by affect, imagery or thoughts, or an inability to take oneself out of the SH trance when feeling overwhelmed.

We hypothesized 1) that both ego activity and ego receptivity are likely to be present in self-hypnosis, with ego receptivity being more frequent than ego activity; 2) that ego receptivity would be positively related to hypnotic susceptibility, trance depth, and the capacity for becoming deeply absorbed; and 3) that ego receptivity is related to personality characteristics associated with openness to internal self-initiated experiences. On the other hand, ego activity would be related to personality characteristics associated with independent initiative and the need to structure internal experiences for oneself in SH instead of just letting them happen.

Roughly 900 diary reports, one for each daily self-hypnotic session of each subject, were scrutinized and scored on a 5-point scale for the presence or absence of the four ego modes. The modes were mutually exclusive and exhaustive. The results showed indeed that ego activity and ego receptivity both are present in self-hypnosis.

Ego activity in the form of self-suggestion, decision making, and problem solving provides a scaffolding for the ego receptive, effortless self-hypnotic experiencing. In three of

	Mean	SD
Ego activity	2.4427	.8043
Ego receptivity	1.6747	.9644
Ego inactivity	.5360	.5405
Ego passivity ²		

² The incidence of ego passivity was so infrequent across subjects that it was virtually nonexistent. Reprinted from Fromm et al., 1987-88, p.340.

Table 2. Four Modes of Ego Functioning in Self-Hypnosis (N = 30)

our subjects, all very rigid personalities, there was so much ego activity and so little ego receptivity, that they really were not able to go into self-hypnotic experiences of any depth. Rather than just providing structure for SH, ego activity in these cases overshadowed ego receptivity. And thus the phenomena of SH became constricted (Fromm et al., 1987-88).

Ego passivity (feeling overwhelmed), indeed was as rare as we had expected it to be in our normal population. It occurred in only one or two instances. And while we expected that many subjects for extended periods would report ego inactivity ("nothing happened"), only a very few subjects ever reported that. Perhaps our volunteer subjects were all too interested in discovering the phenomena of SH to let ego inactivity happen. Or perhaps when there is no stimulation from the outside, the ego needs to provide stimulation for itself -- as we do in dreams -- in order to keep ego structures from withering (Holt, 1965).

Statistically, our findings showed that there is a strong link between ego receptivity and phenomena indicative of a powerful hypnotic experience. Trance depth, absorption, vivid realistic as well as primary process imagery, and hypnotic susceptibility were all strongly related to ego receptivity (Fromm et al., 1987-88). These results indicate, as hypothesized, that ego receptivity is at the very heart of self-hypnosis, perhaps even more central than it is to heterohypnosis. The high correlation between ego receptivity on the one hand and imagery and absorption on the other shows that in SH the ego opens itself up and becomes receptive to stimuli coming from within.

3. Imagery

Results of the statistical analyses of the diaries in our SH studies also showed that ego receptivity and vivid imagery are the most important aspect of self-hypnosis. The presence of vivid imagery was a dramatic common denominator in the SH diaries of all but the above-mentioned three rigid subjects (Lombard, Kahn & Fromm, 1990). It, too, may be considered to be a marker of the self-hypnotic state itself: the more imagery, particularly the more primary process imagery, the deeper is the trance. Indeed, one of the studies done by our research group has shown that imagery in SH positively correlates with the depth of trance (Kahn, Fromm, Lombard & Sossi, 1989). The imagery was either reality oriented or it was fantastic primary process imagery. Ego receptivity, we found, is an essential precondition for the occurrence of primary process imagery.

4. Attention

In our SH questionnaire study (Fromm, et al., 1981) we found that SH is characterized by more concentrated as well as by more expansive attention than is the waking state, and by more frequent vacillation between expansive and concentrated attention. In trance, particularly in self-hypnotic trance, there are fast fluctuations between concentrated and expan-

sive attention. These are characteristics of the self-hypnotic state.

When we tried to score the diaries, too, for attention modes, we found that expansive attention was invariably tied to ego receptivity, and focused attention to ego activity. When a subject is in an ego-receptive state, his or her attention is expansive and free-floating. However, at times of ego activity, for instance when one gives oneself a suggestion, attention is focused.

5. Structural and content factors

Structural factors are state-related factors, variables that relate to the differences between hypnosis and the waking state. In our research (Fromm et al., 1981) we found that there are two factors that are common denominators of self-hypnosis and heterohypnosis; and one that differentiates between them. Absorption and relinquishing of the generalized reality orientation (the GRO) are important common features of hetero- and of self-hypnosis. They set the stage for all (deep) hypnotic experiences and are essential characteristics differentiating hypnotic states from the waking state. Together they form the sine qua non, the axis on which self-hypnotic as well as heterohypnotic experiences rest (Fromm et al., 1981). If they are absent, neither deep heterohypnosis nor deep self-hypnotic phenomena occur. In addition, there are two structural factors which differentiate self-hypnosis from heterohypnosis: expansive, free floating attention and ego receptivity. A good deal of expansive attention and ego receptivity to stimuli arising from within characterize SH. In contrast, concentrative, steadily focused attention and receptivity to stimuli coming from a single outside source (the hypnotist) typify much of what happens in heterohypnosis.

The content categories we established on the basis of the analyses of the questionnaires (Fromm et al., 1981) were: imagery, personal memories, dreams (usually induced by self-suggestion) working on problems, strong affect, sensory and motor phenomena induced by self-suggestions, and self-suggested age regression (which rarely worked). In the content analysis of the diaries which was done five to seven years later than that of the questionnaires (Fromm et al., 1981) and independently from it, the very same content categories were found. This serves to validate my theory, particularly as about the same occurred with regard to the structural components. It should be noted, however, that absorption did not emerge as powerful a factor in the analysis of the diaries, as it did in the analysis of the questionnaires.

Conclusions

Hypnosis is an altered state of consciousness in which the ego functions in a manner that is different from the way in which it functions in the waking state. People in hypnosis retain the capacity to observe, to reflect, to think, and even to guide the experience if they

wish to do so. All of these capacities are ego functions. While thinking in the waking state is mainly reality oriented and along secondary process lines, hypnosis is a state in which the balance shifts towards the primary process pole of the primary/secondary process continuum. The hypnotized person has greater ego receptivity than the person in the waking state; that is, most hypnotized people relax some of their vigilance and defenses and allow stimuli from the inside (their own unconscious thoughts and feelings) to drift into awareness. The material that emerges is often a significant emotional experience for the subject or patient, because the hypnotic state is characterized by greater intensity of affect than the waking state, and by a tendency to experience imagery as real.

Freud abandoned hypnosis because he thought that hypnosis circumvents the ego (Freud, 18...). This statement, however, I feel I have proven to be wrong. Many of the absolutely essential characteristics of hypnosis are actually ego functions: ego receptivity and ego activity, primary and secondary process thinking, concentrated and expansive attention, imagery, absorption, hypermnnesia, and heightened affect. The state-dependent capacity to move back and forth. From unconscious to conscious experience, from secondary process to primary process thinking, from experiencing to observing ego, from ego activity to ego receptivity, from concentrated to expansive attention and vice versa, facilitates problem solving and coping, which also, of course, are ego functions. It is this mobility, this tendency to vacillate so easily within each of the above-named bipolar parameters of the ego, and the increase in such ego functions as imagery and available memory, that creates the major advantage of hypnotherapy over waking state therapy.

Our clearest and most important set of findings established a strong relationship between ego receptivity and phenomena that signify a powerful self-hypnotic experience. Absorption, trance depth, and vivid imagery all are strongly linked to ego receptivity. Thus, as we had hypothesized, ego receptivity is one of the most essential aspects of hypnosis. It represents what commonly has been called suggestibility as well as the ability and inner freedom to allow unconscious fantasies, memories, thoughts and affects to rise into awareness during the state of trance.

Hypnosis is a wondrous, "many-splendored thing." My theory, I believe, explains its essential structure and content. However, it does not cover a few other facets of hypnosis and hypnotherapy, for instance, the transference relationship. Such phenomena can only be understood with the help of either psychoanalytic libido theory, object relationship theory or self theory. Just as I believe that psychoanalysis is not only that which the libido theory or ego psychology says it is, but that it must be understood as a fabric woven out of the four strands of libido theory, ego psychology, object relationship and self theory, so do I believe that hypnosis has many facets, which can best be understood from the viewpoint

of one or the other of these four psychoanalytic theories and by intertwining the four with concepts taken from cognitive psychology. We can and must strive for a unified theory of hypnosis. But the total multi-hued tapestry that will emerge must be one that is woven from solid, well-selected strands of interesting, compatible colors.

References

- Bowers, P.G. (1978). Hypnotizability, creativity, and the role of effortless experiencing. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 26, 184-202.
- Bowers, P.G. (1982-83). On not trying so hard: effortless experiencing and its correlates. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 2, 3-13.
- Breuer, J. & Freud, S. (1955) *Studies of hysteria I: On physical mechanisms of hysterical phenomena: Preliminary communication*. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Standard Edition*, 2, pp. 1-181. London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1893-95)
- Deikman, A.J. (1971) *Bimodal consciousness*. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 25, 481-489.
- Dudek, S.Z. (1980). Primary process ideation. In R.H. Woody (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of clinical assessment: Vol.1* (pp. 520-539). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Fairbairn, W.R.D. (1952). Object relationships and dynamic structure. In Fairbairn, W.R.D. *An object-relations theory of the personality*. New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1946)
- Freud, S. (1953). The interpretation of dreams. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vols. 4 & 5 complete). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1900)
- Freud, S. (1961). The ego and the id. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 16). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1923)
- Fromm, E. (1972). Activity and passivity of the ego in hypnosis. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 20, 238-251.
- Fromm, E. (1976). Altered states of consciousness and ego psychology. *Social Service Review*, 50, 557-569.
- Fromm, E. (1977). An ego psychological theory of altered states of consciousness. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 25, 372-387.
- Fromm, E. (1978-79). Primary and secondary process in waking and in altered states of consciousness. *Journal of Altered States of Consciousness*, 94, 115-128.
- Fromm, E. (1979). The nature of hypnosis and other altered states of consciousness: An ego-psychological theory. In E. Fromm & R.E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 81-103). New York: Aldine.
- Fromm, E. (1988). Self-hypnosis and the creative imagination. In I. Shafer (Ed.) *The incarnate imagination: Essays in theology, the arts and social sciences in honor of Andrew Greeley*. A Festschrift. Bowling Green, Ohio: Popular Press.
- Fromm, E., Brown, D.P., Hurt, S.W., Oberlander, J.Z., Boxer, A.M., & Pfeifer, G. (1981). The phenomena and characteristics of self-hypnosis. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 29(3), 189-246.
- Fromm, E., & Gardner, G.G. (1979). Ego psychology and hypnoanalysis: An integration of theory and technique. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 43, 413-423.
- Fromm, E., & Hurt, S.W. (1980). Ego-psychological parameters of hypnosis and altered states of consciousness. In G.D. Burrows & L. Dennerstein (Eds.), *Handbook of hypnosis and psychosomatic medicine*. New York: Elsevier/North Holland Biomedical Press, pp. 13-27.
- Fromm, E., Lombard, L., Skinner, S.H., & Kahn, S. (1987-88). The modes of the ego in self-hypnosis. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 7, 335-349.
- Fromm, E., & Shor, R.E. (Eds.) (1972). *Hypnosis: Research developments and perspectives*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Fromm, E., & Shor, R.E. (Eds.) (1979). *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives* (2nd Ed.). New York: Aldine.
- Gill, M.M., & Brenman, M. (1959) *Hypnosis and related states: Psychoanalytic studies in regression*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Hartmann, H. (1958). *Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation*. New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published in German 1939)
- Hilgard, E.R. (1977). *Divided consciousness: multiple controls in human thought and action*. New York: Wiley.
- Hilgard, E.R. (1979). Divided consciousness in hypnosis: The implications of the hidden observer. In E. Fromm and R.E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 45-79). New York: Aldine.
- Hilgard, J.R. (1965). *Personality and hypnotizability: Inferences from case studies*. In E.R. Hilgard, *Hypnotic susceptibility* (pp. 343-374). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Hilgard, J.R. (1979). *Personality and hypnosis: A study of imaginative involvement* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hilgard, J.R. (1979). Imaginative and sensory-affective involvements in everyday life and in hypnosis. In E. Fromm, and R.E. Shor (Eds.), *Hypnosis: Developments in research and new perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 483-517). New York: Aldine.
- Holt, R.R. (1965). Ego autonomy re-evaluated. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 46, 151-167.
- Holt, R.R. (1969). Artistic creativity and Rorschach measures of adaptive regression. In B. Klopfer (Ed.), *Developments in the Rorschach technique*, Vol. 8. Yonkers, NY: World Book Company.
- Holt, R.R. (1963). *Manual for the scoring of primary process manifestations in Rorschach responses* (9th ed.). New York: Research Center for Mental Health, New York University, (mimeographed).
- Jacobson, E. (1954). *The self and the object world. The psychoanalytic study of the child* (Vol. IX, pp.75-129). New York: International Universities Press.
- Kahn, S., Fromm, E., Lombard, L., & Sossi, M. (1989). The relation of self reports of hypnotic depth in self-hypnosis to hypnotic susceptibility and imagery production. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 37, 290-304.
- Kohut, H. (1966). *Forms and transformations of narcissism*. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 14, 243-272.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kris, E. 1952 (1934). Psychoanalytic explorations in art. New York: International Universities Press.
- Levin, L.A., & Harrison, R.H. (1976). Hypnosis and regression in the service of the ego. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 24, 400-418.
- Lombard, L., Kahn, S., & Fromm, E. (1990). The role of imagery in self hypnosis: Its relationship to personality characteristics and gender. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 38, 25-38.
- Martindale, C., Covello, E., & West, A. (1986). Primary process in cognition and hemispheric asymmetry. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 147, 79-87.
- Rapaport, C. (1967). Some metapsychological considerations concerning activity and passivity. In M.M. Gill (Ed.), *The collected papers of David Rapaport* (pp. 530-568). New York: Basic Books.
- Rorschach, H. (1954). *Psychodiagnostic plates* (5th ed.). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Shor, R.E. (1962). Three dimensions of hypnotic depth. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 10, 23-38.
- Shor, R.E. (1969). Hypnosis and the concept of the generalized reality-orientation. In C.E. Tart (Ed.), *Altered states of consciousness: A book of readings* (pp. 233-250). New York: Wiley. (Original work published 1959)
- Stolar, D.S., & Fromm, E. (1974). Activity and passivity of the ego in relation to the superego. *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, 1, 297-311.
- Tart, C.T. (1970). Self-report scales of hypnotic depth. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 18, 105-125.
- Tellegen, A. (1981). Practicing the two disciplines for relaxation and enlightenment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 110, 217-226.

Tellegen, A., & Atkinson, G. (1974). Openness to absorbing and self-altering experiences ("absorption"), a trait related to hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 83, 268-277.

Note:

1 An earlier version of this paper was published by International Universities Press in a book by Erika Fromm and Michael R. Nash entitled "Psychoanalysis and Hypnoanalysis".

Freud between Breuer and Bernheim: Some Comments on the Origins of Psychoanalysis

Franz Christian Kinzel

■ Since Freud, the notion has been prevalent in psychoanalytic literature that the so-called „cathartic method“, inaugurated by Breuer during the treatment of Anna O., represents the epistemological starting point of psychoanalytic methodology. Yet, a thorough study of the works of Breuer and Freud shows that such a view cannot be maintained. This paper will propose a different reading: Firstly, the concept of the „cathartic method“ is the final theoretical reflection that existed, at the earliest, at the moment the Preliminary Communication (Vorläufige Mitteilung) was published in 1893 and not yet during the treatment of the patient. Secondly, the treatment of Anna O. and Breuer's method were not, in contrast to Breuer's therapeutic approach, a direct guidance in Freud's practical work; Freud did not refer to Breuer's method until he had already stopped using hypnosis as a therapeutic supplement in his treatments.

Over a long period of time the official canon of Freud's psychoanalytic literature has been limited to those writings that were available in the Standard Edition. Many of Freud's early writings on hypnosis or cocaine were neither known to the general public nor experts. This has led to the conclusion that the birth of psychoanalysis coincided with the publication of the Preliminary Communication (1893) or the Studies on Hysteria (1895) respectively. In these as well as in later writings both Breuer and Freud refer to Breuer's treatment of Anna O. and the cathartic method inaugurated during this treatment; this may give the impression that the case of Anna O. was the starting point of Freud's paradigm, the theoretical „big bang“ of psychoanalysis so to speak. Although the therapeutic work with this patient was important for the development of psychoanalytic theory, such a reduced historical perspective obstructs a clear view of the concrete evolution of therapeutic treatment and the methodical integration of the resulting data.

We may interpret the case description of Anna O. which is Breuer's only report of a tre-