

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

CONTENTS.	PAGE
New Associates .. .. .	137
Meeting of the Council .. .. .	137
General Meeting .. .. .	138
Cases Received by the Literary Committee .. .. .	138-148
Correspondence:—	
Mr. Angelo Lewis and Dr. Monck .. .. .	148
Multiplex Personality .. .. .	146
Crystal Gazing .. .. .	149
Do Animals see Apparitions? .. .. .	150
International Congress of Physiological Psychology .. .. .	151
The Use of Hypnotic Treatment in Insanity .. .. .	151
Library Catalogue .. .. .	152

### NEW ASSOCIATES.

#### HONORARY ASSOCIATE.

WALWYN, Mrs., 9, Sion Hill, Clifton, Bristol.

#### ASSOCIATES.

BLUMENTHAL, MADAME, 43, Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.

BUXTON, MRS. SYDNEY, 15, Eaton Place, London, S.W.

DEVLIN, RICHARD THEODORE, Poste Restante, Monaco, France.

### MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

A Meeting of the Council was held on July 8th. The President was in the chair, and the following Members were also present:— Professor W. F. Barrett, Dr. A. T. Myers, Lieut.-Colonel Hartley, and Messrs. T. Barkworth, F. W. H. Myers, F. Podmore, and H. Arthur Smith.

On the proposition of Mr. Podmore, Mrs. Walwyn was elected as an Honorary Associate.

Three new Associates, whose names and addresses are given above, were elected.

Report was made that the rooms not required by the Society had been let to Mr. H. O. Cresswell, Architect, 31, Spring-gardens, from Midsummer, at a rent of £25 per annum.

It was agreed that General Meetings should be held on the afternoon of Friday, the 25th of October, at four o'clock, and in the evening of Friday, the 29th of November, at 8.30 o'clock. It was also agreed that tea and coffee should be provided at the close of the afternoon meeting on October 25th, in order to afford more opportunity for conversation, and for Members becoming better acquainted with each other.

Some other matters of routine business were attended to, and the next Meeting of the Council was fixed for Friday, October 4th, at 4.30 p.m.

### GENERAL MEETING.

A General Meeting was held at the Westminster Town Hall, on Monday, July 8th, at 8.30 p.m., the President, Professor Sidgwick, in the chair.

The PRESIDENT made some remarks on the census of hallucinations now in progress, describing the objects and methods of investigation and the progress so far made. The number of answers received amounted at that time to about 1,600. He concluded by asking for the co-operation of all interested in the work of the Society, whether as believers or disbelievers in telepathy, stating that he would be glad to send the necessary papers to any one willing to help.

MR. MYERS read a paper on "Recognised Apparitions Occurring more than a Year after Death," quoting several cases in which the phantasm conveyed information previously unknown to the percipient, or in which it was seen by several persons, or on other grounds could not be classed as a purely subjective hallucination. The paper will appear in the next number of the *Proceedings*.

MR. WHITE, commenting on Mr. Myers' paper, objected that he took for granted the question of a future life, and that the evidence of intelligent people about ghosts was not more valuable than that of others, since they were equally subject to hallucinations.

MR. MYERS replied that he did not assume the existence of disembodied spirits, but that the evidence under discussion went to prove it, and that the cogency of the evidence was not affected by the question whether the experiences were hallucinations or not, but depended on there being some coincidence with objective fact, or other characteristic, to distinguish them from ordinary hallucinations.

MR. BARKWORTH remarked that though it seemed most probable that apparitions, even when veridical, were to be regarded as hallucinations and not as objective phenomena, still this should not be too hastily assumed. We must keep our minds open and not reject evidence, in whatever direction it might point.

### CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

#### COLLECTIVE CASES.

The following case was sent to us by Mrs. Wood, of 4, The Avenue, Colchester, who obtained it in course of collecting answers for the

hallucination census. A less complete account of the incident was sent to us in 1883.

## G. 4, Collective.

[1889]

In 1852, between 8.30 and 9.p.m., in either the last week in July, or the first week in August, on a fine, clear, light evening, I, (Mrs. C.) then 14 years of age, and my sister, Mrs. H., then aged 12 years, were shutting a window looking out on the drive up to the front of our father's house, and on to a large open lawn; my first cousin, a lad aged 14½, was in the next room, in which was a window with the same view. We three clearly saw the figure of a small woman or young girl, dressed in white, with a white covering over her head like a hood, coming across the lawn in front of us, and then, passing through a field the figure disappeared. Her mode of progression struck us as being very strange; she made a slight pause occasionally, and then resumed her former pace with a jerk. Her hands were somewhat raised and clasped, but she sometimes unclasped them, making a movement that seemed like wringing them. Two old ponies were tethered at some little distance from each other on the lawn; she passed between them; they were both much frightened and ran wildly round and round; this was seen by a fourth person who came into the room just as the figure disappeared. The ponies were in the habit of seeing people pass them and never took any notice of strangers or others. My sister, my cousin, and myself were in good health and good spirits. The only girl or person of the same stature as this figure living in the neighbourhood was the daughter of my father's bailiff, and at the first sight of the figure my cousin exclaimed "It must be——in her night-dress!" I knew the girl was not likely to be there at that hour, and on inquiry of her mother the next morning, we were told the girl was not well and had never left her bed the previous day. I may add, the figure came from an opposite direction to that of the bailiff's house.

In the year 1854 my sister and I heard for the first time that there was an old legend connected with the house and grounds. We were told by a lady (now deceased) that in a book, giving an account of some of the——counties, there was a history attached to the grounds of——Hall. This history I have never read, but I was told that its purport was, that a girl in the reign of Henry VIII. had been ill-treated, and in her novice or nun's dress dragged across the land and drowned in a lake that had been partially drained, in fact, was a mere bog, long before my father bought the place.

My sister is living, my cousin is dead. He became an officer in the army, and when serving in the West Indies (or Honduras), he met with the son of the gentleman who owned——Hall before my father bought it. This young man happened to relate the apparition of the nun to a third person in the presence of my cousin, and there could be no doubt he was speaking of that which my cousin had seen.

As the legend refers to a curse invoked by the nun on the possessors of the land, and as that land has now passed out of the possession of our family, it is not desirable that any names should be mentioned in relating the story, as a belief in it might cause anxiety and probably diminish the value of the property. I once related the story to Mr. Justice Wightman in the presence

of Mr. Matthew Arnold, and the judge crossed-questioned me closely, and he expressed himself to the effect that it was one of the most inexplicable and yet one of the best authenticated stories of the kind he had ever heard.

The house was purchased by my father in 1861. We saw the figure in 1852, and never heard of the legend till the summer of 1854. I cannot now give the date when my cousin saw the son of the former proprietor, but it was several years later.

(Signed)——

Mrs. C.'s sister, Mrs. H., adds:—

“My first cousin . . . was in the next room . . . We called to him to look at the figure, and he saw just what we did. . . . I have read the account Mrs. C. has written, and it tallies with my recollections.”

G. 184, Collective.

From Mrs. Willett, Bedales, Lindfield, Haywards' Heath,

COPY OF ENTRY IN BOOK.

Bedales, *December*, 1886.

On Saturday, December 11th, about 4, or 4.15 p.m., my eldest child Dorothy, aged nearly thirteen, was standing in the hall talking to Miss S——, the schoolmistress at Scaynes Hill, when they both saw what appeared to them to be a little child in a white pinafore running along the gallery, but they heard no sound of footsteps. Miss S——was just going away, and went towards the garden door. Dorothy, thinking her little cousin, Ralph Bagnell, aged nearly three, who is now living with us while his parents are in India, was on his way downstairs from the nursery, and might fall downstairs, went, expecting to meet him: but neither the child nor any one else was in the gallery, or on the stairs. Subsequent inquiry in the nursery proved that the child had not left the room between his going upstairs about 3 o'clock, and coming down again about 5. Dorothy came into the morning-room where I was sitting, talking to a friend. She told me what she had seen as soon as this friend had left—about 4.30; I asked her for a description of the child. She said it seemed to have fair hair like Ralph's and had apparently a dark frock and white pinafore, and ran along the gallery very quickly, only she heard no sound. I did not understand from her at first that Miss S——had been with her until this evening (Sunday, December 12th,) when at tea-time Miss S——being here, I told her what the child said she had seen, when Miss S——said “Oh! I saw a little child in a white pinafore run quickly along the gallery, and made sure it was Master Ralph; I saw the head of the child with fair hair, and he had on a white pinafore. It was as I was standing talking to Miss Dorothy in the hall, just as I was going away, about 4.15. She went upstairs and I went out at the garden door.”

I wrote out this directly after tea [*i.e.*, on Sunday, December 12th, 1886. F.P.] Dorothy has a very great objection now to anything being said about this, and as I found she was so averse to saying anything if asked, I prevailed on her to make a note in my book. It is this—“On Saturday, December 11th, 1886, about four o'clock, I was standing in the hall talking to Miss S—— I looked up and saw, as I thought, R. Bagnell run along the gallery. It had a dark frock and white pinafore on. Miss S——was just going and

went out of the side door ; I went upstairs quite expecting to meet Ralph, but no one was there. Kate told us he had not been out of the nursery.—D.M.K.W., *November 9th, 1887.*”

*July 25th, 1888.*

Dorothy, who has seen the child I told you about, is the most *matter-of-fact*, practical, and unimaginative girl possible. I see you ask me if she has had any other hallucination. When we were living at the Vicarage, West Bromwich (Dorothy was, I think, about five at the time this happened), she went out of the dining-room to go into the drawing-room to fetch a wool-needle, but came running back in great alarm, saying she had seen a “grinning ugly face” looking at her over the top of some curtains that divided the hall from the entrance lobby. I went with her at once, expecting to find some one had been hiding behind the curtain, but no one was to be seen, and when she showed me where the face was, I saw at once that no one could possibly have been up at the top, looking over the curtain-pole, unless they had been on steps. I asked Dorothy only a short time since again about this, and she said she should never forget that face, and his horrid wicked look. At the time, of course, I made light of it, but for a long time she would not go upstairs past those curtains alone—also I remember soon after we came here in 1881, Dorothy told me she had seen a white figure going along the gallery ; near where she afterwards saw the little child. I did not think much of this at the time, as it was dusk when she saw it.

You ask me how our hall was lighted that December afternoon at 4.15. It is a very large hall, and at the end is a large bay window running the whole height to the roof and admitting, of course, much light. I was sitting in the morning-room at the time, and it was light enough for me not to require any artificial light—this room faces north, but the hall window is south—the gallery runs along the north side of the hall.

There have been very curious sights and sounds in this house. Much as I have wished it I have never seen *any* thing—but I have twice *heard* quite unaccountable noises, like the breaking of crockery. I make a rule now of at once writing down any of these strange things.

MARY WILLETT.

In reply to a letter from us, asking for an independent account, Miss S—— writes :—

“St. Augustine’s House, Scaynes Hill, Lindfield, Haywards’ Heath.

“*September 3rd, 1888.*”

“I have not time now to say more than that my account would be almost word for word the same as that which Mrs. Willett sent you ; since she wrote the account in her journal in my presence directly after the occurrence, and I saw the copy sent to you.”

Afterwards we sent Miss S—— a copy of the account sent by Mrs. Willett, which she returned with “Quite correct, Eleanor S——,” written below. In another letter she says : “I am a very matter-of-fact person, and never had any hallucination in my life.”

## UNCONSCIOUS IMPRESSIONS REVIVED IN DREAMS.

The following account received from Mrs. Bickford-Smith seems to be a very clear case of an impression, unconsciously received or forgotten, being revived in a dream. Such latent memory has been mentioned in some of the discussions in the *Proceedings* as a probable explanation of certain dreams, and we think that from this point of view, the following case will be found to have very considerable interest:—

February 4th, 1889.

On reaching Morley's Hotel at 5 o'clock on Tuesday, 29th January, 1889, I missed a gold brooch, which I supposed I had left in a fitting room at Swan and Edgar's. I sent there at once, but was very disappointed to hear that after a diligent search they could not find the brooch. I was very vexed, and worried about the brooch, and that night dreamed that I should find it shut up in a number of the *Queen* newspaper that had been on the table, and in my dream I saw the very page where it would be. I had noticed one of the plates on that page. Directly after breakfast I went to Swan and Edgar's and asked to see the papers, at the same time telling the young ladies about the dream, and where I had seen the brooch. The papers had been moved from that room, but were found, and to the astonishment of the young ladies, I said, "This is the one that contains my brooch"; and there at the very page I expected I found it.

A. M. BICKFORD-SMITH.

We received a substantially similar account from Mrs. Bickford-Smith's brother-in-law, Mr. H. A. Smith, who was a witness of the trouble taken to find the brooch, both at the hotel, and by sending to Swan and Edgar's on the previous evening.

The following, though less clearly so, is probably a case of the same kind. We have the independent account of the dreamer himself, written two years later, but as it is somewhat disjointed we prefer to give that kindly sent to us by Miss Ada Hunt, of Pen Villa, Yeovil, which has the further advantage of having been written at the time.

The following rather remarkable dream took place on the 20th November, 1886. On that day I gave to our gardener, G. Wilmot, his wages, 15s., in a half-sheet of paper, some letters to post, and two parcels and a note to leave at various houses on his way home. This was at 6 o'clock in the evening. . . . About an hour after, the gardener returned to tell me he had lost his wages. I advised him to carefully retrace his steps and make every inquiry, but this he did without success; and as it was "fair" night and the town full of people, he at last gave it up as hopeless and returned to his home quite a mile distant. During the night he dreamt that he went to one of the houses where he had left a note, and, crossing the road after leaving it, he walked into a mud heap, and that there his foot struck the paper containing

the money; the half-sovereign rolled away and the 5s. remained under his foot. He told his wife the dream, and falling asleep again he dreamt the same dream again. Early in the morning he went to the place and found his dream fulfilled to the letter, even to the rolling away of the gold, and the silver remaining in its place.

He is a most intelligent, truthful man. . . .

The gardener's own account differs from this in giving fewer details as to the dream; his account of it is: "I dreamt I had found it and kicked the half-sovereign off the heap." Miss Hunt thinks that his nervousness at writing himself made him forget to say that he dreamt exactly where the money was found. He had so little belief in his dream that he tossed up as to whether he should go to look for the money again or not.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### MR. ANGELO LEWIS AND DR. MONCK.

*To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

SIR,—In the last number of the *Journal* you print a letter from Mr. Angelo Lewis in which occurs the following passage: "One of Dr. Monck's stock feats was to place a musical-box on the table, and cover it with a cigar-box, after which it played or stopped playing at command. Suggested explanation, 'Spirits.' Real explanation, that the box in question did nothing at all, the sound being produced by a second box strapped to Monck's leg above the knee (inside the trouser), and set in motion by pressure against the under surface of the table."

Now, as you refuse to accept any evidence of spiritual phenomena on vague hearsay, I think you should equally refuse to accept or print such vague accusations as this. Does Mr. Lewis mean by "real explanation" that he himself actually discovered a box tied to Dr. Monck's leg in the way described? Or, merely, that in his own imitations of the phenomena he uses one so tied? If the latter, I submit that he had no right whatever to use the term "real explanation," or to treat Dr. Monck as an impostor in this matter. I happen to have witnessed the phenomena myself, and I can declare positively that Mr. Lewis' account of it is incorrect. The following is an extract from my notes made at the time: "September 21st, 1877. Séance at Mr. C. Reimers', 6, Manor-villas, Richmond. Present—Dr. Monck, Mr. and Mrs. Bennett, Dr. Malcolm, Mrs. Firman and sister, Mr. Reimers, Mr. A. R. Wallace." (The last of an extraordinary series of phenomena is described as follows.) "A musical box, or rather the working part taken out of its box, was placed on the table laid on a sheet of white paper. It then played and stopped when requested, and this took place when I placed my hand lightly on it. Under these conditions it played and stopped just as I desired, Dr. Monck's hands being at a considerable distance on the table. Each person in succession placed his hands on the box and *felt* it play or stop

when desired, thus proving that it was not *another box* under the table which played."

On this occasion, then, there was no cigar-box to hide the musical-box and muffle its sound, while the hands of the spectators assisted their eyes and ears in declaring that the actual box before them played and stopped at command.

ALFRED R. WALLACE.

*To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

DEAR SIR,—In reply to Mr. Wallace's letter, my informant as to the musical-box matter was Mr. H. B. Lodge, of Huddersfield, the gentleman who was the instrument of the crushing exposure of Monck, in October, 1876. Not caring to rest entirely on my own recollection of facts which took place 13 years ago, I have submitted Mr. Wallace's letter to Mr. Lodge, who replies as follows :—

"Your statement as to Dr. Monck's musical-box trick is quite correct. I put the cigar-box over the working part of the musical-box with my own hands, and Monck did not get a sound from it till this was done, and even then only in a very dim light. At first I was puzzled; then it struck me how it was done, and I was so certain about it that at the end of the séance I offered the doctor a handsome sum (whether £20 or £50 I cannot now be certain, but I think the latter) if he would allow me to search him and I did not find both a duplicate musical-box and a 'spirit hand' we had seen in the course of the manifestations. I further told him that if I failed to do so I would not only make him the most abject apology, but would become a Spiritualist and work for the cause to the very utmost of my power. All the sitters except myself and one other gentleman were Spiritualists, and they agreed that my offer was a fair one. In fact, his host (Mr. Hepplestone) said to the doctor, 'If you have nothing concealed, why not allow Mr. Lodge to see for himself? We are believers, and we also believe Mr. Lodge to be an honest investigator,' or something to that effect. The other Spiritualists present also urged Monck to consent, but instead of doing so, he struck me in the face, and then rushed up to his bedroom and locked himself in. After some time a policeman was fetched, and the door burst in; and if it had not been for an open window and a couple of sheets tied to the waterspout, I have no doubt some of us would have thought the doctor had been 'spirited' away. The Rev. Dr. Monck had certainly 'flown,' and without either hat or overcoat. No doubt he took many things with him. A small box (about 10 or 12 inches by six), which he had brought into the séance with him was missing, and the 'hand' and duplicate musical-box used at the séance would naturally be on his person; but he left plenty of other evidence behind, for in two lock-up boxes and a large-sized bath (locked and strapped) we found scores of things such as 'spirit hands,' 'spirit faces,' 'floating rods,' 'illuminated names,' 'spirit lamps,' and any quantity of white gauze, in fact, all sorts of things to produce so-called 'manifestations.' We also found some 60 or 80 keys, some of them being skeleton keys.

"The drum in the musical-box which was supposed to play *never moved*, or



if it did, the spirits must have moved it back again to the point from which it started.

“ We made every endeavour to trace the small box which Monck had carried off with him when he escaped out of the window, but without effect. When he was admitted to bail, I went to the railway station and saw him off. He waved his hand by way of ‘good-bye,’ and when the train had got perhaps 30 or 40 yards out, he held this very box out of the window, shook it, and laughed, as much as to say, ‘I have done you here, at all events.’”

The sequel will be in the recollection of most of your readers, or may be found recorded in the local newspapers. The matter was taken up by the Huddersfield Superintendent of Police, Mr. Hilton, and after one or two appearances before the magistrates, Dr. Monck was sentenced (with the hearty approval of the local Spiritualists) to three months’ imprisonment as a rogue and a vagabond.

So stands the evidence as to the musical-box matter. It is only circumstantial, it is true, but amply sufficient, I think, to satisfy any unprejudiced person. The charge was clear and precise. A definite assertion was made that this “manifestation” was produced by means of a duplicate musical-box on the person of the medium, and he was challenged to disprove it by submitting to a search. If he was innocent, he had everything to gain and nothing to lose by doing so. He would not only have pocketed a handsome money *solatium*, but increased his own prestige, and poured shame and confusion upon the head of his accuser. He was surrounded by friends and believers, only too eager that he should justify himself, and pressing him to comply. Can any sane person doubt that *if he could*, he would have done so? Instead of this, he flies panic-stricken, leaving behind him damning evidence of habitual imposture, in the shape of a whole arsenal of fraudulent machinery.

Mr. Wallace argues that my explanation is incorrect, because *nearly a year later* he was present at a séance with Monck where an *uncovered* musical-box movement played and stopped at command, and Mr. Wallace adds: “Each person in succession placed his hands on the box, and felt it play or stop when desired, *thus proving that it was not another box under the table which played.*”

Is this remarkable? The wonder would rather have been if Monck, after the undesirable publicity given to that second box up the leg of his trousers, had *not* amended his *modus operandi*. He must have sadly wasted those three months of enforced seclusion, if he did not come forth with a few new devices for the confusion of the unwary, and probably an improved musical-box trick was among them. Mr. Wallace’s own note shows that he knew all about the suggested box under the table, and was prepared for that contrivance; but probably he was taken in by some device equally simple. “Each person in succession placed his hands on the box, and *felt* it play or stop when desired.” Why *felt*? Obviously because there was not light enough to *see* it play or stop. Does any man ever put out his hand to *feel* whether a thing is in motion, when his eyes assure him that it is so? It is therefore a mere

figure of speech to say that "the hands of the spectators assisted their eyes and ears," for their eyes could have had no real share in the matter. With a far less degree of obscurity than is here indicated, a black silk thread is perfectly invisible, and the use of such a thread would be amply sufficient (to anyone having the most elementary knowledge of conjuring expedients) to account for the playing and stopping of the actual box on the table.

The only real marvel in the facts stated is that a gentleman of the scientific eminence of Mr. A. R. Wallace should, after the overwhelming exposure of October, 1876, again be found sitting with a proved humbug like Monck. The fact illustrates the weakest point of the Spiritualist creed: viz., the willingness of believers not merely to hush up proved fraud, but again to give credence to the quasi-supernatural powers of the imposter. There is hardly a medium known to fame who has not been detected in flagrant trickery, but the most scathing exposure does not shake the firm faith of thorough-going Spiritualists. However grossly the offender may have deceived others, so long as they themselves have not detected him in fraud (as they probably would not till the end of time), they still fraternise with him, "sit" with him, take grave notes of his "manifestations." What wonder, then, that less credulous persons are chary of accepting their evidence!

ANGELO LEWIS ("Professor Hoffmann").

---

### MULTIPLEX PERSONALITY.

*To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

SIR,—It would seem from the discussion which has broken out on this subject that Mr. Myers will at length be compelled to formulate more precisely the ulterior theories that underlie much of his writing, and which he has, in my opinion wisely, not needlessly obtruded hitherto.

The question that has been raised may be broadly stated as being: What must be the inner constitution of the self so as to include the phenomena of multiplex personality, and in what sense can we speak of "secondary selves"? And the interpretations of the phenomena thus classified would naturally fall under two heads.

I. The first kind of interpretation, which Mr. Myers and Mr. Barkworth agree in calling the materialistic, would seek to explain the facts of "multiplex personality" as co-ordinate effects of peculiar physical conditions, neither related to one another, nor correlated manifestations of any higher motive force. The different personalities on this theory would simply be *different persons*, that happened to share in, or, more accurately, to be the results of different conditions of, the same body and this fact would serve to explain also their general similarity. The bond of union between the different personalities would, in other words, be purely material. In terms of Mr. Myers' metaphor of the factory, the looms would on this hypothesis supply their own motive forces, form their own connections, and themselves change their modes of linking. The "selves," therefore, *i.e.*, the modes of coupling the looms, are only related in their material, *i.e.*, as modes of linking the same looms, and to speak of "secondary selves" is decidedly

misleading, as suggesting some sort of subordination to a primary which has itself to be explained as the resultant of a common arrangement of certain particles. It is perhaps necessary to add that this materialistic interpretation must aim at definitely localising the cerebral centres corresponding to every "personality," and would be greatly facilitated if the phenomena of multiplex personality can be, as Mr. Barkworth desires, reduced to minor varieties of "duplex personality," and brought into connection with the duality of the brain.

But it is becoming more and more doubtful whether so summary an interpretation is capable of doing justice to the intricacy of the facts, and whether the limited areas of our cerebral hemispheres can find room for all these different chains of memory and sets of personalities. For, on a materialist hypothesis, any memory must mean a certain definite arrangement of physical atoms, a change in the relative positions of which would involve loss of memory. It is impossible therefore to admit the assumption that our brains can contain an infinite or indefinite number of such memories, or systems of particles independently preserving themselves intact and increasing by the addition of other particles. Yet there seem to be an indefinite number of "secondary selves," and indefinite potentialities of multiplex personality inherent in each of us, and our present methods seem not to have exhausted their numbers so much as to have limited their available paths of externalisation. If, *e.g.*, we put a pen into the right hand of an automatic writer, we get one secondary self manifested concurrently with its primary; if we put another pen into his left hand, we get another and it almost seems as if it merely required an automatist capable of writing with his feet to get two more of these "secondary selves." Or, again, on the materialistic interpretation, what are we to make of the strange glimpses afforded us that nothing is ever forgotten, and that the atomic combinations that had passed out of conscious memory had not really been dissolved, but persisted unimpaired in some mysterious corner of the brain? Hitherto materialism might have seemed to derive support from the phenomena of memory, and have seemed able to explain oblivion by the necessity of dissolving the combinations of particles constituting memory in order to make room for more recent impressions in the limited area of the brain, but now the brain appears to be an *intelligent* phonograph of inconceivable delicacy that has stored up in its records far more than ever entered into the conscious life of its owner.

II. These and similar difficulties seem to impel a candid investigator towards the second interpretation of the phenomena by means of an underlying non-material principle, that would represent the bond of union of the multiplex personalities, and stand towards the physical organism in the relation rather of a cause than of an effect. For not the least important point about hypnotic experiments is the weird power which the "unconscious self" seems to possess over the bodily organism. When a hypnotic suggestion can destroy something so physical as the pain of organic disease, or produce structural changes, to say nothing of the as yet doubtful powers of lucidity and clairvoyant prescience, we seem by its aid to have influenced the principle which actually *builds up the body* and regulates the growth of the

organism. And at the same time this principle that sways the body, apparently at will, and is able to *make matter*, seems like the long-sought scientific illustration of idealist philosophic theories that declare spirit alone to be the ultimate reality. And though it is, of course, still possible to take divergent views of this ground and unity of the manifold psychical activities within us, I hope I shall not tie myself down to anything mischievously precise if I venture to offer some criticisms of the phraseology to which Mr. Myers seems inclined to give the weighty sanction of his authority. The term "individuality" ought surely to mean the property of being an "individual," *i.e.*, something possessed by every stone and every atom of a stone as well as by conscious beings, and hence something less and not more than "personality." Though, therefore, it might improperly be used, instead of the more precise term "body," to designate the relations of the multiplex personalities on the materialistic hypothesis, it would be decidedly misleading to mean thereby such a higher and deeper principle of union as we seem likely to require. I would suggest rather the adoption of a term about which the metaphysicians have dreamt much, and which psychical research now seems to bring for the first time into the purview of exact science. If we call this underlying unity *the Transcendental Ego*, we shall, I think, acquire an unobjectionable term to express the most striking characteristics of the phenomena in question. It well expresses both its transcendence of the limitations of our ordinary consciousness and also the connection and fundamental kinship with it which it possesses in virtue of its individual selfhood. We should thus be able to distinguish precisely, firstly, *the phenomenal self* or normal consciousness; secondly, the "*secondary selves*"; and thirdly, their union and harmony in the *Transcendental Ego*, the realisation of which in a fully developed consciousness might be represented as the ideal or aim of the evolution of the other two. I have already occupied too much of your patience to touch upon the metaphysical superstructure that might be erected upon this basis, but it will be evident that Mr. Barkworth's fears as to the effect of modern researches into "multiplex personality" upon our prospects of immortality are justly declared by Mr. Myers to be entirely groundless. For if our normal self is but one out of many *imperfect and partial* manifestations of a transcendent personality, we need no longer fear that our true self possesses an amount of reality varying with the chances of this mortal life; that it is crushed by disease, curtailed by loss of memory, subverted by insanity, suspended by sleep, and finally dissolved by death: on the contrary, the grave difficulties that any rational eschatology must as yet continue to present may, perhaps, here receive an ultimate solution.

C. SCHILLER.

*To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

SIR,—In the *Journal* for May last Mr. Barkworth invited me to set forth some of the accumulating evidence which makes (as I hold) for the conception of Multiplex Personality. I have thought that this could be best done in the course of notices of certain French books and pamphlets of which it was thought desirable that reviews should appear in the forthcoming Part XV. of our *Proceedings*. To those reviews, therefore, I beg to refer Mr. Barkworth

Turning to Mr. Schiller's letter, with which I am in substantial agreement, I understand his objection to be to the use of the word individuality as meaning a unity pervading or expressed by an indefinite number of minor individualities. If one wishes to imply that this larger unity antecedes and underlies whatsoever masks or *personæ* it may assume in this or other existences, the term Transcendental Self or Transcendental Ego is more directly expressive. But have we a right to borrow terms which seem to transcend experience for our use in Experimental Psychology? Should we not rather seek our analogy from the natural history of animals other than ourselves?

Yet much the same difficulty as ours seems to be already felt by naturalists in describing what would be our truest parallel;—namely, those inferior animal forms which consist of a co-operating aggregate of minor individuals. To call a hydrozoon a “colonial animal” sounds rather as though we could not conceive of any organised community except in Queensland or Canada. We ought, perhaps, to adopt the term in psychology, and to speak of ourselves as “colonial souls.” Yet I fear that we should thus be exposed to misapprehensions like that of the gentleman who, seeing “Colonial Animals” advertised as the subject of a discourse, offered the lecturer the loan of a kangaroo.

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS.

---

#### CRYSTAL GAZING.

*To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.*

Lieut.-Colonel Fraser writes:—

DEAR SIR,—Being the person alluded to by Professor Barrett in the *Journal* for June, p. 83, I may mention that the whole series of these gazing methods are known to the natives as “Unjamu.” The experiments I made with care, and on very numerous occasions, with an illiterate native, who, however, saw much more clearly than he was able to describe, were with a pitchy substance made up with castor oil; a spot—about the size of a wafer—of which on a green leaf stuck against the wall being what the man looked into. That pictures are seen under these circumstances is a thing I found no native acquainted with these matters would dispute, and I suppose the composition is given in the Sanskrit Atharva Veda. Of course all the pictures he saw and I identified already existed in my recollection, just as they do in every one's who, if they see a photograph of a place they have been at, will tell in a moment where it is, not by one or two but the whole of the features;—they might therefore be produced by thought-reading. The impression I got, however, from repeated trials, was that even clairvoyance had nothing to do with the pictures, and it must be by actual perception of the objects in some undefinable way. Both this man and another who also used to see, but gave up the attempt for several years, stuck out that the property was in the black composition, and that though there was more than one kind, any black stuff would not answer.

\* \* \* \* \*

Calicut, India.

A. T. FRASER.

August 8th, 1889.

[Colonel Fraser adds some suggestions towards a physical theory of the

phenomenon described ; but these appear to us to be at least premature, and our space scarcely permits of our including them.—ED.]

### DO ANIMALS SEE APPARITIONS?

To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

SIR,—I see in the June number of the *Journal*, Mrs. Sidgwick's suggestion that the dogs, in General Barter's case,\* probably saw *nothing*, but merely heard a bewildering sound, while observing their master's attitude of expectation, &c.

I have a remarkable case to forward with my census paper, which decidedly bears out the theory that apparitions are not always merely subjective, but that animals are capable of apprehending apparitions in common with man.

ALYX M. WOOD.

4, The Avenue, Colchester.

June 16th.

[The case forwarded by Mrs. Wood is printed in the present number of the *Journal*, p. 139, and is numbered G. 4.—ED.]

To the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

SIR,—Among the suggestions in the June issue of our *Journal*, as to the reason of the action of the dogs accompanying General Barter, at the time of the apparition in India, I do not find any similar to an impression I had on first reading the account and which may be worth discussion or consideration, viz., that the terror of the animals was derived from that of their master ; impressed telepathically and shared by them as a *transferred idea only*, not in their case the result of, or accompanied by, any "pictorial basis,"—phantasmal or hallucinatory.

As these animals have often been known to seemingly act in anticipation of the wishes of their masters, before utterance, command, or even gesture from the latter ; and are noted for intelligence in such capacity, I do not think it should be considered extravagant to assume that strong mental excitation allied to fear on the part of the General, was reflected, as "undefined" terror, in the perception of the dogs, instead of arising in them as a result of any *direct sensory impression*, either visual or auditory—and thus purely as a transmitted mental "percept"—quite unconnected with any "sight of the alarm depicted on their master's countenance," as suggested by Dr. Klein. With regard to Mrs. Sidgwick's hypothesis I cannot conceive that a mere confused sound of shifting gravel could have been so *rhythmical* in its nature, as to cause the dogs by a process, as it were, of mental induction, in themselves to postulate the sound of a horse galloping and thence anticipate ("ex pede Herculem") the necessary sequence of a visible pony to such a degree as absolutely to become so terrified thereat as to run away in consequence of the said pony's *non-appearance*.

\* It will be remembered that General Barter heard sounds as of an approaching horse, and saw an apparition of a man on a pony and two grooms. His dogs exhibited signs of alarm. The case is published in *Proceedings XIV.*, p. 469.

Should my idea of the possibility of receptivity in animals for telepathic impressions from human beings be true, the same may exist also between animals of the lower orders, and would also apply to hundreds of recorded cases of the behaviour of dogs, in face of supranormal occurrences.

H. VENMAN.

June 15th, 1889.

---

### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

The meeting of this Congress, which was announced in previous *Journals*, took place at Paris in August, and was considered to be a decided success. The Congress took up the statistical inquiry into the frequency and nature of hallucinations which we had already begun, and this inquiry will be carried on in various countries of Europe, and in the United States of America. We hope that an interesting report on the subject will be presented to the Congress at their next meeting, (which is to be in London in 1892,) and if we are right in our belief in the telepathic origin of many hallucinations, it cannot but lead to a considerable addition to our knowledge of this, and, perhaps of other psychical subjects, as well as to a wider acceptance of our views, and interest in our researches. Though telepathy did not form one of the main subjects of discussion by the Congress, we were struck with the amount of interest that seemed to be taken in the subject, even by persons who do not yet consider it to be an established fact.

We do not give any report of the Congress here, as one will appear in a few weeks in our *Proceedings*, Part XV.

---

### THE USE OF HYPNOTIC TREATMENT IN INSANITY.

At the meeting of the British Medical Association, which was held at Leeds last August, a remarkable paper was read by M. Auguste Voisin, physician to the Salpêtrière Hospital, Paris, on the treatment of cases of insanity and of backward and imbecile children by hypnotism. Such an attempt had not been seriously made till within the last few years, but some very good results had been reached in Paris by patient treatment. It had been used on some cases of insanity with hallucination and delusion, with success and also on some very serious cases of suicidal and acute mania. In some cases in which there were recurrent attacks of acute mania, it had been found possible to keep the patients asleep for as much as six or eight days, and thus to tide over the times of crisis, and induce recovery. Some chronic cases of dipsomania and morphinomania had also been cured. Several English doctors expressed their surprise; but Dr. Langdon Down had seen some similar good effects of hypnotic control; and Dr. Lloyd Tuckey had found hypnotism very useful in some cases of dipsomania, and also drew the attention of the Association to the records of the Rev. Arthur Tooth, of Woodside, Croydon, who had established a most successful institute for inebriates and others of bad habits, in which hypnotism had been of use in 79 per cent of the cases. Dr. Percy Smith related the use of hypnotic treatment by Mr. G. A. Smith, with the assistance of Dr. A. T. Myers, at Bethlehem Royal Hospital, on 16 patients, where not much success had been as yet attained, but further trial would be made; and Dr. Hack Tuke mentioned that he had suggested such an attempt as far back as 1865, and was very glad to hear of M. Auguste Voisin's success. He hoped that soon there might be more results to show for it in England.

## SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

## THE EDMUND GURNEY LIBRARY.

*Additions since the last list ("Journal" for May).*

- BERNHEIM (Prof. H., M.D.), Suggestive Therapeutics: A Treatise on the Nature and Uses of Hypnotism. From the French, second edit., by C.A. Herter, M.D., of New York. *New York and London*, 1889.
- BINET (Alfred) and FÉRÉ (Charles), Animal Magnetism, second edition. From the French.....*London*, 1888.
- JACKSON (J. Hughlings, M.D., F.R.S.), The Croonian Lectures: On the Evolution and Dissolution of the Nervous System.....*London*, 1884
- , Remarks on the Evolution and Dissolution of the Nervous System, No. I.....*London*, 1888
- BERTRAND (Alexandre), Du Magnétisme Animal en France.....*Paris*, 1826
- BINET (A.) Les Perceptions inconscientes de l'Hypnotisme (*Revue Scientifique*, 23rd Feb., 1889, p. 241).....*Paris*, 1889
- DUFRESNOY (l'Abbé L.), Recueil de Dissertations, Anciennes et Nouvelles, sur les Apparitions, les Visions et les Songes. 2 vols. *Paris*, 1752
- FÉRÉ (Ch.), De l'État des Forces chez les Épileptiques..... 1888\*
- , Note sur les Temps de Réaction chez les Hystériques et chez les Épileptiques..... 1889\*
- JANET (Prof. Pierre), L'Automatisme Psychologique.....*Paris*, 1889
- LIÉBEAULT (Dr. A. A.), Le Sommeil Provoqué et les États Analogues, *Paris*, 1889
- REVUE DES SCIENCES HYPNOTIQUES, Vol. I.....*Paris*, 1887-8
- SIMONIN (Amédée H.), Solution du Problème de la Suggestion Hypnotique.....*Paris*, 1880
- DESSOIR (Max), Das Doppel-Ich (2 copies).....*Berlin* 1889†
- DU PREL (Carl), Das Zweite Gesicht.....*Breslau*, n.d.
- FOREL (Prof. Dr. Aug.), Einige Therapeutische Versuche mit dem Hypnotismus bei Geisteskranken. (*Correspondenz-Blatt für Schweizer Aerzte*, 15th Aug., 1887). .....*Basle*, 1887
- , Der Hypnotismus, seine Bedeutung und seine Handhabung *Stuttgart*, 1889
- GESELLSCHAFT FÜR EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGIE. Ersten Jahres BERICHT.....*Berlin*, 1889
- HERING (Dr.), Ueber Hypnotismus.....*Berlin*, 1888
- HUCKEL (Dr. Armand), Die Rolle der Suggestion bei gewissen Erscheinungen der Hysterie und des Hypnotismus.....*Jena*, 1888
- KRAFFT-EBING (Dr. R. von), Eine experimentelle Studie auf dem Gebiete des Hypnotismus. Second edition.....*Stuttgart*, 1889
- MOLL (Dr. Albert), Der Hypnotismus.....*Berlin*, 1889‡
- ST. J., Die Psychologische Bedeutung des Gedankenlesens *Leipzig*, 1885
- WESERMANN (H.M.), Der Magnetismus und die Allgemeine Welt-sprache.....*Crevelt*, 1822
- WETTERSTRAND (Dr. Otto G.), Om Hypnotismus anwändande iden Praktiska Medicinen.....*Stockholm*, 1888
- OTTOLENGHI (S.) e LOMBROSO (C.), Nuovi Studi sull' Ipnatismo e sulla Credulità.....*Turin*, 1889

\*Extrait des Comptes rendus des Séances de la Société de Biologie.

† One copy presented by Author. ‡ Presented by the Author.

*Want of space compels us to defer the list of additions to the General Library till November.*