

Bartholomeu Vieira

Deleuze's Animal Magnetism as a Theoretical Parallel for the Theory of Psychoanalytic Technique

Introduction

A major question that arose within the field of psychology in the nineteenth century concerned the existence of cognitive processes that took place unconsciously, or subconsciously. The discovery of such processes marked a watershed in Western psychological thought. The reality of such processes was made manifest by experiments conducted by the animal magnetizer Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815) during the course of the eighteenth century (Ellenberger, 1965).

According to Crabtree (1993), Mesmer's work opened the way for a new paradigm of the mind. Crabtree argued that natural dissociation became the critical historical turn that formed the basis of a new psychology. It is important, however, to make clear that neither Mesmer nor his disciples intended to create the new science of psychology. Rather, they merely intended to promote the recognition of magnetism as a revolution within the field of medical science (Crabtree, 1993).

In general, Mesmer sought to cure patients through the circulation of a so-called animal fluid. According to Mesmer, this fluid flowed through all human beings and was capable of effecting a direct and external influence on a body in the same way that gravitational and magnetic forces influenced the planets. Mesmer introduced this practice in his doctoral thesis, one that was inspired by Paracelsus' romantic proposal on the power of magnetic metals. Mesmer soon realized, however, that he did not need such metals to influence the supposed magnetic fluid. Thus, he changed his methods and developed new instrumentation. This is when he started to use musical tones and the famous baquet¹

¹ The baquet was a collective method of treatment. It was a big metal vessel with iron rods bent from its top. A rope connected the patients to the baquet. The whole apparatus was meant to transmit the fluid from the one to the other using only certain motions without physical contact.

(Cazeto, 2001; Laurence & Perry, 1988; Crabtree, 1993; Ellenberger, 1970; Gauld, 1992; Zweig, 2012).

Mesmer's work soon aroused great interest in France. His practices were especially well-received by the aristocracy. However, his conclusions were not universally accepted. Although some researchers in the field accepted the existence of magnetic fluid, others believed the "effects of magnetism" were rather the result of psychological influences. Some saw this magnetic fluid as a possible panacea, while others were quite suspicious of it (Deleuze, 1813).

This present article does not intend to investigate the origins of the theory of magnetism, nor its influence on the discovery of the unconscious. The scope of this article will be much less ambitious. My argument will be limited to a particular author and will focus only on his possible contribution to the understanding of the theory of psychoanalytic technique. According to Gauld (1992), Joseph Philippe François Deleuze (1753–1835) was one of the leading figures in the magnetic movement. Deleuze was an intellectual who produced numerous scientific articles, and who worked as a librarian for many years. Being a very well-informed author, Deleuze collected his reflections and essential observations over the course of his twenty-seven years of research. He then published these in his two-volume work *Histoire Critique du Animal* (1813). The first volume of this book was dedicated to the methods and the phenomena of animal magnetism. The second volume contained a review of the leading French works on the subject dating back to the year 1812, and it was characterized by a paradoxical dedication to, and critical view of, magnetism. However, for our purposes, Deleuze's most important work was undoubtedly the *Instruction Pratique sur le Magnétisme Animal* (1825). It is only in this edition that one will find the author's more developed thoughts regarding the application of the method of magnetism (Cazeto, 2001).

One of the values of this work is that it records the author's sober and honest appraisal of the practice of magnetism. Deleuze declares himself to be a disciple of Puységur, and in 1825 he addressed his "master". In doing so, Deleuze stands out from his contemporaries both in his clarity and in his prudence in evaluating the influences of the animal fluid. He is cautious in his judgments, careful in his attitude towards the somnambulists, and moderate in his statements. Deleuze remained a "Fluidist," and in doing so he can be counted as one of the last representatives of the classical magnetizers (Ellenberger, 1965; Crabtree, 1993).

The “problem of demarcation” between the fields of psychology and various areas of “the occult” (see Gyimesi, 2009) was not only characteristic of the field of psychoanalysis, but of that of animal magnetism, as well. In Deleuze, we can observe the same endeavor that one can see in Freud—the effort to offer a rational-logical and medical explanation for the unconscious. Of course, this is not a reason for us to make a direct comparison between psychoanalysis and magnetism. Due to the work of Ellenberger (1970), I have the impression that the theories of magnetism developed by Deleuze are based on the same form of reasoning that psychoanalysis is. Nevertheless, it is fundamental to keep in mind that both practices understand the manifestations of the unconscious in different ways.

The point of contact between the old knowledge and psychoanalysis: the question of the occult

Historically, we are aware that during their famous trip to the United States Freud, Ferenczi, and Jung engaged in a series of passionate conversations. The general atmosphere was exciting because of the opportunity to spend a few weeks together. During this period, admiration and courtesy prevailed, and this state of affairs was fundamental in establishing an honest relationship that was capable of inspiring both Freud and his disciples (Grosskurth, 1991). The opportunity for a “mutual psychoanalytic investigation” between the fellows inspired fascinating conversations, and it was within this context that the occult debate arose.

The subject of occultism emerged as a source of interest among the three psychoanalysts because they all had curious relations with the topic. Jung (1902), who had written his doctoral dissertation on the matter, proved to be a true investigator of occult phenomena². Ferenczi had had practical experience with “automatic writing” at the age of 25, and this had inspired his first work in the field of psychology (Gyimesi, 2012, 2016; Talarn, 2003). Finally, even Freud was interested in occult phenomena; although, he remained sceptical about the matter (Gay, 1998; Roudinesco, 2016).

Freud's position was the most interesting. His official opinions evolved over the years; although, he never abandoned his defensive and neutral position regarding the subject. Loureiro (2002) has shown how the occult was a privi-

² For a deeper exploration of this matter, I suggest that the interested reader look for *Psychology and the Occult: (From Vols. 1, 8, 18 Collected Works)* (Vol. 20). Princeton University Press. 1977.

leged subject within the more paradoxical areas of Freud's work. When treating the topic of telepathy or, as Freud preferred to call it in his letters, the "transference of thoughts", he transferred the phenomenon from the dimension of the occult to the psychological sphere. However, Freud's official position was to relegate this field to other theorists while still attributing great value to this subject, identifying telepathy as one of the forms of transference (Roudinesco & Plon, 1998).

Five months after the aforementioned trip to the United States, Ferenczi received a *carte blanche* from his master to proceed with a psychoanalytic investigation of the occult. Afterward, Freud and Ferenczi engaged in an extraordinary exchange of letters, in which they discussed the intense research that the Hungarian conducted with a visionary from Berlin. In this correspondence, Freud gave instruction and guidance for, and offered his interpretations of, several experiments carried out by Ferenczi with the clairvoyant in search of explanations for the telepathic phenomena (Falzeder, Brabant, & Giampieri-Deutsch, 1993).

As pointed out by Rabeyron and Evrard (2012), this correspondence was quite surprising, and afterward, a whole new line of research was developed. Telepathy, which Freud referred to as "transference of thought" (*Gedankenübertragung*), was then linked to the clinical concept of transference. Freud preferred not to recognize this phenomenon as an element of the "occult". Rather, he viewed it as some sort of natural phenomenon.

The proposal to demystify telepathy by interpreting as a natural, organic activity can also be seen in Deleuze (1825) when he asserted that "the ties of blood contribute, by a physical sympathy, to establish a communication" (1825: 154). Freud, however, was careful to keep his research on telepathy secret (Grosskourt, 1992) and preferred to rely on "intrapsychic causality in which the origin lay in nothing but what was within himself" (Gyimesi, 2009: 468-469) in order to explain the phenomenon.

Yet, as the above-mentioned correspondence between Freud and Ferenczi has shown, Freud did speak about the possibility of direct communication between unconscious. It is my assertion that the magnetic ideals of identification, resemblance, and mixture that are present in the concept of "sympathy" as articulated by Deleuze (1825) come close to what Ferenczi understands about introjection. I will now illuminate this parallel.

Controversies about magnetism

After the existence of animal magnetism was proposed and the theory behind it was developed, it began to attract the attention of people from different social classes. Much of the polemic that Mesmer's ideas had produced was due to his epistemological perspective (Neubern, 2007). The scientific mindset that had been gaining force since the end of the Middle Ages was laying the foundation for the modern ideal in which science should occupy a determinative place in our thinking (Stengers, 1995). Mesmer ran into opposition when he tried to use hegemonic scientific discourse to distance his theories from any association with mystical practices. This discourse was rejected both by the representatives of science, as well as by the Roman Catholic Church which still viewed his ideas as being very much occult (Perry & McConkey, 2002).

The theory of magnetism is based on an identification and similarity between man, the world, and its elements. However, as Stengers has shown (1995), the prerogatives of magnetism were opposed to the directives of the modern science. Magnetism required a monistic worldview, but the scientific epistemology inherited from the Middle Age was based on a dualistic model of the world. Thus, Mesmer's system was a hybrid, one inspired both by the seminal expectations of the Enlightenment, and by the Romantic ideas of the age.

Several of Mesmer's disciples went on to develop his ideas in new directions and in greater depth. One of the most outstanding of these disciples was Marquis de Puységur, who carried out extensive research in the field of "magnetic somnambulism." Puységur used the terms analgesia and anaesthesia to characterize somnambulism. He also described a state of a particular connection between the magnetizer and the patient (*rapport*), one in which there was the suggestibility to be magnetized from a distance, a possibility of ecstasy, of "travelling clairvoyance³", and the amnesia resulting from the process of awakening (Crabtree, 1993, 2012).

Puységur said that one of the main characteristics of the somnambulistic state was the establishment of a strong *rapport*. He described this phenomenon as a deep and intimate state of communication between the magnetizer and the magnetized. It was a state of deep connection and undifferentiated functioning between the participants. As Puységur noted, "in this state, the ill person enters into a very intimate *rapport* with the magnetizer; one could almost say becoming part of the magnetizer" (Puységur, 1784: 2-3).

³ This is the supposed ability to leave the body and find oneself at another location.

Deleuze began experimenting with the practice of magnetism in the mid-1780s, and much of the value of his work lies in the fact that he started with a sceptical attitude towards the practices of Mesmer. It was only with his first book, *A Critical History of Animal Magnetism* (1813), that Deleuze started to gain some recognition. Naturally, he also became the object of many attacks. Unlike other practitioners of magnetism, Deleuze was able to offer formidable rebuttals to the criticisms directed at his work. He was also able to describe in detail how to magnetize, how to position oneself physically, what should be the ethical posture of the magnetizer, how the magnetizer must calm his mind, what to do, and what to avoid. Along with these precautions, Deleuze also described some of the phenomena that later became hallmarks of hypnosis (Laurence & Perry, 1988).

Originally, Deleuze had been trained directly by Mesmer. Later, he modified his methodology based on some of the technical proposals suggested by Puységur. Eventually, Deleuze found himself at the vital axis between the fluidists and the animists (Ellenberger, 1965). And it was here that he was able to put forth a number of very balanced and pragmatic considerations in connection with the practice of magnetism.

Like Mesmer, Deleuze (1825) believed that magnetism was a natural phenomenon. However, Deleuze never abandoned the thesis that magnetic somnambulism was the product of divine grace. The author made his opinion very clear. Although magnetism was natural to man:

“the ability to magnetize, or to do good to others by influencing their will, by the communication of the principle that keeps health and life in us, is the most beautiful and most precious grace that God has given to men” (1825: 22).

Perhaps because Deleuze was convinced of the connection between magnetism and the divine, he did not worry too much about evaluating the potential risks of magnetic influence. The author seems to suggest that the state of somnambulism was “somehow supernatural” (1825: 287) and that it spanned the border between the human and the supernatural. As such, it was deserving of admiration, respect, and attention. Here, one can see in Deleuze’s thought a typical manifestation of the Romantic “*Naturphilosophie*”, in which the life force is a universal entity acting through nature in deep commutation with the divine (Saliba, 2003; Safranski, 2007).

As a scholar, Deleuze was the first man to gain an international reputation as both a healer and a historian of animal magnetism. According to Laurence and Perry (1988), he was the last of the traditional magnetizers, and his work contributed to the demystification of the magnetic treatment.

In his first work (1813), Deleuze accepted Mesmer's hypothesis about the existence of the animal fluid, saying that "cures produced cannot be attributed to imagination or imitation" (1813: 138-139). Within a few years later, such a fluid then became seen as a logical necessity to explain the phenomena of magnetism: "how can we not understand that one body acts on another at a distance, without there being anything between them (...) we suppose which emanates from that which magnetizes a substance." (1825: 7). He also believed that this fluid had a metaphorical meaning. The bond of attention established between the magnetic operator and the magnetized subject created a relationship strong enough to allow the two participants to influence one another. Deleuze explicitly asserted that the one element in this whole process that could produce the phenomena of animal magnetism must have been the existence of "moral and physical sympathy." As he wrote, "physical sympathy is established by the following means: by the desire, we have to do good to anyone who wishes to receive it, or by the ideas and desires that form between them a communication of feelings." (1825: 11).

In his book *Practical Instructions on Animal Magnetism*, he often speaks of "interest," "desire," "hope", and "attraction." On this point, I shall compare this attitude with Ferenczi's concept of "Freundlichkeit" (1932). In this matter, Ferenczi is very rigorous about the psychoanalyst's attention to unconscious attitudes. He also suggests that the analyst create an atmosphere of pleasant relaxation by expressing a friendly and honest neutrality. Without such an atmosphere, there would be a greater risk that passion might contaminate the relationship and blind the psychoanalyst when interpreting the transference material.

The notion of a "physical sympathy" played an important role in magnetic theories. At first, Deleuze had hoped to end the "confusion caused by the cures that are realized through magnetism, those attributable to sympathy" (1813: 40). However, a few years later, Deleuze came to believe that it was sympathy that produced the rapport between the two participants. As such, sympathy became a very important element in Deleuze's work. As he wrote, this is the reason why "magnetizers can act effectively and promptly on diseases" (1825: 16). Hence, Deleuze postulated that physical and moral sympathy were responsible for producing the communication of the all-important animal fluid. An empathetic relationship was necessary to guide "communication through sympathy or imitation" (1825: 92), and this relationship would allow the magnetizer to build the rapport necessary for the healing process.

Regarding the physical connection that was established by the rapport, Deleuze was cautious. He wrote, if "a sympathy between the organs of the two

individuals is established during the magnetic connection, a person who has a delicate thorax cannot safely magnetize someone who has a condition of the same type” (1825: 289). As we can see, Deleuze believed that in the practice of animal magnetism, it was fundamentally important to identify the patient’s condition. Since “the magnetizer who enjoys good health sometimes feels sympathetically the pains of the patient that he magnetizes; but he does not take upon himself the principle of sickness: he will push the fluid out of it, he is active and not passive, he gives and does not receive.” (1825: 290).

Deleuze’s understanding of sympathy is similar to the way in which Ferenczi (1928) spoke of *Einfühlung*. In his theory on the principle of elasticity, Ferenczi asserted that in the case of an empathically guided analysis, the analyst has to be aware of the possibility of identification with the patient’s psychic suffering and then has to remain neutral in order to avoid an inaccurate interpretation.

The inspiration for the psychoanalytic technique within animal magnetism

All the works that investigated the phenomenon of rapport also examined the ideas of tuning and harmony. Puységur for example, declared these to be in need of the most delicate of treatments.⁴ From the imagination of these thinkers came what Crabtree (1993) considers the fundamental ideology of all psychotherapies, that is, the recognition of the therapeutic value of transferring emotions from one to the other person. The supposition is even made by some that an undeveloped rapport is capable of causing illness. Hence, in such cases, in order to effect a more certain cure, a new rapport with the magnetizer needs to be established in order to replace the old one and to break the original weak and unhealthy magnetic relation.

The establishment of a healthy atmosphere was very important for an effective treatment. In this regard, Deleuze attached great value to trust and friendship as elements that were capable of producing the devotion and affection that would properly unite the magnetizing and the somnambule in the sort of intimate relationships that were necessary to produce the desired magnetic effects. Deleuze’s definition of “magnetic somnambulism” deserves a full quotation

⁴ I suggest the reading of Victor Race’s case for a deeper understanding of Puységur’s method.

because it is another constituent element of the healthy atmosphere mentioned above. It is:

“a mode of existence during which the person who is in it appears to be asleep. If his magnetizer speaks to him, he answers without waking; he can also execute various movements, and when he returns to the natural state, he retains no remembrance of what has passed. His eyes are closed; he generally understands only those put in communication with him. The external organs of sense are all, or nearly all, asleep; and yet he experiences sensations, but by another means. It arouses in him an internal sense, which is perhaps the centre of the others, or a sort of instinct, which enlightens him in respect to his own preservation. He is subject to the influence of his magnetizer, and this influence may be either useful or injurious, according to the disposition and the conduct of the magnetizer.” (1825: 98-99)

The operator's goodwill became a central element in the practice of magnetism. The operator had to establish the kind of sympathy appropriate to rapport. “Moral and physical sympathy” was understood by Deleuze as the ability of two spirits to influence each other, producing a bond of equal value to the bond established between body and soul. This notion is also opposed to modern and dualistic ideas.

Psychoanalytic empathy

In 1928, Ferenczi published his influential paper, “The Elasticity of Technique”. This proved to be an important work in many ways. In fact, it marked a turning point in the field of psychoanalysis. For here, Ferenczi proposed a profound change in the way in which an analyst should interact with a subject. Ferenczi's theory of elasticity came as the result of a long maturation process, and it was influenced both by his professional and his personal relationship with Freud. The theory was based the whole logic of thought that Ferenczi had introduced earlier on emotional involvement in a bidirectional relationship mediated by identification, and by respect for the emotional life.

Borgogno (2007) has noted that this relational knowledge became the basis of psychoanalytic knowledge. To put it another way, the ability to accomplish transference with elasticity came to be seen as a consequence of the analyst's empathy. An accurate analysis could develop only when the analyst became emotionally involved, thereby allowing the subject to perceive himself/herself as responsible for managing the factors that would lead to such analysis.

The empathic capacity of the analyst had to be rooted in the pre-reflective situation of the encounter. It also had to be carefully nurtured because the nature

of the moment was transient and temporary. Yet, this empathy was the only force capable of creating an atmosphere of high permeability and receptivity (Pacheco-Ferreira & Vertzman, 2008; Figueiredo & Coelho Junior, 2000). There are two fundamental points to highlight about this function of empathy. First, it reveals the importance of the emotional support of the analyst, who gains the status of a guiding filter. Second, its importance then supports Ferenczi's entire elaboration on the need to change the emotional mood in the session. Hence, affections would become central elements of psychoanalytic interpretation, and this would differentiate this technique from its traditional predecessor (Pacheco-Ferreira & Vertzman, 2008).

With empathy, the analyst offers his ability to be affected, that is, his personality as a real person for exchanges. Interpretation by the analyst was still required, but its efficacy was dependent upon the affective relation. Although Ferenczi, proposed significant modifications to the recommendations made earlier by Freud, the Hungarian's theory would soon move to the foreground of the field. Ferenczi wanted the analyst to achieve two goals: first, to succeed "in forming a picture of possible or probable associations of the patient's of which he is still completely unaware" (Ferenczi, 1928: 89); and with that, to become able of having the necessary tact to do an interpretation. These two abilities are introjected into the analyst by the personal analysis of the analyst.

The analysis of the analyst became the paramount element in Ferenczi's technique. Insofar as empathy was seen as an inner faculty developed by the analyst, this ability assumed a metapsychology of its own. Tact, therefore, was no longer viewed as an innate and nontransferable gift, as Freud (1910) had feared. Rather, it became a natural reflection of the analytic process. In this regard, Ferenczi asked himself:

"But what is 'tact'? The answer is not very difficult. It is the capacity for empathy. If, with the aid of the knowledge we have obtained from the dissection of many minds, but above all from the dissection of our own, we have succeeded in forming a picture of possible or probable associations of the patient's of which he is still completely unaware, we, not having the patient's resistances to contend with, are able to conjecture, not only his withheld thoughts, but trends of his of which he is unconscious. At the same time, as we are continuously aware of the strength of the patient's resistance, we should not find it difficult to decide on the appropriateness or otherwise of telling him some particular thing or the form in which to put it. This empathy will protect us from unnecessarily stimulating the patient's resistance, or doing so at the wrong moment. It is not within the capacity of psycho-analysis entirely to spare the patient pain; indeed, one of the chief gains from psycho-analysis is the capacity to bear pain. But its tactless infliction by the analyst would only

give the patient the unconsciously deeply desired opportunity of withdrawing himself from his influence.” (Ferenczi, 1928: 89-90)

Introjection, the ability to re-edit the inner world of the subject, is Ferenczi's primary contribution to psychoanalysis, and it occupies a place of prominence in the author's thinking. Indeed, it reverberates through his whole understanding of transference. Defined by Maia (2001) as “the process in which the Self carries a large part of the outer world to itself” (2001: 269), introjection marks the architectural model by which a relation of constitution and differentiation initially establishes itself intersubjectively. Perceiving how this dimension of contact between people produces transference, not understanding it as exclusively neurotic phenomena, allowed Ferenczi to study cases previously impossible to psychoanalysis. Hence, introjection is a mechanism of the psychism that works for the extension towards the world.

Regarding the capacity of the plasticity of the analyst, Ferenczi departs from the idea of an analyst who would work with emotional abstinence. One can say that “*Einfühlung*” is the capacity to represent to the patient his or her own experience, which is possible due to the fair measure of the emotional distance between subjectivities. Therefore, empathy becomes an oscillatory assignment of symmetry and dissymmetry between analyst and patient. As a dynamic process, empathy occurs in three moments: First, with a true “feeling with,” the analyst feels the atmosphere created by the patient's emotion that arose through the verbal and non-verbal communication.

Next, there follows the self-observation of the effects of this perception within the psyche of the analyst at a time when introspection and countertransference analysis regulate a process of mixing and differentiating emotions. Lastly, there follows the judgment of the correct moment for communication, and of the proper way to do it. In this respect, Ferenczi employed the word “coldness”: the analyst must “withdraw his libido from the latter, and weigh the situation coolly; he must in no circumstances allow himself to be guided by his feelings alone” (Ferenczi, 1928: 90). I emphasize that coldness, in this case, points to the experience lived in the inner world of the analyst, not to the patient or the communicated message. Consequently, psychoanalytic empathy must necessarily respect an elastic movement. By way of introjection, we produce a mixture, and to overcome this state of undifferentiation the analyst must observe his metapsychological movements/attitudes.

In the oscillation between the poles of affections characterized by the “feeling with” and the moment of the critical examination, Gondar (2008) points out that

it is the analyst's role as analyzer that provides him with the ability to contact his own affections without fear or restraints. Putting the "personal equation" at the very centre of the theory of the technique, one can conclude that, to conduct a proper psychoanalytical treatment one also ought to analyze the individual organization, style, and sensitivity of the analyst. After all, the analyst's position as the creator of the correct atmosphere for treatment depends almost exclusively on his introjection skills of the setting through his own experience of analysis. In short, as the one who has been entrusted with the treatment of the patient, the analyst must have constituted within himself, in a fluid and natural way, the essence of a psychoanalytic experience (Coelho Junior, 2013).

Theoretical similarities and contrasts between magnetism and psychoanalysis

Deleuze (1825) saw in somnambulism a naturally attained mode of exploring the psyche which resembles in certain important ways the method employed by Breuer and Freud in the hypnotic-cathartic period (1895). Just as Breuer attempted to explore psyches via altered states of consciousness in 1882 in his treatment of Anna O., half a century earlier, Deleuze also explored the psyche (both his own and that of patients) through altered states of consciousness.

There is a significant divergence between Deleuze's method and future psychoanalytic methodologies of the soul (whether they are the cathartic-hypnotic method or one of free association). In animal magnetism, the exploration of the mind in somnambulist states should be conducted exclusively and objectively behind the primary object of the illness, whereas the psychoanalytic methodology was initially considered accurate only when it discontinued this objectivity. When listening to the train of thoughts of his patients, Freud was able to pay attention to something other than just the manifestation of symptoms. We know that Freud never took Mesmer into account when writing about psychoanalysis. Nevertheless, following Ellenberger's (1970) thesis, I reckon that when Freud considered the existence of a psychic reality, he mostly remained on common ground, but he did cause a partial rupture with the old knowledge inaugurated by Mesmer⁵.

The numerous proposals made by Deleuze regarding the treatment of subjects in a somnambulant state differed in very important ways from the practice as it

⁵ For a broader extension of the idea about the importance of mesmeric tradition for present-day psychotherapy practice, I suggest looking at "The Transition to Secular Psychotherapy: Hypnosis and the Alternate-Consciousness Paradigm" (Crabtree, 2010)

had been performed by psychoanalysis since its origin. According to Deleuze, the magnetizer should suppose it dangerous to investigate the secrets of a person in the somnambulist state. Moreover, he would not advise any associative exploration in that disposition that would follow a course other than one that would seek to bargain with the disease for a form of healing. As Deleuze prescribed, “[the magnetizer] will question the patient only about the illness and the means of curing it” (1825: 240).

The manner in which Deleuze (1825) indicated how the work should be conducted also differed radically from classical psychoanalytic methodology. In his text, the author specified that it would be through a sensation in the magnetizer's own body, or through an automatic movement of his hands, that the magnetizer could locate in another subject which places merited the attention the concentration of his magnetic forces. Deleuze, like all followers of magnetism, sought to treat diseases directly associated with parts of the body without considering too much that such sensations had some relation with psychic life, especially with sexual fantasies. Nevertheless, Deleuze did give some thought to a subject's inner sexual life, because he was very respectful of the dangers of a magnetic relationship between a man and a woman. The unfolding of the process that generated somnambulism could easily provoke convulsive states of emotional discharge. Hence, there was no concern in this method to make the subject talk about his life. Undoubtedly, the interest of the analyst in the inner world of the patient was the most significant difference between the old and the new practices. However, both in magnetism and in psychoanalysis, the relationship established between doctor and patient served as the basis upon which the processes of healing would unfold.

Some final considerations and conclusion

In this article, I have sought to compare the phenomena of rapport, as understood by Deleuze in his practice of animal magnetism, to that of transference as understood by Ferenczi, especially in regard to empathy (1928) as our searchlight. This comparison is made possible by Ferenczi's idea of introjection and Deleuze's definition of “moral and physical sympathy.”

Ferenczi presented introjection as a kind of interest in the world in which the subject's narcissism guided the psyche through a process of blending with the world. Undifferentiation was the result of this psychic phenomenon that, paradoxically, constituted individuality. In this sense, both introjection and rapport merged into the general theory of transfer, as can be seen in Ferenczi's (1909) inaugural text on the subject.

Empathy, on the other hand, is the direct experience of the affective states of others. It is, therefore, a conception of the internal state of others and their modes of existence in the world. Looking at Deleuze's inspiration for "moral and physical sympathy", I am led to think about empathy. For both "empathy" and "moral and physical sympathy" are expressions that seek to explain the situation of emotional interaction in which there is an exchange of perceptions of the affective experience.

Finally, while observing the possibility of a contribution to psychoanalysis from the study of animal magnetism, I would like to reemphasize the warning issued by Neubern (2007) regarding the need to revise our historical knowledge of Mesmer and the magnetizers. As he has pointed out elsewhere, magnetism, at least in Brazil, is a synonym for a pre-psychological discernment, based on pseudo-scientific foundations and mysticism, and lead to a kind of experience that is the result of ignorance, lack of common sense and even charlatanism. Following these considerations, I believe that the supposed rational fragility attributed to the Mesmer system is actually due to an epistemological puzzle: the method of magnetism stood as an insult to the modern scientific project. While the conventional scientific paradigm sought credibility by disclosing the truth and knowledge of the real through direct and linear access, animal magnetism could only assume to maintain a scientific discourse in these ways.

Deleuze defined his practice as one always guided by the ideals of attraction, interest, desire, hope, and devotion. These were some of the adjectives used by the author to explain the atmosphere required for his proposal of emotional tuning. I see in these suggestions healthy ways of thinking about a work ethic that would seek contact through empathy. And while we might say that the language chosen by Deleuze was not sufficiently precise, or perhaps even too "mystical", we can also see that contemporary authors (Cazeto, 2001), have raised questions indicating that innumerable possibilities of understanding the phenomena of emotional tuning are possible. For us, the question of how to develop such a sensitive field within psychoanalysis is open; the fundamental problem of "who is, what does, and who interprets" remains intriguing.

Ultimately, as a topic for future research, I note that Deleuze (1825) mentions the existence of a very particular state of somnambulism, one different from the dangerous state of ecstasy from which potentially hazardous and eventually unnecessary reactions can unfold. The psychological circumstances of such are marked by a kind of deep calm in which an intimate and indistinct contact can

occur between the magnetizer and the subject. In this state, there is then a possibility of unmediated communication and of telepathic potentiality. In regard to this, I see how important it is to try to delimit what this state of human contact would be and even how to acquire such sensitivity. As much as Deleuze speaks from a terrain marked by mysticism, such a contribution may inspire psychoanalysis to seek an understanding of how empathy is established in the clinical relationship.

REFERENCES

- BORGOGNO, F. (2007). *Psychoanalysis as a Journey*. London, UK: Open Gate Press.
- CAZETO, S.J. (2001). *A constituição do inconsciente em práticas clínicas na França do século XIX* [Constitution of the Unconscious in Clinical Practices in Nineteenth-Century's France]. São Paulo: Escuta.
- COELHO JUNIOR, N.E. (2013). Psicanálise ou psicoterapia? Delineamentos para um debate contemporâneo [Psychoanalysis or Psychotherapy? Guidelines for a Contemporary Debate]. In: Magalhães, M.C. (ed.), *Elasticidade e limite na clínica contemporânea* [Elasticity and Limit in Contemporary Clinic] (pp. 95-106). São Paulo: Escuta.
- CRABTREE, A. (1993). *From Mesmer to Freud: Magnetic Sleep and the Roots of Psychological Healing*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- CRABTREE, A. (2010). The Transition to Secular Psychotherapy: Hypnosis and the Alternate-Consciousness Paradigm. In: Wallace, E.R. – Gach, J. (eds.), *History of Psychiatry and Medical psychology: With an Epilogue on Psychiatry and the Mind-Body Relation*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- CRABTREE, A. (2012). Hypnosis Reconsidered, Resituated, and Redefined. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 26(2): 297-327.
- DELEUZE, J.P.F. (1813). *Histoire critique du magnétisme animal*. 2 vols. Paris: Mame. [A critical history of animal magnetism: in two parts. (Trans. by Francis Corbeaux.) London: University of Leeds. Library, 1816.]
- DELEUZE, J.P.F. (1825). *Instruction pratique sur le magnétisme animal*. Paris: Germer Baillière Libraire-Éditeur, 1850. [Practical instructions in animal magnetism. (Trans. by Thomas C. Hartshorn.) London: Hippolyte Baillière, 1850.]
- ELLENBERGER, H.F. (1965). Mesmer and Puysegur: from Magnetism to Hypnotism. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 52: 137-153.
- ELLENBERGER, H. F. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic books.
- FALZEDER, E. – BRABANT, E. – GIAMPIERI-DEUTSCH, P. (1993). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi. Volume 1, 1908–1914*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- FIGUEIREDO, L.C.M. – COELHO JUNIOR, N.E. (2000). *Ética e técnica em psicanálise* [Ethics and Technique in Psychoanalysis]. São Paulo: Escuta.
- FERENCZI, S. (1909). Introjection and transference. In: *Essential Papers on Transference*. New York, NY: NYU Press 1990: 15-27.
- FERENCZI, S. (1912). On the definition of introjection. In: Balint, M. (ed.), *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psycho-Analysis*. London: Karnac (reprint), 1994, 316-319.
- FERENCZI, S. (1928). The elasticity of psycho-analytic technique. In: Balint, M. (ed.), *Final Contributions to the Problems and Methods of Psycho-Analysis*. London: Karnac (reprint), 1994, 87-101.
- FERENCZI, S. (1932). *The Clinical Diary of Sándor Ferenczi*. Edited by Judith Dupont. Translated by Michael Balint & Nicola Zarday Jackson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- FREUD, S. (1905 [1890]). Psychical (or Mental) Treatment. In: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. VII*. London, UK: Hogarth Press. 1948.
- FREUD, S. – BREUER, J. (1893–1895). *Studies on Hysteria*. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. II*. London, UK: Hogarth Press. 1948.
- GAULD, A. (1992). *A History of Hypnotism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- GAY, P. (1998). *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- GONDAR, J. (2008). Além da contratransferência: os afetos do analista [Beyond counter-transference: the analyst's affections]. *Cadernos de Psicanálise–CPRJ*, 30: 175-191.
- GROSSKURTH, P. (1991). *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley/Addison Wesley Longman.
- GYIMESI, J. (2009). The Problem of Demarcation: Psychoanalysis and the Occult. *American Imago*, 66: 457-470.
- GYIMESI, J. (2012). Sándor Ferenczi and the Problem of Telepathy. *History of the Human Sciences*, 25: 131-148.
- GYIMESI, J. (2016). Why 'spiritism'?. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 97: 357-383.
- HAYNAL, A. (1988). *The Technique at Issue: Controversies in Psychoanalysis: from Freud and Ferenczi to Michael Balint*. London: Karnac.
- JUNG, C.G. (1902). On the psychology and pathology of so-called occult phenomena. In: *Psychiatric Studies* (Collected works. Volume: 1). New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- JUNG, C.G. (1977). *Psychology and the Occult*. In: *Psychiatric Studies* (Collected works. Volume: 20). New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 2014
- LAURENCE, J.R. – PERRY, C. (1988). *Hypnosis, Will, and Memory: A Psycho-Legal History*. New-York: Guilford Press.
- LOUREIRO, I. (2002). *O carvalho e o pinheiro: Freud e o estilo romântico* [The Oak and the Pine Tree: Freud and the Romantic Style]. São Paulo: Escuta/Fapesp.

- MAIA, M.S. (2001). A questão do sentido na clínica psicanalítica [The question of meaning in the psychoanalytic clinic]. In: B. Bezerra Jr & C.A. Plastino (Eds.), *Corpo, afeto, linguagem: a questão do sentido hoje* [Body, Affection, Language: the Question of Meaning Today]. Rio de Janeiro: Marca d'água.
- NEUBERN, M. DA S. (2007). Sobre a Condenação do Magnetismo Animal: Revisitando a História da Psicologia [On the condemnation of animal magnetism: reviewing the history of psychology]. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 23(3): 347-356.
- PACHECO-FERREIRA, F. – VERTZMAN, J. (2008). O uso do afeto na obra de Sándor Ferenczi [The use of affection in the work of Sándor Ferenczi]. *Cadernos de Psicanálise–CPRJ*, 1: 45-78.
- PERRY, C. – MCCONKEY, K.M. (2002). The franklin commission report in light of past and present understandings of hypnosis. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 50: 387-396.
- PUYSÉGUR, J. M. P. DE C. (1784). *Rapport des cures opérées à Bayonne par le magnétisme animal, adressé à M. l'abbé de Poulouzat, conseiller clerc au Parlement de Bordeaux, par le comte de Puységur, avec notes de M. Duval d'Eprémèsnil, conseiller ao Parlement de Paris*. Bayonne and Paris: Prault.
- TALARN, A. (2003). *Sándor Ferenczi: el mejor discípulo de Freud* [Sándor Ferenczi: the best disciple of Freud]. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- RABEYRON, T. – EVRARD, R. (2012). Historical and contemporary perspectives on occultism in the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence. *Recherches en psychanalyse*, 13: 98-111.
- ROUDINESCO, E. – PLON, M. (1998). *Dicionário de psicanálise* [Dictionary of psychoanalysis]. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- ROUDINESCO, E. (2016). *Freud: In His Time and Ours*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Press.
- STENGERS, I. (1995). *L'invention des sciences modernes*. Paris: Flammarion.
- SALIBA, E. T. (2003). *As utopias românticas* [The Romantic Utopias]. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade.
- SAFRANSKI, R. (2007). *Romanticism: A German Affair*. Translated from the German by Robert E. Goodwin. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2014.
- ZWEIG, S. (2012). *Mental Healers: Mesmer, Eddy and Freud*. London, UK: Pushkin Press.

* * *