

THE ORIGINS OF THE CONCEPT OF DISSOCIATION: PAUL JANET, HIS NEPHEW PIERRE, AND THE PROBLEM OF POST-HYPNOTIC SUGGESTION

André LeBlanc

Université du Québec à Montréal

In 1884, the eminent French philosopher Paul Janet (1823–99) introduced the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion.¹ A subject is given the post-hypnotic command to return to the hypnotist in thirteen days. Awake, the subject seems never to remember the command yet he nonetheless fulfils it. The problem then is this: how does the subject count thirteen days without knowing it? Two years later, the philosopher and psychologist Pierre Janet (1859–1947) would submit the concept of dissociation as a solution to his uncle's query.² He proposed that a second consciousness kept track of time and executed the suggestion outside the awareness of the main consciousness. His solution also provided a psychological framework for describing multiple personality, hysteria, and spirit possession. It led to the first purely psychological conceptualization of the traumatic memory, and it furnished Freud with a theoretical base upon which to build his theory of psychoanalysis.³

The concept of dissociation has been the object of intense scholarly and scientific interest in recent years with the North American epidemic of multiple personality disorder, renamed dissociative identity disorder in 1994, and the controversies surrounding the veracity of traumatic memories.⁴ Several historians, philosophers, anthropologists, psychiatrists and psychologists have investigated the history of dissociation with the purpose of shedding light on the dissociative disorders and the beginnings of psychoanalysis.⁵ It is therefore remarkable that no one seems to have noticed the origin of dissociation in the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion.⁶ This paper narrates this unknown history. It begins with Paul Janet's formulation of the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion. It next describes the experiments Pierre Janet conducted in support of dissociation, relates the significance of the concept, and concludes with Paul Janet's reaction to his nephew's solution.

PAUL JANET AND THE PROBLEM OF POST-HYPNOTIC SUGGESTION

Paul Janet was born in Paris in 1823.⁷ He attended the élite lycée Saint-Louis and entered the École Normale in 1841 where he was to study philosophy. He obtained his doctorate *ès lettres* in 1848 and went to teach philosophy at the university in Strasbourg. By 1862 he was teaching philosophy at the Sorbonne. In 1864 he was appointed professor of the history of philosophy and, that same year, he was elected a member of the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*. He wrote numerous

books on metaphysics, politics, morality and the history of philosophy, as well as classic textbooks on philosophy.

In 1883, the philosopher Alfred Fouillée remarked that “the principal merit of M. Janet, in his [book *La morale*], is ... the great number of incidental views and secondary questions studied by him and not found in any other treatise on morality”.⁸ As we shall see, the same can be said for his formulation of the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion, published the following year in the *Revue politique et littéraire*.⁹

Before turning to the problem, it will be useful to describe the associationist theory of hypnosis that Paul Janet used in framing it. “When two ideas are found together, or one after the other, in the same act of consciousness”, he wrote, “if one is produced by accident, the other tends to produce itself as well. In other words, one *suggests* the other”.¹⁰

This law of the association of ideas has a physical counterpart — the law of the association of movements: “When two or several movements are produced once or several times together, they later tend to produce themselves together....”¹¹

When considered together and in relation to each other, these two laws give rise to two secondary laws: (1) ideas suggest the movements with which they have previously been associated; and conversely, (2) movements suggest the ideas with which they have previously been associated. Two examples of the first of these laws are yawning and nausea: these physical reactions can be brought on, respectively, by the sight of others yawning and by the belief, when aboard a ship, that the water is rough when it is in fact smooth as ice. The second of these laws, whereby movements trigger corresponding ideas, is more unusual. An outward attitude of respect or goodwill is normally accompanied, Janet noted, by the inward beginnings of analogous sentiments.

To sum up Janet’s exposition of the laws of association: (1) ideas suggest ideas; (2) movements suggest movements; (3) ideas suggest movements; and (4) movements suggest ideas. These four fundamental laws operate under normal conditions. What Janet called “morbid suggestion” is the exaggerated and unchecked expression of these laws under “certain unknown physiological conditions”, like those that are obtained by hypnosis. He defined hypnotic suggestion as

the operation by which, in the state of hypnotism or perhaps in certain waking states yet to be defined, we may, with the help of certain sensations, especially speech, provoke in a well-disposed nervous subject a series of more or less automatic phenomena and make him speak, act, think, feel as we wish him to, in a word transform him into a *machine*.¹²

“Automaton”, “machine”, and the “physiological reflex” were standard metaphors for the apparently passive and fatalistic actions of the hypnotic subject. The mechanical imagery of association was particularly well suited for describing the operations of hypnotic suggestion. But there was one special type of post-hypnotic suggestion that the laws of association could not explain.

Paul Janet's associationist conception of hypnosis could account for the kind of unconscious memories that seemed to be present in subjects who performed simple post-hypnotic suggestions that they could not remember:

Whatever the case may be, when it comes to immediate recall, an image may persist and automatically produce the suggested act. The known and previously mentioned laws of the association of ideas and movements can account for this much.¹³

It could not account, however, for the kind of memory found in the following experiment described by the French professor of medicine Dr Hippolyte Bernheim (1840–1919):

I instructed S that he would come back and see me after thirteen days at ten in the morning. Awake, he remembered nothing. On the thirteenth day, at ten in the morning, he was present.... He told me that he had not had this idea during the preceding days. He did not know that he was supposed to come. The idea presented itself to his mind only at the moment at which he was required to execute it.¹⁴

The problem with Bernheim's experiment was that it could not be explained by a mere association of ideas since the subject somehow had to keep track of time without being aware of doing so. Here is Paul Janet's formulation of the problem:

These facts are extraordinary and almost incomprehensible. It is not a reason to reject them; but it is interesting, from a psychological perspective, to identify precisely the points wherein the inexplicable lies.

What surprises me in these facts is not the impregnation and persistence in memory of an image of which we are not conscious: the facts of unconscious and automatic memory are today too numerous and too well noted to be the object of doubt.

I admit, moreover, that these unknown memories (*souvenirs ignorés*) as M. Ch. Richet calls them, can waken at a particular moment, following such and such circumstance. I would furthermore understand the return of these images and acts at a fixed date, if the operator associated them with the appearance of a vivid sensation; for example, "the day you see M. so-and-so, you will kiss him", the sight of M. so-and-so thus acting as the stimulant that wakens the idea.

But what I absolutely do not understand is the awakening on a fixed day without any point of attachment other than the numeration of time: *in thirteen days*, for example. Thirteen days do not represent a sensation; it is an abstraction. To understand these facts, we must infer an unconscious faculty for measuring time. Now that is an unknown faculty for which we can supply no analogies. Up until now, everything could be explained by the laws of the association of ideas, images and movements; but here we make a sudden leap. No association can explain counting thirteen days without knowing it.¹⁵

The physiologist Charles Richet (1850–1935) was the first person to publish a possible solution to the problem.¹⁶ He held that there were unconscious intellectual operations that could keep track of time, attributing them to the same unconscious intelligence that finds that word we are looking for only some time after we have abandoned our attempts to produce it. Keeping track of time, he argued, “is obviously a much simpler operation than finding a word, making verses, solving a geometrical problem”, all of which can be “accomplished without the participation of the *moi*”.¹⁷

The physiologist H. Beaunis (1830–1921) advanced a similar idea.¹⁸ He proposed that we all have a kind of internal clock that keeps track of time without our knowing it. The thirteen-day period between the moment the suggestion is given and the moment it is executed represented, according to Beaunis, a sensation rather than an abstraction. Unlike Paul Janet, Beaunis claimed that a day is itself a succession of sensations and unconscious reactions: “The regular periodicity of days, weeks, months, and seasons correspond to periodical organic reactions, which, in certain conditions, can acquire enough intensity to constitute a kind of unconscious faculty for measuring time.”¹⁹ He noted, for instance, that barnyard animals know when it is time to eat and that some people can wake at fixed times. Might not this natural ability to measure time unconsciously have the potential, wondered Beaunis, to achieve an “unknown intensity and precision” in somnambules with remarkably sensitive and acute nervous systems?²⁰

No one seems to have taken Richet’s or Beaunis’s theory very seriously. As we shall see, Pierre Janet demonstrated that the problem consists in explaining not only the unconscious awareness of time but also the unconscious exercise of judgement in general. A more plausible theory was independently offered by the Belgian philosopher and psychologist Joseph Delboeuf (1831–96), in 1885, and by Bernheim, in 1886. They proposed and demonstrated that after being hypnotised and woken up, in subsequent days subjects occasionally switched into an hypnotic state in which they were reminded of the suggestion. The drawback of this theory, however, was that it could not explain, as Beaunis and Pierre Janet later pointed out, what prompted the subject to enter into hypnosis at the moment of executing the suggestion.²¹

THE CONCEPT OF DISSOCIATION

The paper in which Janet introduced the concept of dissociation was fittingly titled “Unconscious acts and double (*dédoublement*) personality during provoked somnambulism”.²² “*Doublement*”, “*dédoublement*” and “*dualité*” of the personality were standard names for “multiple personality” before the physicians Hippolyte Bourru (1840–1914) and P. Burot introduced the latter term in 1885.²³ Janet’s paper described a series of experiments conducted on Lucie, a 19-year-old woman suffering from “*grande hystérie*”. These experiments took place in Le Havre, where, between February 1883 and July 1889, Janet taught philosophy in a *lycée*.

He met Lucie in the Le Havre Hospital where Doctor Powilewicz allowed him to examine hysterical patients.

Lucie had daily hysterical attacks that lasted several hours. Hypnotic sleep (or somnambulism — Janet used the terms interchangeably) was first induced by means of hand passes during one of her attacks. Lucie had apparently never before been hypnotized, but she was a fast learner. Janet found that he could easily induce all the phenomena characteristic of somnambulism such as contractions, movements, hallucinations and post-hypnotic suggestions. Once awake, Lucie could not remember the events of her hypnotic sleep. At first, she would not obey suggestions that very much displeased her, but after the fourth session, according to Janet, she no longer presented any resistance to his suggestions. Moreover, in the first sessions she was aware of the suggestions and of executing them, but after the fourth session she claimed that she was no longer aware of hearing or of executing suggestions.

“Put your thumb to your nose”, commanded Janet in the middle of a conversation with Lucie. She obeyed and continued to converse, apparently oblivious of the thumb in front of her face. How then did she distinguish his suggestions from normal conversation? By the way he addressed her: Janet shifted the tone of his voice, speaking abruptly whenever he gave a suggestion. The suggestions were obeyed yet they apparently did not enter Lucie’s consciousness — they were obeyed unconsciously. Janet then set out to determine the full extent of this unconscious and, in the process, to solve the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion.

While Lucie was in a state of somnambulant sleep, he gave her the following suggestion: “When I have clapped my hands twelve times, you will fall asleep.” Awake she remembered nothing. While she was engaged in conversation with a group of people, Janet stood away from them and clapped his hands lightly five times. He approached her and asked: “Did you hear what I was doing? — What? I wasn’t paying attention. — And this [Janet claps his hands]. — You clapped your hands. — How many times? — Once.” Janet withdrew, clapped his hands six more times (making the total twelve) and Lucie fell into somnambulant sleep. “Why are you sleeping?”, he asked her. — “I have no idea, it came upon me all of a sudden.”²⁴ Instead of counting days unconsciously as in Bernheim’s experiment, his subject counted the number of claps. This ruled out Beaunis’s hypothesis, Janet remarked, of the existence of an unknown faculty for counting time, because Lucie was required to unconsciously keep track of events rather than time. He next varied the experiment and showed that Lucie could also perform unconscious multiplication and division and other acts that required the exercise of judgement.

Janet pressed on. “There obviously existed in Lucie’s mind”, wrote Janet, “important psychological operations outside of normal consciousness. How to render them perceptible by some sign or language? Speech revealed nothing. Let us try by another kind of sign, writing for instance”. He then gave her the post-hypnotic suggestion to pick up a pencil and write the word “*bonjour*” after he clapped his hands once. She was next asked to write a full sentence, to work

out a multiplication, and to improvise a letter to a friend.²⁵ Janet thus produced a variation of the phenomenon known as automatic writing. In a standard automatic writing experiment, a subject is given a pencil and is told to let his or her hand move on its own accord without making any conscious attempts to influence its movement. The experiment is conducted with the purpose of detecting the influence of either external spirits or internal thoughts.²⁶ Janet instead used a post-hypnotic suggestion as a means of first provoking these thoughts into manifesting themselves as automatic writing in the waking state.

After having Lucie write a number of automatic letters, it occurred to Janet that she might answer his questions in writing. And so while she was engaged in conversation with a group of people and paying no attention to him, Janet asked her questions to which she responded in writing. At this point, he remarked that the notion of unconscious mental operations has now become meaningless. "What is an unconscious judgement, an unconscious multiplication?", he asked. "If speech is for us a sign of consciousness in the other, why could writing not also be a characteristic sign? We could no longer say that in Lucie there had been absence of consciousness, but rather that there were two consciousnesses." Janet then had conversations with this second consciousness. He even gave her a name, Blanche, which was later changed to Adrienne. Thenceforth, he held conversations both with Lucie who responded in speech and with Adrienne who responded in writing.²⁷

In addition to purportedly solving the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion, Janet's demonstration of a dissociated consciousness served also as a general theory of hypnosis. Adrienne, for instance, was both aware of and responsible for carrying out all the hypnotic suggestions. "The suggestions which I had always considered as unconscious were in reality only unconscious to Lucie; Adrienne always knew them and could write them after waking. It was she who lifted her arms; it was she who counted the signals."²⁸ From here, it was a small step to suppose that the same process was going on in all hypnotic phenomena. "All suggestions", Janet concluded, "must be accompanied by a certain degree of unconsciousness or rather, if I generalize from what I have seen, by a certain double (*dédoublement*) consciousness".²⁹ Cases of spirit possession and mediumship, he conjectured, were also the result of double consciousness. Janet then hit upon the idea, somewhat by chance, that double consciousness was also the mechanism behind hysterical phenomena. Adrienne relived a frightening childhood event, Janet learned, during each of Lucie's hysterical attacks. Adrienne explained in writing how she had been terribly frightened one day because of two men who had hidden behind a curtain that they had hung from the trees in her grandmother's garden. Except for a vague recollection of having been sick after a fright at the age of seven, Lucie had apparently no memory of her attacks or of the event described by Adrienne.³⁰ Thus, in working out his solution to the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion, Janet had arrived at the ideas of the traumatic memory and, in a rudimentary way, the cathartic cure.³¹

Pierre Janet first used the term 'dissociation' in print in May 1887 to designate

the apparent double consciousness in hypnotism, hysteria, spirit possession and mediumship, and the term 'subconscious' in early 1888, to underscore the fact that so-called unconscious acts were unconscious only to the primary consciousness and not to the secondary consciousness that performed them.³² The ideas of dissociation and the subconscious, however, were already clearly present in the 1886 paper described above.³³

Though we may credit Janet with inventing the concept of dissociation, the concept of the simultaneous existence of more than one consciousness in the same individual was foreshadowed by experiments in automatic writing³⁴ and doubtless by the many cases of "double personality" that began appearing around 1876 and were being frequently diagnosed during the 1880s.³⁵ Also, as many writers have shown, the idea of traumatic memory would not have been possible had it not been for the physio-psychological groundwork laid in the early 1880s by the renowned neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–93).³⁶

Janet's priority in conceptualizing the concept of dissociation has long been recognized. Already in 1890 William James was introducing the concept to the Anglo-Saxon world in his book, *Principles of psychology*.³⁷ In 1906, the Boston physician Morton Prince built upon Janet's work and popularized the condition of multiple personality in his sensational book *The dissociation of a personality*.³⁸ But by 1925 dissociation was hardly spoken of on either side of the Atlantic, because cases of multiple personality and hysteria had all but disappeared.³⁹ The concept made a startling comeback in the early 1970s, however, when three lines of inquiry converged upon it. The first was the publication in 1970 of Henri F. Ellenberger's well known *Discovery of the unconscious*. Ellenberger gave renewed prestige to Janet's work by presenting him as one of the principal pioneers of the psychology of the unconscious. He was keen to show Janet's priority over Freud and Breuer in viewing psychic trauma as a partial cause of hysteria and hitting upon the cathartic cure. Although he almost never referred to the term 'dissociation', Ellenberger nonetheless highlighted the fact that Janet had been the first to formulate the equivalent notion of 'subconscious' processes and ideas.⁴⁰

Dissociation received another major boost when the Stanford experimental psychologist Ernest Hilgard advanced his "neodissociationist" view of hypnosis in 1973.⁴¹ He gave his theory this name because, unlike Janet, he did not believe that dissociated processes could function without interfering with each other. Hilgard's work lent scientific respectability to the multiple personality movement in North America.⁴² The movement began in the early 1970s and grew exponentially until it was bogged down by the memory controversies of the early 1990s.⁴³

The movement largely patterned its cases after Cornelia Wilbur's case of Sybil.⁴⁴ In treating Sybil, Wilbur, a psychoanalyst, drew chiefly upon Prince's *Dissociation of a personality* although her conceptualization of dissociation was closer to the more refined formulation that Breuer and Freud had given it under the name of repression in their "preliminary communication" in 1893.⁴⁵

The multiple personality movement fell into disrepute when it became apparent

that many of the dissociated traumatic memories elicited in therapy could not possibly be real. One of the consequences of this recent scandal was to substitute the term ‘dissociative identity disorder’ for the term ‘multiple personality disorder’.⁴⁶ This was done in part to divert attention away from the more sensational aspects of the dissociative disorders and to forestall a complete repudiation of the field of dissociation.

PIERRE AND PAUL

Pierre Janet developed his general theory of dissociation in his doctoral thesis, *Psychological automatism*. The thesis was published in 1889 and received favourable reviews.⁴⁷ There was one rather striking exception, however. Paul Janet printed a careful critique of his nephew’s dissertation in his *Principles of metaphysics and psychology*, published in 1897, two years before his death at age 76.⁴⁸ This final book, which contained the philosophy courses he gave at the Sorbonne between 1888 and 1894, was a conscious stand against the steady ascendancy of materialism, nihilism and atheism. In the preface of what he called his “philosophical testament”, he wrote:

We wished to produce a concrete metaphysics, objective and real, having beings for its object and not ideas. The soul, God, the external world, freedom, such are the objects that Descartes defended in his Meditations, that Kant combatted in the transcendental Dialectic, and that we persist in supporting in their existence and truth.⁴⁹

May [these pages], in the troubled world in which we live, bring to those who will read them the same calm and the same satisfaction that I have always found in the doctrine of which they are the all too imperfect expression!⁵⁰

In deference to his nephew his critique did not condemn the idea of dissociation outright, but he made it clear that he would to his dying day never accept it as true.⁵¹ When presented with the apparent fact of simultaneous consciousness, he wrote, “must we abandon even here, that so solid doctrine of the unity of consciousness, without which everything vanishes into universal illusion”?⁵²

To understand Paul Janet’s resistance to his nephew’s theory, it is important to keep in mind that Janet *oncle* was the leading disciple of the spiritualist philosopher, Victor Cousin (1798–1867).⁵³ Cousin promoted a philosophical approach he called “eclectic spiritualism”, recommending “an enlightened eclecticism, that on evaluating all doctrines, takes that which they have in common and is true, and rejects that which they have in conflict and is false — the eclecticism which is the true spirit of the sciences”.⁵⁴ Such a philosophy was scientific, Cousin maintained, because it took as its starting point the empirical data of consciousness, using a method he traced back to Descartes. He and his disciples claimed that it was possible to establish the spirituality of the soul and the existence of God through introspective awareness. But if dissociation is true, such introspection is undermined by the possibility that virtually any one might have a consciousness of which he or

she is not aware and thus be incapable of fully trusting the contents of his or her own mind. Clearly, no self-respecting spiritualist could subscribe to the existence of an unknown consciousness.

Would it not be easier to accept, Paul Janet continued, that the consciousnesses are only apparently simultaneous and are rather the work of a single unified consciousness? “In certain cases, the two selves overlap”, he noted:

“Do you hear me? — No. — But you do hear me, since you answer me. — That is true. — Who hears me? — Other than Lucie.” We see that the subject is conscious of hearing at the very moment she believes that she does not hear.... At any rate, it will always be simpler to admit that it is the same consciousness that combines the two, than to admit the creation out of nothing [*ex nihilo*] of a new consciousness.⁵⁵

It is a “rather desperate solution”, he wrote in the preceding paragraph,

to conjure a consciousness from nothingness as soon as one is needed to explain the formation of a new self [*moi*]. Is this not to call upon the ultra-transcendent to account for natural facts? Would it not be wiser to simply attempt to get by with the original consciousness?⁵⁶

Notwithstanding his uncle’s remonstrations, Pierre Janet’s “rather desperate solution” to the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion established the conceptual foundation of much of his lifework and, arguably, of the general psychology of the unconscious.⁵⁷ It is ironic, therefore, that in formulating the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion, Paul Janet should have initiated a psychology that partly displaced the ideas he had spent his life defending.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Ian Hacking for helping me with this work and to Oliver Stunt for proofreading it. I also wish to thank my referees for their suggestions and criticisms. This article is based on the first two chapters of my Ph.D. dissertation, *On hypnosis, simulation, and faith: The problem of post-hypnotic suggestion in France, 1884–1896* (Toronto, 2000). The work was supported by a doctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

1. Paul Janet, “De la suggestion dans l’état d’hypnotisme”, *Revue politique et littéraire*, xxxiv (1884), 100–4, 129–32, 178–85, 198–203.
2. Pierre Janet, “Les actes inconscients et le dédoublement de la personnalité pendant le somnambulisme provoqué”, *Revue philosophique*, xxii (1886), 577–92.
3. Freud’s debt to Janet is well documented in Henri F. Ellenberger, *The discovery of the unconscious* (New York, 1970). Freud personally acknowledges the debt psychoanalysis owes to experiments in post-hypnotic suggestion: “Even before the time of psychoanalysis, hypnotic experiments, and especially post-hypnotic suggestion, had tangibly demonstrated the existence and mode

- of operation of the mental unconscious.” This passage appeared, in 1915, in Freud’s paper, “The unconscious”, under the section, “Justification for the concept of the unconscious” in *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, xiv (London, 1957), 161–204.
4. The scholarship is immense, but the most comprehensive survey and analysis of the literature is Ian Hacking, *Rewriting the soul: Multiple personality and the sciences of memory* (Princeton, 1995).
 5. The frontline scholarship bearing upon the history of dissociation is principally: Paul Antze and Michael Lambek (eds), *Tense past: Cultural essays in trauma and memory* (New York, 1996); Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, *Souvenirs d’Anna O: Une mystification centenaire* (Mesnil-sur-l’Estrée, 1995); *idem*, “L’effet Bernheim (fragments d’une théorie de l’artefact généralisé)”, *Corpus des oeuvres de philosophie en langue française*, xxxii (1997), 147–73; John C. Burnham, “The fragmenting of the soul: Intellectual prerequisites for ideas of dissociation in the United States”, in J. M. Quen (ed.), *Split minds/split brains* (New York, 1986), 63–83; Jaqueline Carroy, *Hypnose, suggestion et psychologie: L’invention de sujets* (Paris, 1991); *idem*, *Les personnalités doubles et multiples: Entre science et fiction* (Paris, 1993); Pierre-Henri Castel, *La querelle de l’hystérie: La formation du discours psychopathologique en France (1881–1913)* (Paris, 1998); Adam Crabtree, *From Mesmer to Freud: Magnetic sleep and the roots of psychological healing* (New Haven, 1993); Ellenberger, *Discovery* (ref. 3); Alan Gauld, *A history of hypnotism* (Cambridge, 1992); Ian Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4), and *Mad travelers: Reflections on the reality of transient mental illnesses* (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1998); Ernest R. Hilgard, *Divided consciousness: Multiple controls in human thought and action* (New York, 1977 [expanded edition, 1986]); Ruth Leys, “Traumatic cures: Shell shock, Janet, and the question of memory”, *Critical inquiry*, xx (1994), 623–62; Allan Young, *The harmony of illusions: Inventing post-traumatic stress disorder* (Princeton, 1995).
 6. The author also reviewed the scientific literature from the 1960s to the present and found no mention of dissociation having originated in the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion. This survey included special issues devoted to Janet in the *Bulletin de psychologie*, xiv (1960), 2–193, and the *Annales médico-psychologiques*, clxvii (1989), 935–1016.
 7. For biographical information on Paul Janet see John I. Brooks III, *The eclectic legacy: Academic philosophy and the human sciences in nineteenth-century France* (Newark, 1998), 39; Ellenberger, *Discovery* (ref. 3), 332–4; Georges Lacour-Gayet, *Pour la mémoire de Paul Janet* (Paris, 1923); and Georges Picot, *Paul Janet: Notice historique* (Paris, 1903).
 8. Alfred Fouillée, *Critique des systèmes de morale contemporaine* (Paris, 1883; eighth edn, Paris, 1911). Ellenberger mentions Fouillée’s remark in *Discovery* (ref. 3), 401–2, but paraphrases it in such a way that it refers to all of Janet’s work and not only his book *La morale*.
 9. Paul Janet, “De la suggestion” (ref. 1).
 10. *Ibid.*, 103; his emphasis.
 11. *Ibid.*, 103.
 12. *Ibid.*, 103; his emphasis.
 13. *Ibid.*, 201.
 14. Hippolyte Bernheim, “De la suggestion dans l’état d’hypnotique et dans l’état de veille”, *Revue médicale de l’est*, xv (1883), 545–59, pp. 555–6.
 15. Paul Janet, “De la suggestion” (ref. 1), 201; his emphasis.
 16. Charles Richet, “De la suggestion et de l’inconscience”, *Revue politique et littéraire*, xxxiv (1884), 253–4. It is the same Richet who won the Nobel prize for medicine in 1913.
 17. *Ibid.*, 254.
 18. H. Beaunis, “L’expérimentation en psychologie par le somnambulisme provoqué”, *Revue*

philosophique, xx (1885), 1–36, pp. 18–21.

19. *Ibid.*, 20.
20. *Ibid.*, 21.
21. H. Beanis, *Le somnambulisme provoqué: Études physiologiques et psychologiques* (2nd edn, Paris, 1886), 243; Hippolyte Bernheim, “Souvenirs latents et suggestions à longue échéance”, *Revue médicale de l’est*, xvii (1886), 97–111; Joseph Delboeuf, “Sur les suggestions à date fixe”, *Revue philosophique*, xx (1885), 514–15; and Pierre Janet, *Automatisme psychologique: Essai de psychologie expérimentale sur les formes inférieures de l’activité humaine* (Paris, 1889; 4th edn reprinted, Paris, 1989), 248–62.
22. Pierre Janet, “Les actes inconscients et le dédoublement” (ref. 2). The idea of dissociation is present in the 1886 paper but the term itself appears a year later in Janet, “L’anesthésie systématisée et la dissociation des phénomènes psychologiques”, *Revue philosophique*, xxiii (1887), 449–72. Janet more frequently employed the term ‘*désagrégation*’ at this period. Throughout this paper I use the term ‘dissociation’, which was later adopted by the majority of writers, including Janet himself, to refer to Janet’s early work, in particular, and the mechanism of multiple consciousnesses, in general.
23. Hippolyte Bourru and P. Burot, “Un cas de la multiplicité des états de conscience chez un hystéro-épileptique”, *Revue philosophique*, xx (1885), 411–16. See Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4), 171–82.
24. Pierre Janet, “Les actes inconscients et le dédoublement” (ref. 2), 582–4.
25. *Ibid.*, 584–6.
26. On automatic writing, see Wilma Koutstall, “Skirting the abyss: A history of experimental explorations of automatic writing in psychology”, *Journal of the history of the behavioral sciences*, xxviii (1992), 5–27; and Sonu Shamdasani, “Automatic writing and the discovery of the unconscious”, *Spring*, lxiv (1993), 118–21.
27. Pierre Janet, “Les actes inconscients et le dédoublement” (ref. 2), 586.
28. *Ibid.*, 589.
29. *Ibid.*, 592.
30. *Ibid.*, 590–2.
31. “[T]he result of his work with the patient Lucie”, Ellenberger writes, “in retrospect is considered as the first cathartic cure”, *Discovery* (ref. 3), 755.
32. Pierre Janet, “L’anesthésie systématisée et la dissociation” (ref. 22), and “Les actes inconscients et la mémoire pendant le somnambulisme provoqué”, *Revue philosophique*, xxv (1888), 238–79.
33. Adam Crabtree and Alan Gauld also acknowledge Janet as having been the first to formulate the concept of dissociation. Gauld seems not to have noticed that the concept originated as a solution to the problem of post-hypnotic suggestion although he does mention that some researchers, especially L. Loewenfeld, worked on the problem. See Crabtree, *From Mesmer to Freud* (ref. 5), 307–26; and Gauld, *History of hypnotism* (ref. 5), on Janet, 369–75, and on Loewenfeld, 454–7.
34. Janet very likely modelled his automatic writing experiments upon those reported by Frederick W. H. Myers, a founding member of the Society for Psychical Research in London. On the important conceptual debt Janet owed to Myers, see Shamdasani, “Automatic writing” (ref. 26).
35. See Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4), 159–70.
36. For recent work on Charcot and the concept of psychological trauma, see Jacques Gasser, *Aux origines du cerveau moderne: Localisations, langage et mémoire dans l’oeuvre de Charcot* (Paris, 1995), 217–88; Marcel Gauchet and Gladys Swain, *Le vrai Charcot: Les chemins imprévus de l’inconscient* (Paris, 1997); Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4), 183–97; Mark

- Micale, "Charcot and the idea of hysteria in the male: Gender, mental science, and medical diagnosis in late nineteenth-century France", *Medical history*, xxxiv (1990), 363–411, pp. 390–1; *idem*, "Charcot and *les névroses traumatiques*: Historical and scientific reflections", *Revue neurologique*, clx (1994), 498–505.
37. William James, *The principles of psychology* (London, 1890), 165 and 203–13.
 38. Morton Prince, *The dissociation of a personality: A biographical study in abnormal psychology* (New York, 1906).
 39. See Mark Micale, "On the disappearance of hysteria: A study in the clinical deconstruction of a diagnosis", *Isis*, lxxxiv (1993), 496–526.
 40. Ellenberger, *Discovery* (ref. 3), 413.
 41. Ernest R. Hilgard, "A neodissociation interpretation of pain reduction in hypnosis", *Psychological review*, lxxx (1973), 396–411.
 42. See also Hilgard, *Divided consciousness* (ref. 5).
 43. See Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4). Some of the books generated by the general controversy include: Frederick Crews, *The memory wars: Freud's legacy in dispute* (New York, 1995); Elizabeth Loftus and Katherine Ketcham, *The myth of repressed memory: False memories and allegations of sexual abuse* (New York, 1994); D. Nathan and M. Snedeker, *Satan's silence: Ritual abuse and the making of a modern American witch hunt* (New York, 1995); Richard Ofshe and E. Watters, *Making monsters: False memory, psychotherapy, and sexual hysteria* (New York, 1994); Mark Pendergrast, *Victims of memory: Sex abuse accusations and shattered lives* (2nd edn, Hinesberg, 1996); Elaine Showalter, *Hystories: Hysterical epidemics and modern culture* (New York, 1997).
 44. Flora Rheta Schreiber, *Sybil* (New York, 1973).
 45. Joseph Breuer and Sigmund Freud, "On the psychical mechanism of hysterical phenomena: Preliminary communication", *Standard edition* (ref. 3), ii (1893), 3–17.
 46. See American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th edn [DSM–IV] (Washington, 1994); and Hacking, *Rewriting the soul* (ref. 4), 39–54.
 47. Alfred Binet, "L'automatisme psychologique", *Revue philosophique*, xxix (1890), 186–200; André Lalande, "L'automatisme psychologique", *Revue de l'hypnotisme*, iv (1889–90), 363–69; Frederic W. H. Myers, "Professor Pierre Janet's 'Automatisme psychologique'", *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vi (1889–90), 186–99.
 48. Paul Janet, *Principes de métaphysique et de psychologie: Leçons professées à la faculté de lettres de Paris — 1888–1894* (Paris, 1897), 556–72. The critical essay, "L'automatisme psychologique. M. Pierre Janet", is in the appendix and corresponds to the report he prepared as a jury member of Pierre Janet's doctoral defence.
 49. *Ibid.*, p. vi.
 50. *Ibid.*, p. viii.
 51. Brooks III also notes that Paul Janet "questioned the notion of the split ego" and raised "objections" that were "quite penetrating", *The eclectic legacy* (ref. 7), 170, and note 28 on p. 283.
 52. Paul Janet, *Principes de métaphysique* (ref. 48), 570.
 53. Brooks III, *The eclectic legacy* (ref. 7), 39.
 54. Victor Cousin, *Du vrai, du beau, et du bien* (Paris, 1836), 11, cited in Paul Janet, *Victor Cousin et son oeuvre* (Paris, 1885), 420.
 55. Paul Janet, *Principes de métaphysique* (ref. 48), 571–2; on eclectic spiritualism, see John I. Brooks III, "Philosophy and psychology at the Sorbonne, 1885–1913", *Journal of the history of the behavioral sciences*, xxix (1993), 123–45, and *The eclectic legacy* (ref. 7).
 56. Paul Janet, *Principes de métaphysique* (ref. 48), 571. See Pierre Janet, "Les actes inconscients et le dédoublement" (ref. 2), 589. One hundred years on, Alan Gauld came to much the same

conclusion. In a detailed critique of dissociation, he demonstrated how the concept complicates theoretical matters much more than it simplifies them and urged that we be extremely cautious about accepting evidence for secondary streams of consciousness. But while he criticised dissociation for its implausibility, he nevertheless admitted that he “can see no reason for arguing that the concept of a secondary stream of consciousness, or second ‘apperceptive centre’, is incoherent or totally without instantiation”, *History of hypnotism* (ref. 5), 591–5, p. 595.

57. Until at least 1898, Janet continued to build upon the general theory of dissociation he advanced in the late 1880s. See especially, “Étude sur un cas d’aboulie et d’idées fixes”, *Revue philosophique*, xxxi (1891), 258–87, 382–407; “Quelques définitions récentes de l’hystérie”, *Archives de neurologie*, xxv (1893), 417–38 and xxvi (1893), 1–29; “Histoire d’une idée fixe”, *Revue philosophique*, xxxvii (1894), 121–68; and *Névroses et idées fixes* (Paris, 1898).