

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

---

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE
New Members and Associates .. .. .	177
Meeting of Council .. .. .	177
A Meeting of the Society .. .. .	178
Experiments in Thought-Transference .. .. .	179
Correspondence .. .. .	192
Supplementary Library Catalogue .. .. .	195

---

### NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

#### MEMBERS.

- SAUNDERS, FREDERICK A., F.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Denburn, Crail,  
Fife, N.B.
- TANCRED, MRS. CLEMENT, 23, Duke-street, Manchester-square,  
London, W.

#### ASSOCIATES.

- BONUS, JOSEPH, MAJOR-GENERAL, R.E., E.I.U.S. Club, 14, St. James's-  
square, London, S.W.
- BRUHNS, THEODORE, Simferopol, Russia.
- DICKINSON, GOLDSWORTHY L., B.A., King's College, Cambridge.
- MACNAUGHTON, REV. SAMUEL, M.A., Rose Bank, Addison-road,  
Preston.
- MASON, MISS M. H., Morton Hall, Retford, Notts.
- MOUL, MRS., 10, Cheniston-gardens, Kensington, London, W.
- PITCHER, CHARLES A., The Knoll, Lodge Hill, Farnham.
- WALKER, REGINALD T., 27, Hanover-square, Leeds.

---

### MEETING OF COUNCIL.

There not being a quorum of Members present on the 4th of November, some necessary matters of business only were considered, and a confirmatory minute was passed on the 2nd of December. The following report includes the matters so confirmed.

The Members present at the meeting of the Council on the 2nd of December were:—Professor Sidgwick, Messrs. Walter H. Coffin, Edmund Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, and J. Herbert Stack. The chair was taken by Professor Sidgwick.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read, and signed as correct.

Two new Members and eight new Associates, whose names and addresses are given above, were elected.

Information was received with regret of the death of Mr. Titus Salt, J.P., a Member of the Society.

A small number of books were on the table, presents to the Library, for which a vote of thanks was passed to the donors.

Cash accounts in the usual form were presented for the months of October and November.

A circular was authorised, under the title of "Free Distribution Fund," inviting contributions towards a fund for placing the *Proceedings* of the Society, and a certain number of copies of *Phantasms of the Living*, in the free public libraries of the country and in other kindred institutions. It was agreed that the circular should be sent round to members with the December *Journal*.

The arrangements that had been made for the Meeting to be held on the evening of the 2nd of December were sanctioned. It was further resolved that a General Meeting of the Society should be held on the evening of the day of the Annual Business Meeting; a convenient date to be fixed about the usual time at the end of January. Full notice of this will be given later.

The next Meeting of the Council was fixed for the 13th of January, 1888.

---

### A MEETING OF THE SOCIETY.

---

A meeting of the Society, for the description and discussion of some recent experiments in Hypnotism, was held in the Council Chamber of the Westminster Town Hall, on the evening of the 2nd of December. About 150 members and friends were present, cards of admission having been sent to those who applied, in accordance with the previous announcement.

Mr. Edmund Gurney described some further experiments of the same character as some described in his paper on "Peculiarities of Certain Post-hypnotic States," in Part XI. of the *Proceedings*; the point being that the subject, in a normal state, but unknown to his normal self, executes distinctly mental work which has been suggested to him in the hypnotic state, and the performance of which cannot apparently be referred to "unconscious cerebration," since on re-hypnotisation he remembers the mental process involved.

An interesting conversational discussion followed, in which Mr. O. Elton, Mr. Ion Perdicaris (of Tangier), Mr. F. W. H. Myers, Mr. H. Venman, and others, took part. A variety of points connected with the experiments were further elucidated by Mr. Gurney's replies.

Mr. Perdicaris referred to some apparently important experiences

of his own in years gone by, in connection with hypnotism, the particulars of which he was strongly urged to supply in a written form.

Some questions were asked as to the possibility of employing hypnotism as a means of education. To these Mr. Myers replied that the power of attention could undoubtedly be strengthened by hypnotic suggestion. Mr. Myers pointed out also how dreams sometimes supply a link between a normal continuous memory and the markedly discontinuous memory of hypnotic and other abnormal states.

In reply to some questions as to the facilities for obtaining "subjects," Mr. Gurney said that in France the hospitals supplied the greater number of "subjects," but that in England the only effective method seems to be by giving entertainments, at which persons were invited to allow themselves to be experimented upon. He thought it exceedingly desirable that the experiments which he had described should be repeated on persons of more education than the "subjects" who were obtained in this way; and he should be very glad if such would offer themselves. He had no idea what proportion of persons would be found to be sensitive.

Mr. Gurney then proceeded to describe some other experiments on the hypnotisation (anæsthetisation and stiffening) of one or another of the "subject's" fingers which were concealed from his view, while the hypnotiser held his hand without contact over the selected finger. The novel point was that the finger as a rule remained unaffected if the operator directed his will to the *non*-production instead of to the production of the result.

---

## EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE.

---

The results here printed of various sets of trials in Thought-transference have been accumulating for some time. It is earnestly to be wished that more of our friends would join in this most important branch of the work.

(1). The following experiments were made by Mrs. Shield, of Bowers Gifford Rectory, Essex, with two maid-servants and a "rough farm lad" as percipients. Mrs. Shield writes, June 18th, 1887:—

"There was no thought of deception, I am sure, and I carefully abstained from suggesting any. No motive for deception existed, for right answers came more quickly than a pretender would have thought prudent—generally as quickly as a question could be answered. If there was delay, there was failure." When the object to be thought of was being selected, the percipients went into a lobby, closing the door behind them. "We spoke

in whispers, or by dumb signs, needlessly, that no one should even imagine he or she 'heard,' and numbers, &c., were always turned from the percipient, however blindfolded. And they were desirous of excluding every ray of light, 'that they might see the better,' and impressed the necessity on occasional visitors who tried. A few boys from the night school came in with Sam—an assistant in the school was there once—and most were successful in one or more attempts. But as these were made in a somewhat scrambling way they are omitted. On the other hand, when we were able to make a real series of attempts, *I entered every one*, successful and unsuccessful. All three servants were good agents as well as percipients, but we got on faster when I acted agent—the only part I am capable of. I have written as if all four persons were always present. It was not so. Twice a week Sam attended night school, and if he was to bring in a school-fellow I waited for him after my usual time. One or other of the girls was often absent for long or short periods, and I utilised opportunities to test each singly—finding no difference. Some percipients could not explain how they got their answers. Sam always *saw the thing*. He is very intelligent, and I regret that he has left the service and gone to a distance. Other domestic affairs broke up our meetings—to be resumed some day, perhaps.

"To me the experiments are very easy and very interesting. I cannot but wonder so few people are disposed to give a little time and attention to the subject.

"I have omitted to say that when by the Secretary's advice I ceased to make all present acquainted with the object, the interest much declined, though I did my best to maintain it, and the answers came more slowly. The agent and the percipient were left to settle the particular question, and only the result interested the others.

"MARY E. SHIELD."

#### FINDING ARTICLES, WITH CONTACT.

*December 31st, 1886.*

AGENT.	{ 3 trials with Clara, all successful.
Mrs. Shield.	{ 3 do. Phoebe do.
	{ 3 do. Sam, 2 complete, 1 partial success.

#### GUESSING ARTICLES, WITHOUT CONTACT.

*Not blindfolded; eyes shut.*

AGENT.	PERCIPIENT.	ARTICLE OR ACTION THOUGHT OF.	RESULT.
Mrs. Shield.	Sam.	Making toast.	"Toasting fork." (? Prompted.) "Toasting bread."
do.	do.	Threading a needle.	"Using a needle." (How?) "Threading of it. Threading a needle."
do.	do.	Pouring out tea.	"Pouring out water." (Try again.) "It's from a teapot—pouring out tea."

February 3rd, 1887.

AGENT.	PERCIPIENT.	ARTICLE THOUGHT OF.	RESULT.
Mrs. Shield, Clara, and Phoebe.	Sam. do. do.	Monkey. Box of matches. Pony carriage.	"Ape." "Lucifers." "Horse and trap."
Mrs. Shield, Sam, and Phoebe.	Clara. do.	Lamp. Boy's cap.	"Lanthorn." "Cap." (Like yours?) "No; boy's black cap."
	do.	Loaf of bread.	"Saucepan. Kettle. Bread and butter."
Mrs. Shield.	F e m a l e School As- sistant.	2 numbers (2 ex- periments).	Right.
do.	do.	A knife.	Right.
do.	do.	Two names.	Guessed partly right.
do.	do.	I wrote "York."	She said, "New York."
do.	do.	I wrote "Benfleet."	She said, "South Benfleet."
Feb. 12, 1887.		{ Ace of Dia- monds.	Right second guess.
Mrs. Shield.	Sam.	{ K n a v e o f Hearts. } looked at.	Not guessed in 3 trials.

February 18th, 1887.

AGENT.	PERCIPIENT.	ARTICLE THOUGHT OF.	RESULT.
Mrs. Shield.	Clara.	Ball of wool.	Right.
do.	do.	"What colour?"	Red (right).
do.	do.	Thimble.	Knife.
do.	do.	Button.	Right.
do.	do.	Sixpence.	Halfpenny.
do.	do.	Ring.	Knife.
		February 19th. *	
Mrs. Shield.	Phoebe.	Ring.	Nothing guessed.
do.	do.	Silk.	Nothing guessed.
do.	do.	"Days" (printed word).	Right.
do.	do.	"Hand" (printed word).	Right.
do.	do.	Scrap of red morocco.	Something red.
do.	do.	Double number (32).	84.

\* On the 18th and 19th the agent and percipient were alone present. Mrs. Shield says, "The objects, including words, were, to use your own expression, 'chosen out of all the objects in the whole world.' In the afternoon of the 18th I prepared in my own room a collection of fresh objects—excepting everything that resembled what we had used. These I put into an envelope, and the envelope into the pocket of my gown, whence I could withdraw one thing without exposing the others. They included a few words cut from waste paper—all short nouns, such as I could easily see with eye and mind, to use as other things, without saying they were words."

GUESSING DOUBLE NUMBERS.—‘SAM,’ Percipient.

Date.	Trials.	No. right 1st trial.	No. right 2nd trial.	No. right 3rd trial.	Agent.	No. right in 3 guesses.
Feb. 5	8	3	4	1	Mrs. Shield, Phœbe, Clara.	8
„ 10	3	0	0	1	Mrs. Shield only.	1
„ 11	9	3	5	1	do.	9
„ 12	2	0	0	0	Mrs. Shield and Phœbe.	0
„ 14	5	2	1	1		4
	—					—
	27					22

CLARA, Percipient.

Feb. 2	3	0	1	1	Mrs. Shield and Phœbe.	2
„ 4	7	2	3	1	do.	6
„ 5	3	1	1	1	Sam.	3
„ 10	3	1	1	1	Mrs. Shield only.	3
„ 11	14	3	5	5	do.	13
„ 12	1	0	0	0	do.	0
„ 14	4	0	2	2	Sam.	4
	—					—
	35					31

PHŒBE, Percipient.

Feb. 2	3	0	2	1	Mrs. Shield and Clara.	3
„ 4	6	2	2	2	do.	4
				{ one figure right		
„ 5	3	1	1	1	Sam.	3
„ 10	3	0	1	2	Mrs. Shield.	3
„ 12	2	0	0	0	do.	0
„ 14	11	1	5	2	Sam.	8
	—					—
	28					21

BETTIS (boy), Percipient.

Feb. 10	3	0	0	3	Mrs. Shield.	3
Total	—	93			Total	—
						77

NOTES :—

Mrs. Shield remarks that on February 10th, when she acted as agent *alone*, the results were unusually poor.

On February 12th, when there were observers present—Misses Evelyn and Lucy Williams—the experiments were nearly all failures, a *card* being the only success, with Sam.

After the 12 experiments on December 31st, Mrs. Shield suffered for 20 hours with nervous headache.

On all dates after February 8th the agent and percipient were *alone*, except where otherwise stated.

(2). The next set of experiments is from Mr. Henry G. Rawson, of 23, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn (percipient), L., a young lady friend

(agent). He had never tried any experiments of the sort before. The trials were made in a railway carriage, but notes were taken. Mr. Rawson writes, January 26th, 1885 :—

“I was seated opposite her [L.] in the railway carriage, the remaining four of our party, in the other seats, being perfectly quiet, as they were tired out by a long day. Our method was this : I closed my eyes ; she then cut the pack, the one thus sent to the bottom being the card to be guessed. She then said ‘Yes’ as a signal. It seemed to me that certain cards presented themselves to me, apparently at the back of the eyes. In each case I had three guesses. In the cases which came right the correct card appeared to me within five seconds of her saying ‘Yes.’ ”

TRIALS.	CARD CUT.	1ST GUESS.	2ND GUESS.	3RD GUESS.
1	Knave of clubs.	<i>Knave of hearts.</i>	8 of hearts.	3 of clubs.
2	3 of diamonds.	Quite wrong.	2 of diamonds.	Quite wrong.
3	8 of spades.	do.	10 of spades.	8 of spades.
4	Queen of hearts.	<i>Queen of hearts.</i>		
5	2 of hearts.	7 of hearts.	10 of hearts.	4 of hearts.
6	No record.	Quite wrong.	Quite wrong.	Quite wrong.
7	do.	do.	do.	do.
8	7 of clubs.	7 of clubs.		
9	Ace of spades.	Quite wrong.	Quite wrong.	2 of spades.
10	No record.	do.	do.	do.
11	do.	do.	do.	do.
12	Ace of clubs.	<i>Ace of spades.</i>	do.	do.

Mr. Rawson adds that in trials in guessing *colours* of cards, L. was right 8 times out of 11 in a first series, and 13 out of 20 in a second.

Mr. Rawson writes, May 18th, 1885 :—

“I have kept the records of all my experiments that proved at all successful ; and am able from memory to state pretty accurately the number of times I tried in vain.\* With regard to the latter, I should explain that if in the first 4 or 5 tries I neither see a card at all (which often happens) or see one which is neither right in number nor suit, I give it up as hopeless for that day. Therefore, if you count the abortive trials on an average as 5 entire failures you will be probably well over the mark ; indeed, I should say that the attempt has usually been abandoned after 3 tries with a new operator.”

A month later he writes :—

“I am positive I have overstated the number of failures, as I desired not to exaggerate the success of the experiments. I have been the percipient in all the recorded cases. . . . In each case I have sat facing the agent, with my eyes shut, at a distance varying from 3 to 6 feet ; in the first instance it was in a railway carriage.”

The following are his results :—

It is of course most desirable—essential, indeed, for scientific purposes—that all records should be kept.

EXPERIMENTS WITH CARDS.

From August, 1885.

Agent : Miss B. L. Percipient : Mr. Rawson.

CARD CUT.	1ST GUESS.	2ND GUESS.	3RD GUESS.
Knave of d'monds. 7 of spades. Queen of hearts. 2 of spades. 3 of diamonds. 9 of hearts. 10 of clubs. 7 of clubs. No record. Queen of clubs. <sup>2</sup>	<i>Knave of hearts.</i> 9 of hearts. <i>Queen of hearts.</i> 9 of spades. <i>3 of diamonds.</i> 7 of hearts. <i>10 of clubs.</i> 7 of spades. Wrong. 7 of hearts.	<i>Knave of diamonds.</i> 7 of spades. <sup>1</sup>  2 of spades.  Knave of spades.  7 of clubs. do. 2 of spades.	      Knave of spades.   do. 2 of hearts.

<sup>1</sup> He saw 7 of spades as soon as the agent said "Yes," but did not think it could be right, coming so soon, so said 9 of hearts. Then came back to 7 of spades for the second guess.

<sup>2</sup> Agent, Miss C. J. H., who stated that she had *thought* of selecting 2 of spades. Three other trials were completely unsuccessful.

Agent : Miss K. H. Percipient : Mr. Rawson.

CARD CUT.	1ST GUESS.	2ND GUESS.	3RD GUESS.
1 { 10 of hearts. Ace of spades. 5 of spades. 9 of diamonds. 4 of spades. Ace of hearts. 10 of diamonds.	3 of hearts. 7 of spades. 5 of spades. 6 of clubs. 4 of diamonds. 10 of hearts. 5 of diamonds.	5 of hearts. 10 of spades.  9 of clubs. Knave of spades. Ace of hearts. 8 of diamonds.	Queen of hearts. 2 of spades.  9 of diamonds. King of spades. 9 of diamonds. 2 of hearts.
2 { 2 of spades. King of clubs. 7 of hearts. 3 of hearts. 7 of hearts.	3 of hearts. 8 of spades. 7 of clubs. 3 of hearts. Ace of hearts.	7 of hearts. King of clubs. 9 of clubs.  6 of hearts.	9 of diamonds. 2 of hearts. Queen of clubs.  Queen of hearts. <sup>4</sup>
3 { 8 of hearts. 9 of spades.	8 of hearts. 9 of spades.		

<sup>1</sup> Five other experiments completely unsuccessful in this batch.

<sup>2</sup> Four other trials completely unsuccessful in this batch.

<sup>3</sup> Mrs. C. P. and Miss R. joint agents. Mr. Rawson is not quite certain (the notes being lost) whether there was not more than one guess in the second experiment under these conditions. After this there were five abortive attempts with Miss F. A. R., at other trials on other days.

<sup>4</sup> Then came four trials with Mrs. C. P., Miss R., Miss G., with no results—except once the guessing of a card that Mrs. C. P. *intended* to choose.



The following table shows results when no third guess was made :—

AGENT.	CARD CUT.	1ST GUESS.	2ND GUESS.
Miss K. S. R.	7 of spades. Queen of clubs. 10 of spades. 5 of clubs. 8 of diamonds. 2 of spades. 8 of hearts. 7 of diamonds.	10 of <i>spades</i> . <i>Queen of clubs</i> . 9 of hearts. 5 of <i>clubs</i> . 8 of <i>diamonds</i> . 3 of <i>spades</i> . 9 of hearts. 4 of <i>diamonds</i> .	7 of <i>spades</i> . 10 of hearts.  Ace of <i>spades</i> . 8 of hearts. 7 of <i>diamonds</i> .
	2		
	10 of clubs. 2 of hearts. 5 of hearts. 9 of diamonds. 6 of diamonds. 2 of spades. Knave of clubs. 7 of diamonds.	6 of <i>clubs</i> . Knave of <i>hearts</i> . 5 of <i>hearts</i> . 9 of clubs. 6 of <i>diamonds</i> . 2 of clubs. Kna. of <i>diamonds</i> . 9 of <i>diamonds</i> .	7 of <i>clubs</i> . Ace of <i>hearts</i> . Queen of clubs. 4 of hearts. King of <i>diamonds</i> . 7 of <i>diamonds</i> .
	4		
Miss F. A. R.	8 of diamonds. 9 of spades. Knave of spades. 6 of diamonds.	4 of <i>diamonds</i> . 6 of hearts. Knave of <i>spades</i> . 5 of <i>diamonds</i> .	Knave of <i>diamonds</i> . 9 of <i>spades</i> . 3 of <i>diamonds</i> .
	8 of spades. 3 of clubs. 9 of diamonds.	4 of <i>spades</i> . 3 of <i>clubs</i> . 7 of clubs.	8 of <i>spades</i> . 9 of clubs.

These and following were in March, 1887. All before were anterior to July, 1886.

- <sup>1</sup> Four complete failures also in this batch.
- <sup>2</sup> Six trials, all complete failures, except in one case where the *suit* was named.
- <sup>3</sup> Four complete failures in this batch.
- <sup>4</sup> Three separate attempts, all unsuccessful each time.
- <sup>5</sup> Three complete failures also in this batch.
- <sup>6</sup> These were all *with contact*. There were four complete failures in this batch.

Later, Mr. Rawson again tried experiments in guessing cards with Miss L. and Miss K. H., but the results then were not so striking. With the former he made 26 experiments, guessing the card once right on the second trial, and the *suit* right twice on the first trial, and the number of pips right *once* on the first trial. With Miss K. H. he made 20 trials, guessing the card quite right once on the second trial, the number of pips twice on the second trial, and twice on a fourth.

He also made four experiments in drawing objects looked at by Miss L. A crochet needle was the only thing approaching success, which was fairly reproduced, with a barb [—→].

(3). The next account is from Major Taylor, Royal Military College, Sandhurst.  
 “June 15th, 1887.

“The experiments were in every respect *bona fide*, and so arranged that no accidental information could reach the percipient. The percipient sat either in an arm-chair or at a small table; her eyes were lightly bandaged with a silk handkerchief, and care was taken that there were no reflecting surfaces available for her. The agents sat behind the percipient, one of whom held up a card on which was drawn what was to be thought of, and when ready said *Now*, everyone else remaining silent. When the guess had been made, nothing was said as to its correctness or otherwise, but another picture held up, and the word *Now* repeated.” Trials were first made with letters of the alphabet, with Miss Manders as percipient and Major Taylor and Dr. Manders as agents. The percipient, who held Major Taylor's hand, knew that letters of the alphabet would form the subject of experiment. In the first 10 trials with different letters two were rightly guessed; in the second trial with 10 letters one was correctly named. Two series of 11 trials, with figures from 0 to 9, were next tried. In the first series Miss Manders gave one figure correctly, and in the second series three were rightly named.

Trials were then made with simple coloured figures prepared by Major Taylor; such as Star, Diamond, Crescent, Arrowhead, Shamrock-leaf, Oxford Frame, Maltese Cross, &c. Miss Manders was informed that they were geometrical figures which could be easily described.

Ten experiments were made in May, 1884, with Miss A. Manders as percipient, and Major Taylor, Dr. and Mrs. Manders, and Mrs. Good, agents. Two were given quite correctly in colour and shape, and two right in colour but wrong in shape.

Fifteen experiments were made on June 1st, with the same percipient, but with Major Taylor and Dr. Manders only as agents. Two *shapes* were correctly named, with the wrong colours, and two *colours* with the wrong shapes. Twice during these experiments some domestic article was looked at without warning, and something domestic was named, viz., jug (“spoon”); key (“cup”).

Later in June, 18 similar trials were made with fresh drawings, and the same agents and percipient. One was correctly described both in shape and colour; three were right in colour, but the shapes wrong. On this occasion a jug unexpectedly used was described as a “cup.”

On November 9th, 1884, 6 trials were made with Miss G. Manders as percipient; agents: Major Taylor, Dr. and Mrs. Manders, and Mrs. Good. One figure was correctly described—a skull and cross bones.

In reference to these experiments, Miss G. Manders writes that as far as she can remember she did not see any of the pictures until after the experiments were over.

(4). The following experiments in guessing *suits* were made by some friends of Miss Porter, in December, 1886, and January and February, 1887. Miss Porter says:—

“Three girls were lodging together in Kensington—art students. They each guessed a few cards every evening, two acting as agents; sometimes, however, one was absent, and then the remaining two made the experiments. I cannot find in these cases that the success was less with one than with two.”

Mr. Fenton Aylmer, brother of one of the ladies, also tried guessing on some occasions.

	GUESSES.		RIGHT.
Miss Helen Aylmer ... ..	276	.....	123
Miss Ada Costerton ... ..	324	.....	130
Miss Florence Costerton ... ..	261	.....	116
Mr. Fenton Aylmer ... ..	60	.....	21
	921		390

The most probable number of successes for chance to produce was of course 230.

In addition to these trials, Miss Porter adds that Mr. Fenton Aylmer, as agent, made about 200 trials both with his sister and with Miss Costerton, with even greater success; but the records of these are lost; and “Miss Aylmer tells me that she has succeeded in drawing simple designs when agented by her brother.” Miss Porter hopes to induce the young ladies to continue the experiments.

(5). Mr. J. G. Keulemans, of 28, St. Mary’s-road, Harlesden Park, N. W., supplies the following account of experiments:—

“On several previous occasions I had tried to establish a *rapport* between myself and four of my children, experimenting alternately with each for a short time and at irregular intervals; but the results were invariably failures throughout. I now attribute the failures to my acting upon the principle that, being their father, I ought also to be their agent, and they my subjects or percipients. By mere accident I discovered that by reversing the parts a *rapport* was established between my eldest son (aged 18) and myself. This was on August 10th last. We happened to be the only occupants of the house. The place was remarkably quiet, and the causes that might lead to interruption in these trials totally absent. I had just finished reading the last paragraph of your correspondent, ‘H. G. R.’s’ communica-

tion in the July number of the *Journal*, where the writer quotes it as his experience that he succeeded as a *percipient* but failed as *operator*. This induced me to also reverse the parts previously adopted in the case with my children.

Asking my son, in his capacity of *agent*, to look at a number he could find in a newspaper or book within his reach, and fix his gaze upon a single figure, it at once struck me that he had cast his eye upon a bold 8. Awaiting his decision, I wrote down 8 on the cover of the *Journal*, which was out of his sight. Seeing I was ready, he said, pointing to a figure before him, 'Eight.' I then showed him the figure 8 as put down by myself.

Six more trials followed—he looking at a single figure, and I trying to read his thought—and on four occasions I guessed rightly. But of these latter six trials no record was kept, because I did not expect such a decided success, and hence had made no preparations to write down the results. Seeing, however, that a striking improvement was now apparent, I took a book, placed a sheet of paper on it, and turning my chair with my back towards the agent, at once prepared to note down the results that would follow. My agent could not, from his position, notice what I would write on my paper. He stood before my writing-desk, facing the west. I faced the south-east, the distance between us was three feet.

Trial No. 1.—The agent wrote 7	...	...	Guess 1.
Trial No. 2.—The agent wrote 9	...	...	Guess 7.
Trial No. 3.—The agent wrote 3	...	...	Guess 3.
Trial No. 4.—The agent wrote 9	...	...	Guess 8.
(Agent had previously thought of trying 8.)			
Trial No. 5.—The agent wrote 3	...	...	Guess 3.
Trial No. 6.—The agent wrote 7	...	...	Guess 9.
Trial No. 7.—The agent wrote 2	...	...	Guess 2.
Trial No. 8.—The agent wrote 4	...	...	Guess 4.

(The last guess, although correct, may have been due to anticipation on my part, as the figure 4 had not as yet occurred in the experiments. My agent, however, stated that he never thought of the figures already used, and did not select the 4 by way of varying the figures.)

Trial No. 9.—The agent wrote 8	...	...	Guess 8.
Trial No. 10.—The agent wrote 5	...	...	Guess 5.
Trial No. 11.—The agent wrote 5	...	...	Guess 5.

Now, out of these *eleven* trials, *seven* guesses were correct, and one, No. 4, was partly so. These coincidences could not, therefore, be attributed to mere chance only. Especially in the last trial, viz., No. 11, where a previous figure is repeated, the probability of chance, or that of anticipation, is well-nigh excluded. I must also state that in all the cases, except No. 4, where the guess was correct, the figure seemed to flash instantaneously into my mind and caused me to think that, after all, I was the agent and my son the percipient. As to the experiment No. 4, where the agent first intended to write 8 but afterwards wrote a 9, no such instantaneous impression was conveyed to me; on the contrary, it took a long time—perhaps a minute—before I saw the 8 in my mind's eye. I have, or rather what I

will call 'my mind's eye' has, on more than one occasion *seen* either the object or the figure thought of by the agent as a whitish, semi-objective representation coming out clearly against a dark background. If I cast my eyes in the direction of a wall (instinctively I will always look towards the darker part of the room when expecting a telepathic impression) then the object thought of by the agent will appear as before described, and leave the impression that it is near that wall—at least, much nearer to the wall than to my eyes. If the room be large, the vision will seem to be farther away from myself, but it will become visible always near the background, no matter what its distance. In experiment No. 4, the 8 appeared against a set of books, placed on a shelf in a shaded corner, at a distance of three yards from my eyes. The figure seemed to be coming forward about two feet away from the books.

You will, I hope, not object to a description of these details. I quote them because my experience agrees to some extent with that of your correspondent, 'H. G. R.,' who sees the object slightly above his eyes. I see mine straight before me, or slightly *above* my eyes in case I am sitting in an easy chair, my head resting against the back, or in a recumbent position.\* From this it is evident that the 'visible impression' is built up in the brain.

After the first series of eleven trials we took a short rest, chiefly because I thought the guessing at single figures was too simple, and perhaps too inconclusive, and that besides, in some cases a figure may be guessed by expectation. Whilst I was meditating upon some more conclusive experiment, my agent proposed to throw numbers by dice. He had a set of exceedingly small proportions (taken out of a fancy solitaire, I believe) and threw them out into an empty cigar box. The trial consisted in my reading or guessing the *total* of the three respective figures.

- Trial 1. Agent throws three 3's or total of 9, and writes out 9, fixing his eye upon it ... .. Guess 9.
- Trial 2.—Agent throws 4, 6, 3, or total of 13 ... .. Guess 15.
- Trial 3.—Agent throws 2, 2, 1, or total of 5 ... .. Guess 5.
- Trial 4.—Agent throws three 6's.

Before he had time to write out the total I saw the dice (in my mind's eye) and observed: 'There is a lot this time.' 'Guess,' said agent. I guessed two 6's and a 5. Very nearly correct!

In trial 5 agent throws 5, 3, 4. Total 12.

I felt unable to guess. The two 6's and the 5 were still occupying my mind. After a pause, I *saw* a 5, but could not perceive the remaining 3 and 4.

Trial 6.—I now asked my agent to concentrate his gaze upon the separate figures of the dice and not to count the total. I saw a 4 (on the right), a 5 (on the left), and the remaining 3 a little lower down. Not only did I perceive the different numbers, but also the position of each of the dice. I described my impression to my agent, *i.e.*, that the dice were not far apart and formed a crescent. Here the agent became quite excited, calling out

---

\* If I recollect well, I gave you a detailed description of the direction in which I saw the vision, quoted in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. I., case 184. I believe it was in reply to a letter of yourself referring to that case.

loudly, 'It is quite right!' This caused me to leave my chair and see for myself. I found the dice just as I had seen them telepathically. But here, I must remark, we had both overlooked a somewhat important point. In experiment 5 the agent threw 5, 3, 4, and it struck me as being strange that in the next trial we should again obtain the very same figures. Were they the same throw as experiment 5, or a fresh one? Unfortunately neither agent nor percipient could tell for certain. Yet my agent said the dice were differently arranged in trial 5. He was sure that the figure 4 was at the other end of the box, and not on the right of figure 3 as on last occasion. In the hurry to verify the results by actual inspection, I had also forgotten to note down my impression before leaving my chair.

Trial 7.—Taking extra precautions, I noted down 6, 1, 6, this being my impression as soon as I heard that the dice had ceased rolling, and before my agent informed me he was ready to hear my report. On comparison my impression was found to be again correct.

Trial 8.—Was a complete failure. My agent had thrown 2, 4, 5. He was still jubilant over the last successes, and made the mistake of writing down the total 11 instead of fixing his eye upon the separate figures. I could see nothing.

Trial 9.—Agent throws 4, 4, 1     ...     ...     ... Guess 4, 3, 2.

Trial 10.—Agent throws 6, 3, 4     ...     ...     ... Guess 1, 3, 4.

Trial 11.—Agent throws 1, 1, 2     ...     ...     ... Guess 2, 1, 1.

I saw the 2 nearest to his left hand, the box being placed at his left. Hence I mentioned the 2 first.

Trial 12.—One of the dice fell in the corner. Agent lays it flat between the other dice—with the figure 6 upwards. I could only see that 6.

Trial 13.—Agent throws 5, 5, 3. I guessed a 5 and tried hard to see the other figures, but did not succeed. The return of the other members of the family put a sudden stop to further experiments.

My agent has for some time been staying with a relative. He will be home again in a few days, when further experiments will be made and the results forwarded to you."

(6). The next set in guessing suits, conducted early in this year, is from Miss Hopkinson, of 37, Woburn Place, W.C.

The trials were with young lady friends. A full pack of cards was used.

"We adhere rigidly to the rules as to position, cutting, &c.—indeed, I should not consider it an experiment if we did not do so. . . . My three young lady friends had no idea I was trying an experiment with them. Owing to a slight accident I have been confined to my room for many weeks, and they imagined they were playing a sort of 'willing game' with cards to amuse me. Had I mentioned my object, both the parents of my young friends and they themselves would have felt annoyed, and I should not again have had their company."

	AGENT.	PERCIPIENT.	QUITE RIGHT.	SUIT RIGHT.
200	L. H.	G. C.	6	49
500	L. P.	L. H.	21	131
500	L. H.	G. C.	22	127
500	L. H.	L. L.	17	106
300	L. H.	G. C.	28	106
200	L. H.	B. A.	6	52
2,200			100	571
500	L. P.	L. H. and		126

(7). The following experiments in card-guessing were made early in this year by the Hon. Miss Tracy, of 44, Grosvenor Gardens, S.W. The percipients were in most cases her younger brothers and sisters. The trials were carefully conducted according to instructions; and the fact that some of the percipients were young children in no way detracts from the value of the results.

Miss Tracy writes, June 7th, 1887 :—

“The ‘guesser’ has always sat back turned to the ‘thinker,’ generally with eyes shut—though, of course, with the quite small ones one cannot ensure that; and the distance apart has generally been from 6 to 12 feet.”

GUESSING SUITS.

TRIALS.	RIGHT.	
2184	588	(out of pack of 52.)
320	91	(out of pack of 40.)

GUESSING NO. OF PIPS.

TRIALS.	RIGHT.	
1092	120	(out of pack of 52.)

GUESSING A SINGLE CARD.

NO.	52 Cards. One Guess.		52 Cards. One Guess.	
	QUITE RIGHT.	SUIT ONLY RIGHT.	PIPS ONLY RIGHT.	
25	2	4	1	(“Baby.”)
25	1	5	1	(Masser—the nurse.)
25	1	6	2	(Marian.)
25	2	8	0	(Ida.)
24	3	5	0	(Ida.)
26	3	5	2	(Ida.)
25	0	6	1	(Mother.)
25	1	7	1	(Mary—maid.)
25	1	6	1	(Mary.)
12	0	2	0	(Florence.)
25	0	8	3	(Rhona.)
24	1	6	1	(Rhona.)
286	15	68	13	

40 Cards. One guess. Chosen card not replaced.			
40 guesses	2 right	15 suits	2 pips (Masser.)
40	3	8	1 (Ida.)
80	5	23	3

## CORRESPONDENCE.

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

SIR,—In answer to Mr. J. G. Keulemans' letter, printed in the November number of the *Journal*, we would say (1) that Mr. Keulemans assumes too much in talking of our "fancies as sceptics," for neither of us were or are sceptics in the sense of not being open to conviction; (2) that neither of us now depends "upon his memory alone," since our memories are corroborative of each other, though in several vital points not so of Mr. Keulemans; (3) that we were shown *many* drawings done by Mr. Keulemans from "spirits" (one we both remember of a spirit with claws like those of an eagle instead of hands), and especially several of spirit lamps, or lights and phases of materialisation (some of which drawings he supplied to *Light*, we believe), all of which Mr. Keulemans told us he had "drawn from life"—(you will have noticed that in his letter Mr. Keulemans refers to a *single* drawing, and omits to notice our mention of *many*)—and finally, that we distinctly remember Mr. Keulemans telling us the various incidents described by us in the October number of the *Journal* as *having happened to himself and within his own experience*. We were most particular to ask at the time if each incident, as narrated to us, had happened to Mr. Keulemans himself. It is possible that Mr. Keulemans being at that time, by his own admission, duped, was anxious to convert others, and so exaggerated (perhaps unconsciously) his "facts."

Neither of us can forget—and this seems to us a strong point in Mr. Keulemans' explanations—the very impressive way in which he warned us against ever believing anything until we had absolutely satisfied ourselves, by ocular demonstration or otherwise, of its truth; *he assured us that he himself never did so*.

As Mr. Fry has already said, Mr. Keulemans distinctly told us of the little girl-spirit—whether she sat on his knee or stood by his side would not seem to signify; that he used to pass his finger through her eye into her skull, "up to the hilt," so to say; this point you will notice he has ignored. We will now only ask Mr. Keulemans one question, since he admits that the little girl-spirit and her pleasing ways *were* within his own experience. Does he still believe that story, as he undoubtedly told it to us; and does he now think that he used to put his finger into the skull of the medium's daughter? If the first, then our position is proved good; if the second, then we shall be entitled to our own opinion of the value of Mr. Keulemans' evidence.—Yours obediently.

The Temple, E.C.

A. G. WETHERBY.  
OLIVER A. FRY.

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

SIR,—I have been much impressed by Mr. Downing's analysis of expectation into pure and impure—(see his letter in the October number of the *Journal*)—and may at once admit that I am quite satisfied with his conclusion, and with his reconciliation of our apparently conflicting views. Nay,



more; his analysis enables me to understand a phenomenon which was beginning to puzzle me extremely in my experiments, viz., the increasing difficulty which I find in preventing myself from trying to "think out" the card, instead of waiting for the impression to strike me. I send you the result of several experiments made during the Long Vacation, none of them nearly so successful as those previously recorded. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to remark, in curious corroboration of my July letter, that the best result achieved (three right out of nine) was with a lady with whom I had had but little success comparatively the previous year, and that it was only on the first trial with her on this occasion that there were any correct guesses, two subsequent attempts turning out blank. On the other hand, to my great disappointment, two very successful agents of 1886 produced no *séance* nearly as satisfactory, though we made three trials. I also send you some results of a "thought-drawing experiment" (if I may coin a word) with Miss K. H., the former of the two ladies mentioned [above].

I have endeavoured to get from the three agents with whom I have been most successful, hitherto, some opinion upon Mr. Downing's theory that success depends on the "pure" expectation of it in the agent's mind—in other words, on the non-conception of the negative. Also I asked whether there had been any conscious exertion of the will in those cases where success resulted. The answers must be qualified by consideration of the difficulty which they have all found in recalling their state of mind on successful, as distinguished from unsuccessful, occasions.

My sister, with whom, as I have before told you, I guessed seven out of twelve on the first occasion, tells me I was always right, or more nearly right, when she "felt we would succeed." She believes she "never, on successful occasions, expected any other result." (This, I conceive, is the "non-conception of the negative.") But she remembers on some occasions having felt "disappointed" when she was "sure" that I would see it and I did not. She further believes that success attended more often an effort of her will. This, however, I am much inclined to doubt, not only in her case, but in all, for the following reasons:—(1) The vision of the card in such a large majority of instances comes instantaneously, and before any concentration of will could well be produced; (2) cards are so often guessed which the agent did not intend, much less "will" me to see; (3) as the result of several experiments, I find it is no good waiting for the card to appear. I have tried as many as a dozen "shots" at the same card, extending over a period of five minutes, without getting anywhere near it. This, I may remark, tells considerably against the theory of mere coincidence.

Miss B. L., the other very successful agent of 1886, thinks Mr. Downing's theory agrees with her recollection, and that she "did make up her mind to succeed." She does not, however, explain our subsequent comparative failures, both last year and this. Miss K. H. also confirms Mr. Downing.

Before reverting to my own experiences as percipient, I may express an opinion, founded partly on my correspondent's replies, that after our successful first experiments there were present to their minds not only conjectures as to success, *i.e.*, conception of the negative, but also reflections

upon the remarks of third persons ; all tending to make concentration of thought, or will, impossible.

It will be seen that I have frequently used above the term "guess" ; and, with a view to "B. W.'s" letter in the November number, I ought to say a few words on this point. The word is distinctly a misnomer ; it is my great object to avoid guessing, if possible ; and for this reason I always ask the agent to avoid making any inflection of the voice in answering "No" to my first incorrect guess, for otherwise I knew sometimes from the tone that I was nearly right, and then a conscious "shot" was very difficult to avoid. But, except the word "see," I do not know what term to use ; and I must confess that since my earlier experiments I have had less and less power of visualisation, and seem to reach the card by a more purely mental effort.

But, seeing that my results have certainly fallen off, it may be that the failure to "see," and the attempt to supply its place by mental effort, are at the root of my non-success. As to a power of visualisation apart from thought-transference, I may mention, in reply to "B. W.," that I possess, in common with many people, the faculty of seeing a passage in a book which has roused my attention, and thus finding it with comparatively little difficulty ; but am not aware that I otherwise possess any such power.

Before concluding, I may be allowed to make a remark suggested by my own experience and by Mr. Creery's letter. If loss of capacity commonly attends continued experiments of this sort, how great must be the temptation, especially where credit or pocket is concerned, to call in the aid of art to produce effects which were undeniably genuine in the first instance. Your readers will recall Browning's *Sludge, the Medium*.—Yours truly,

H. G. R.

November 15th, 1887.

SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

The following additions have been made since the last list ("Journal" for July):—

ANGELS (GOOD AND EVIL). By a Country Pastor (Archbishop Whateley)  
London, 1851\*

MARTINEAU (HARRIET), Letters on Mesmerism, second edition (bound  
up with two other pamphlets) .....London, 1845

PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH,  
Vol. I., No. 2 .....Boston, 1886

---

DELBŒUF (J.), Une Visite à la Salpêtrière. (*Revue de Belgique*, October  
and November, 1886) .....Brussels, 1886

DE ROSNY (Léon), La Méthode Conscientielle .....Paris, 1887

DESCOURTIS (Gabriel), Du Fractionnement des Opérations Cérébrales  
(a second copy) .....Paris, 1882

LUYS (J.), Les émotions chez les sujets en état d'Hypnotisme...Paris, 1887

REVUE SCIENTIFIQUE, Nos. 23, 24, 25, 26 of 1884, and Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4,  
5 of 1885 .....Paris, 1884-5

ROMANES (J. G., F.R.S.), L'Intelligence des Animaux. Two vols.  
Paris, 1887†

SERGI (Professor G.), La Psychologie Physiologique. From the Italian  
by M. Mouton.....Paris, 1887†

THORE (J.), Communications sur une Nouvelle Force .....Dax, 1887

VOISIN (Dr. Auguste), Etude sur l'Hypnotisme et sur les Suggestions  
chez les Aliénés..... Paris, 1884

—, De l'Hypnotisme employé comme moyen de Traitement de  
l'Aliénation Mentale, et des nervoses et comme Agent Moralisateur  
Paris, 1884

—, De l'Hypnotisme et de la Suggestion Hypnotique dans leur  
application au Traitement des Maladies Nerveuses et Mentales  
Paris, 1886

—, Migraine chez une Fille de Neuf Ans guérie par la Suggestion  
Hypnotique.....Paris, 1887

—, Du Traitement de Aménorrhée par la Suggestion Hypnotique  
Paris, 1887

—, Traitement et Guérison d'une Morphinomane par la Suggestion  
Hypnotique .....Paris, 1887

---

DU PREL (Carl), Das Gedankenlesen.....Berlin, N.D.

GURNEY (Edmund), Telepathie : Eine Erwiderung auf die Kritik des  
Herrn Prof. W. Preyer.....Leipzig, 1887‡

SCHUBERT (Dr. G. H. von), Ueber Ahnen und Wissen .....Munich, 1847

ST. —(J.) DiePsychologische Bedeutung des Gedankenlesens Leipzig, 1885

\* Presented by the Rev. Canon Wood. † Presented by M. Félix Alcan.  
‡ Presented by the Author.

