

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

	CONTENTS.	PAGE
New Associates ..	.. .. .	345
Proposed Memorial to Mr. Edmund Gurney ..	.. .. .	345
Meeting of the Council ..	.. .. .	348
General Meeting ..	.. .. .	348
Some Remarks on Professor Richet's Experiments on the Possibility of Clairvoyant perception of Drawings ..	.. .. .	348
Cases received by the Literary Committee ..	.. .. .	355
Notes ..	.. .. .	380

### NEW ASSOCIATES.

CONSTABLE, M. S., Wassand, Hull.

DILL, ROBERT C. GORDON, M.A., Isthmian Club, Grafton-street,  
London, W.

SMITH, G. A., Manstone Cottage, St. Lawrence, Kent.

### PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO MR. EDMUND GURNEY.

It has been suggested by a member of the Society for Psychical Research that it would be fitting to commemorate Mr. Gurney's work in Psychical Research by dedicating to his name some branch of the Society's library, and raising a fund to make the department more complete. The Council gladly accept the suggestion, and (with the approval of Mr. Gurney's family) propose that any books of value already in the library which bear on Hypnotism and kindred subjects should be known as the "Edmund Gurney Library," and bound and stamped accordingly.

The subject of Hypnotism has been selected, partly because it was in this direction that much of Mr. Gurney's most valuable and original work was done; and partly because it is a branch of research now widely recognised as of high scientific importance, and on which every year produces new publications of value. The Society's collection of books on Hypnotism is incomplete, and many fresh works will need to be added both at once and, in all probability, for many years to come. The Council in fact would be glad, if possible, to expend in each year only the interest of the fund to be collected. It is proposed that all books thus purchased shall continue to form part of the "Edmund Gurney Library," and that the employment of the funds raised shall be entrusted to the Library Committee of the Society for Psychical Research for the time being. Donations are invited both from

members of the Society for Psychical Research and from other friends of Mr. Gurney's, who may be glad of this opportunity of doing honour to his memory. The Rev. A. T. Fryer, 3, Vernon-place, Bloomsbury, W.C., has kindly consented to act as treasurer, and will receive any sum entrusted to him for the "Edmund Gurney Library Fund."

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, } Hon. Secs. Society  
FRANK PODMORE, } for Psychical Research.

November, 1888.

### MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

At a Meeting of the Council held at the Society's Rooms, on November 16th, the following Members were present:—The President (in the chair), Dr. A. T. Myers, and Messrs. F. W. H. Myers and Frank Podmore.

Three new Associates, whose names and addresses are given on the previous page, were elected.

Information was received with regret of the death of the Rev. P. H. Newnham, a Member of the Society, and also of Mr. Charles A. Pitcher, an Associate. It was resolved that a letter of sympathy be written to Mrs. Newnham.

A proposal as to a memorial to Mr. Edmund Gurney, fully explained above, was agreed to.

Various matters of routine business were attended to.

It was agreed that the Annual Business Meeting of the Members of the Society be held on Friday, January 25th, 1889, and also that a General Meeting be held on the evening of the same day.

The next Meeting of the Council will be held on Monday, December 17th.

### GENERAL MEETING.

A General Meeting was held at the Westminster Town Hall, on November 16th, Professor Sidgwick, the President of the Society, in the chair.

A paper was read from Professor Charles Richet, of Paris, on some experiments of his own on "lucidity" or "clairvoyance," made with Madame B., a hypnotic subject well known to French physicians. He found that she could frequently recognise an ordinary playing card unknown to anyone present and

enclosed in two thick envelopes. His method was to select a card at random, and without looking at it, from a pile of ten packs, to enclose this in an envelope (and in a second series of experiments in two envelopes), which he gummed down and handed to Madame B., whom he had previously hypnotised and who remained under his eye throughout the experiment. This was often very tedious, hours sometimes elapsing before she professed to know the card. In most cases she only attempted to name the suit, and was often wrong, but out of the 15 trials in which she completely described the card she was right 12 times—the second envelope not reducing the proportion of complete and successful guesses. After she had named the card, Professor Richet examined the envelope to see whether it was intact. He thinks that the hypotheses of visual or tactile hyperæsthesia are neither of them admissible, and inclines to believe that she discerns the cards by the exercise of some faculty as yet imperfectly known. He intends to continue his experiments.

The reading of Professor Richet's paper was followed by some discussion on the details of the experiments.

MR. PODMORE remarked that Madame B. might conceivably have deceived Professor Richet in two ways. She might have brought with her envelopes similar to his own, enclosing cards which she knew, and then substituted these envelopes for his. Or she might have opened his envelope, taken out the card, looked at it, and placed it in an envelope of her own. It did not appear that Professor Richet had himself marked his envelopes beforehand.

MR. BARKWORTH referred to the experiments with Mr. Davey as showing the extreme difficulty of maintaining continuous attention even for 20 minutes. Professor Richet's continuous attention was needed for some hours together, and at dead of night.

MR. H. A. SMITH remarked that in this case fraud on Madame B.'s part would imply preparation; but that, judging from other accounts of the intermixture of her psychical states, her hypnotic self might be responsible for the preparation as well as for the definite act of fraud, if fraud were committed.

MR. F. W. H. MYERS remarked that the most striking incident in Professor Richet's paper—the perception by Madame B. of an accident with bromine in Professor Richet's laboratory—was beyond the reach of fraud. He had had the opportunity some years ago of examining the records of some similar clairvoyant perceptions (as it seemed) of Madame B.'s, which occurred at Havre, but had not yet been published.

The PRESIDENT said that his general confidence in Professor

Richet's skill and caution in experimentation was as great as, or greater than, the confidence which he would feel had the experiments been his own; at the same time he acknowledged the force of the objections that had been made that evening to the card experiments.

A paper was also read on "The Connection of Hypnotism with the Subjective Phenomena of Spiritualism," giving an account of observations and experiments on the production of local anæsthesia, muscular rigidity, and delusions, by self-suggestion. It was argued, among other things, that the trance utterances of "mediums," when there is real and not only pretended abnormality of condition during the utterance, may be the result of self-suggestion inducing a somnambulant state, combined with a tendency to impersonate some deceased person or supposed spirit, on whom the mind of the medium had been previously fixed. There may thus be no conscious deception, while yet the words uttered are the product of the medium's own mind, just as much as if they were uttered in obedience to a suggestion given by a hypnotiser.

MR. VICTOR HORSLEY said that he had been very much interested in the paper, and thought that the facts of auto-suggestion which had been presented in it offered a promising field for further study. Of the phenomena of self-induced anæsthesia he should be glad to learn more. It was a generalisation at which M. Charcot had arrived in cases of hysterical anæsthesia, and the same result had been reached by direct experiment on the cortex of the brain, that the anæsthesia was not less than segmental, that is to say, did not extend over shorter areas of the body than between joint and joint, though it might be sometimes confined to one side or the other of what was termed a segment. He should be glad to know if the same had been observed in these cases of anæsthesia arising from auto-suggestion. Of the general method and objects of the experiments he expressed warm approval.

---

#### SOME REMARKS ON PROFESSOR RICHET'S EXPERIMENTS ON THE POSSIBILITY OF CLAIRVOYANT PERCEPTION OF DRAWINGS.

BY A. R. BALFOUR.

---

I am impelled to make the following remarks upon that part of Professor Richet's valuable paper in *Proceedings*, Part XII., pp. 55-116, which relates to experiments with drawings, because those experiments interested me very much, and, as affording evidence of "lucidity," or clairvoyance, seem to me decidedly encouraging—more so in some

instances than M. Richet allows.\* I am, therefore, anxious that they should be repeated under even better conditions, and should like to suggest to those who may have the opportunity of repeating them, certain points in which I think they might be improved.

The most important of these is that the original drawings should be more carefully done, by a person accustomed to draw clearly and accurately; and that they should represent definite objects (*e.g.*, a fork, a cock, a cow, a letter of the alphabet, a house), which can be named in one or two words, and not easily mistaken for other objects, and which are familiar by sight and by name to comparatively uneducated persons. If any geometrical figures are used, these should be of the simplest kind in shape, and such as have well known names. Further, the drawings should be very simple, so that they may be fully taken in at a glance, which would exclude photographs such as Figs. 16 and 19; they should be known for what they are in whatever position they come before the percipient, upside down or otherwise (Fig. 53, representing an extinguisher, may have been misinterpreted from being seen upside down, and, I believe, the same may be said of Fig. 64, and perhaps of others), and should never be larger than the real object, as, for instance, Fig. 32 is, if it represents a die, which I conclude it does.

I think also that the drawing should never be folded, as this introduces an ambiguity, and that care should be taken to have nothing inside or outside the envelope containing it, such as seals, notes of dates, &c., which may confuse the percipient, or complicate the experiment.

It seems to me very likely that had these points been attended to many of the percipient's own drawings would have borne a much greater resemblance to the original drawings than they do. Moreover, since the original drawing could be easily described, there would be no necessity for representing the percipient's impression by a drawing—a great advantage in the case of a percipient not accustomed to draw; especially as we should thus avoid, not only the defects arising out of her own bad drawing, but the still more serious ones which, as it appears to me, may arise (1) from her influencing her impression by her own description and then drawing the altered and not the original impression, and (2) out of the attempts of other persons to realise her ideas and express them in a drawing. M. Richet's experiments—so far as they tend to prove clairvoyance—tend also to show, I think, that the perception clairvoyantly obtained is of an indistinct and evanescent kind, easily

---

\* I should select as the most encouraging experiments, numbers IV., pp. 82, 83; VI., pp. 85, 86; XI., pp. 91, 92; XIII., pp. 93, 94; XVII., p. 97; XVIII., p. 98; XXIV., pp. 102, 103; XXXIV., p. 107; XXXV., p. 107; XXXVIII., pp. 111, 112; all in the second series.

effaced or confused by ideas otherwise introduced. Other persons in the room, who are trying to understand the percipient's description, may introduce such erroneous ideas either by words, or by drawings, or even by thought-transference, and I think that they probably have done so in some instances. For this reason the hypnotiser and other persons present should, while putting down the percipient's words, try to prevent themselves as far as possible from endeavouring to interpret these words,—as they must do, for instance, if they wish to draw the idea suggested—and should never speak a word having any reference to what the percipient describes, while the experiment is going on.

I will now try to justify the above remarks by discussing some of the drawings and experiments in detail, under the heads of

I. Defects in the original drawings.

II. Complications in the experiments.

III. Ideas suggested to the percipient by other persons present.

I ought to say at the outset that I have not gone into the question of the possibility of perception by the senses in the ordinary way—(conscious or unconscious deception),—but have assumed that M. Richet's precautions against this were adequate except where he states the contrary.

I. Cases where defects in the original drawings have possibly interfered with success.

The original drawings fail in several ways, but first and foremost in being for the most part so imperfectly drawn, that it is not always easy even for a person under ordinary conditions to say what they are meant to represent; and for persons under extraordinary conditions one would think it must be almost hopelessly difficult. Indeed, what surprises me most is to find how often the percipient does seem to have made something out of them approximating to the originals. Take for instance the following drawings:—Fig. 42 is called a serpent; it is quite as like the edge of a frill. Fig. 45 is a mere collection of crooked lines. Fig. 56 is more like a flower-bud (seen in a foreshortened position) with a stalk, than a cat. One almost requires to be told that Fig. 58 represents a ship. Fig. 60 is as much like a wig on a stand as a tree, and Fig. 71 is little more than an irregular patch of cross-hatching. It does not surprise me in the least to find that the percipient calls Fig. 45 "a heart with two bars, or balloon with its cradle," instead of a face; or Fig. 49 a butterfly instead of a palette,—very slight alterations in the lines will make it an undoubted butterfly; or Fig. 62 a window or frame instead of a flag; or Fig. 64 a crown instead of a table (of course, you must put it upside down); or Fig. 72 a vase with a fountain or flowers in it instead of a cray-fish; or Fig. 76 a ladder instead of a fan. In some cases these drawings are com-

paratively carefully done, such as Fig. 62 (the flag), 72 (the cray-fish), 76 (the fan), and 86 (a balloon), but even then they are not sufficiently characteristic at once to convey their meaning.\* Some drawings again are not representations of definite objects (as Figs. 51 and 26), and others (as Figs. 37 and 78) are nameless elaborate geometrical figures, almost impossible to describe in words, and very difficult to draw from recollection.

I think I see considerable evidence for another important result already mentioned, following, but less directly, from the imperfection of the original drawings. The percipient not unfrequently draws, not what she may have perceived of the original drawing, but something apparently suggested to her by her own description of what she perceived. Thus her drawing may have little or no resemblance to the original, and yet may show evidence for lucidity. Some such cases seem to be considered by M. Richet as almost failures. I should consider them partial successes. My regret is then great, for I think it highly probable that had the original drawings been well done and easily described in one or two words, we should have had first-rate evidence for lucidity.

The most remarkable instance of the percipient drawing what she described and not what she may clairvoyantly have seen is Exp. XIII., pp. 93-4. We are told that the original drawing (Fig. 56) is a cat, but as I said before, it is quite as like a foreshortened flower-bud with a stalk, and it is as a "flower with a stalk" that the percipient describes it. She then makes a drawing of a flower on a stalk, which has no resemblance whatsoever to the original drawing, yet it is an undoubted representation of her description.

Out of the eighteen cases in the second series of experiments (pp. 77-112), where the percipient's attempts to draw what she perceives are given, ten, or possibly twelve, appear to me to show traces of the above process. I should especially call attention in this respect to Exps. IX., pp. 89, 90; X., pp. 90, 91; XI., pp. 91, 92; XIV., pp. 94, 95; XVIII., pp. 98, and more doubtfully to Exps. XII., pp. 92, 93, and XXXVII., pp. 110, 111. The first series of experiments need not be considered under this head, as they were professedly not carried out under conditions excluding thought-transference and therefore afford no test of clairvoyance.

---

\* The dragon-fly of Exp. XXXII., p. 107, of which the original drawing is not given us, may be another case of this. If this dragon-fly was drawn with wings extended at right angles to the body, as dragon-flies generally are, may it not be these wings rather than the eyes which the percipient described as "deux ovales très rapprochés comme deux lunettes"?

II. The objection to complications in the experiment is well shown by Exp. VII., p. 68. Here the original drawing is a circle with a transverse bar. The percipient talks of seeing photographs, and on being told that she is wrong, adds that she sees something brilliant like varnish. On being then told that there is a seal, she describes the letters on it correctly. She also says there is writing inside, and makes a few rough horizontal lines of different lengths to describe the general form of the lines of writing. Her other remarks are not to the point. At first sight one is struck by her saying she sees something brilliant, and by her correctly describing the letters on the seal; also by the statement, which turns out to be true, that there is writing. But these lose all their value when we find that she might possibly have seen the seal and the writing, or, if this were not so, we reflect that she might at any rate have *felt* the seal. From that to guessing the letters—the initials of a man whom she very likely knew to be interested in the experiments—is not a very surprising step; nor is it strange that she should guess there was writing.\* *Of the drawing she sees nothing.* Thus, then, this experiment is rendered completely useless, owing to the complications of a seal and writing being introduced into it, without intention, and therefore without precaution.

Somewhat similar complications occurred in Exp. I., pp. 57, 58, where there is a note of date on the drawing, which may be what the percipient refers to in the words "Comme un escalier"; and in Exp. IV., pp. 63-65, where the postage stamps on the inside envelopes and the folded drawing may both have influenced the result, as M. Richet points out. *Apropos* to folding, I may remark that in Exp. VII., p. 86, the percipient's description would be very good if the original drawing was folded half-way across and then seen like a transparency, and the same is true of the description in Exp. XXXIII., p. 107. It would be interesting to know whether these drawings were folded.

III. Proceeding next to the cases where the intervention of some person present other than the percipient have, it seems to me, injured the experiment, I may cite Exp. XXVI., p. 104, as a good example of the class in which the interposition of the hypnotiser, by word, has done harm. The drawing to be described is intended to represent a fan, but it is quite as like the bird's-eye view or ground plan of part of a spiral staircase. The percipient says she sees "une Echelle," not of an ordinary kind, but "adaptée à quelque chose." M. Richet suggests a house, and although she answers no, that idea takes possession of her mind, and she immediately draws a house, and adds a curved set of

---

\*If she *saw* the writing she might perhaps know it for M. Rondeau's, and in that case would at once guess the initials on the seal.



steps leading to the house, as if she still retained a dim recollection of the curve of the steps derived from the original drawing. Is it not quite likely that she would have drawn something much more like the spiral staircase or fan of the original had her ideas not been altered by M. Richet's remark?

Perhaps it cannot be absolutely asserted that the hypnotiser has, by his own drawings from the percipient's descriptions, seriously affected for the worse the results of the experiments, but it may be safely said that only in one case (Exp. X., p. 72) has he helped the interpretation of the percipient's words by his drawings. Anyone who will look at Fig. 60, representing a tree, and Fig. 88, representing a swallow, and will then note that the percipient's description of the tree is translated by M. Richet into a wreath, while her description of the swallow suggests to him a collection of lines intended to represent the head of a parrot, will agree in thinking that the drawings done from the percipient's description are worse than useless.

More important are the cases in which I would suggest that transference of thoughts coming either consciously or unconsciously into the mind of a person in the room while the experiment is going on has perhaps taken place.

Exp. VII., pp. 86, 87, may be an instance of transference of thought which consciously entered the mind of the hypnotiser during the experiment. The original drawing is supposed to represent a serpent. The two things M. Richet thinks of, while the percipient is making vague and incomprehensible remarks on what she perceives, are (1) a caduceus and (2) a book-plate representing an anchor with two serpents interlacing it, surmounted by the cap of Mercury. Neither of these, however, have any resemblance to the original drawing (unless this was folded across, see above). But is it not possible that the ideas of a caduceus and of the book-plate were transferred from M. Richet's mind to that of the percipient, and that it is owing to this that the latter part of her remarks forms a very good description of the book-plate as figured (Fig. 44)? To put it shortly, may she not have described M. Richet's idea and not the drawing? I cannot think that the original drawing, having been intended to represent a serpent—and one requires to be told that such is the fact—can have had anything to do with M. Richet's thinking of the serpents entwining the caduceus and the anchor on the book-plate. It is far more likely that the percipient's word's "un nœud entrelacé . . . des ronds entrelacés," suggested the form both of caduceus and book-plate; the fact of the *nœuds entrelacés* on them being serpents, being merely a coincidence.

Exp. III., pp. 61-63, is, perhaps, an instance of transference of unconscious thought from an onlooker to the percipient. M. Hericourt gives

as the object to be described a rough drawing of a photograph frame, suggested by one containing a photograph of himself at his own house. The percipient describes the likeness of a man in uniform in a frame, and the description applies, on the whole, well to the photograph of M. Hericourt, who was, at the time it was taken, a military doctor. It seems to me that M. Hericourt must have unconsciously had in his mind the whole effect of the frame with his photograph inside it, and not the frame alone; and if so, that his unconscious thought may have been transferred to the percipient, who described it accordingly. It may be noted that the percipient describes the frame as "un cadre avec un ovale dans le cadre." It would be interesting to know whether the original frame had an oval inside it or not. If it had, this is a valuable addition to the description. M. Richet thinks there is an indication of lucidity in this experiment, but on the supposition of thought-transference there would be no evidence for lucidity, M. Hericourt having been present the whole time.

Transference of unconscious thoughts may also have occurred, as M. Richet suggests, in Exp. IV., pp. 63-66.

Reference to a case (Exp. XVI., pp. 95, 96) looking like thought-transference, which did not, however, influence the image of the original drawing as apparently seen by the percipient, comes in fitly here. The original drawing (Fig. 60, already mentioned) represents a tree, somewhat in the style of the "King Charles's Oak" which you see on cutting a bracken stem near the roots. The opening words of the percipient's description suggest a laurel wreath to M. Richet. Thereupon the percipient says, "The shape is not that of laurel leaves—they are not pointed leaves," and ends by saying there is "nothing in the middle." M. Richet then draws something intended to be a wreath, but the percipient does not understand what it is meant for. She sees something she cannot easily describe, *but it is different from M. Richet's idea and drawing suggested by her first words.* Hence her non-comprehension of his drawing and her words about the laurel and pointed leaves. It seems to me possible that thought-transference and partial lucidity were here simultaneous, but did not interfere with each other;—that she saw something more or less like the tree, and she also saw M. Richet's conception, which she combats as being inaccurate; but the two were separate in her mind. Can, however, the thought-transference have begun to overpower the lucidity when she says at the end "Rien au milieu"—a remark that is eminently untrue of the tree, and true of the wreath? This experiment has, perhaps, more interest regarded as affording evidence of thought-transference than of clairvoyance; but the experiments taken as a whole certainly suggest the existence of a clairvoyant faculty.

CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

---

At a recent meeting of the Society the question was raised whether the faculties of receiving telepathic impressions, through hallucinations or otherwise, appeared ever to be hereditary. There is certainly some evidence that it is, as the following cases among others will show.\*

---

Experiences in the family of Mrs. Treloar, of River, Dover, taken down by F. W. H. M., from a conversation with her and her sister, Mrs. Gardiner, April 4th, 1888, and revised and signed as correct by the two ladies aforesaid.

L. 819. Ad Pm

Our mother, Mrs. Cowpland, wife of the Rev. Robert Cowpland, late of Weeford Rectory, Staffordshire, on three occasions, and, we believe, on those three occasions only, saw a hallucinatory figure. On all three occasions the apparition coincided with the death of the person seen. On the first two occasions both of us heard of the apparition from our mother before the death was known; on the third occasion Mrs. Treloar alone so heard of it.

I. In 1857 our mother was bending over a chest of drawers in her bedroom, and on turning round saw, as she thought, her brother-in-law, the Rev. William Cowpland, rector of Acton Beauchamp, Worcestershire, standing by her side. She exclaimed, "Ah, William! When did you arrive?" Next day a telegram came, saying he had been found dead in bed. The coincidence as to *hour* could not be traced. My mother mentioned the apparition to us both, at once, before the telegram came; and the matter was frequently spoken of afterwards.

II. In 1860, or thereabouts, she heard a footstep, and went into the hall, and returned and told my father and us that she had seen William Dunn, a gardener at the house of some relatives of ours. We did not know that he was ill, but afterwards heard that he had died about the time that my mother saw him, and had expressed a wish to see her. We believe that the coincidence of hour was clearly made out.

III. In 1862, my mother, being in bed, told me that she had seen a Mrs. F., a connection of ours, standing at the foot of her bed, and was sure she was dead, though we did not know that she was ill. This was in fact the case; and the hour in this case, too, was found to coincide. Mrs. F. had been mixed up in affairs with my mother, but there was no special affection.

Here follow some cases of shrieks heard before death, of which the particulars will be found in Mrs. Sidgwick's paper on "The Evidence for Premonitions," to be published in *Proceedings*, Part XIII. The narrative proceeds:—

---

\* See also in this connection the cases referred to in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol II., p. 132, footnote.

## L. 820. A° P 2 [SIMULTANEOUS APPARITIONS.]

In connection with this sister's death an event of another kind occurred to myself and a niece, Miss Maud Cowpland :—

On August 26th, 1885, Mr. Treloar and I, then living at The Firs, Bromyard, dined with my brother, the Rev. W. Cowpland, who had succeeded my uncle in the rectory of Acton Beauchamp. Mr. Treloar's letter of March 3rd, 1888, will describe what happened.

“My wife and I were dining with my brother-in-law, and there met my wife's sister, who lived a short distance from the rectory. It was a very lively party, and this lady was in the best of health and spirits. It was on a Wednesday, and as we left the house my wife promised to drive over to see her shortly, at her own house (Upper House, Bishop's Frome), where she resided alone. On the Tuesday following, in the evening, about eight o'clock, my wife, who had been in the nursery during the half-hour the nurse was having her supper, went into our bedroom, where there was a lamp burning on the dressing-table ; and as she passed the bed, in going round to the other end of the room, she saw, as she thought, a black dress on the other side of the bed, but on looking again, a figure slowly rose up from what appeared a bent position, and looked straight at her for the space of three or four seconds ; and she then recognised her sister. Her face was very pale, and had a look of anguish on it. My wife came downstairs, and I noticed that she seemed troubled, and on asking her what had upset her, she told me. I, of course, thought it must have been a delusion. Next evening (Wednesday, September 2nd), just as we were sitting down to dinner, the groom of our doctor came to the house and said his master wished to see me. I went down and found him just about to start for my sister-in-law's residence, as he told me that she had sent for him, and from what he could learn she was in a most dangerous state from diphtheria. She died two days afterwards, and my wife never saw her, as it was, in the doctor's opinion, running too great a risk.”

This account is correct, but does not state that just as I had told him of the apparition, my niece, Miss Maud Cowpland, who was staying with us, came rushing downstairs from her bedroom, whither she had gone a few minutes before—and simultaneously *I* began to tell *her* what I had seen, and she, scarcely heeding me, burst out, “I've seen Auntie Annie ! I've seen Auntie Annie !” [Mr. Treloar confirms this.] I did not question her further then, but her letter appended shows what she saw. She left the house next day, I believe partly on account of the fright. I had never before seen, nor have I since seen, any apparition whatever, nor have I had any other experience at all resembling those which I here recount. After the first moment, I was not alarmed by the vision of my sister Anne. She was so remarkably vigorous and full of life that the idea of her death never occurred to me. In fact, what happened was this : there was diphtheria in the parish, and she most imprudently kissed a school-child suffering from that disease. On the Tuesday evening (when the figure was seen) she had retired early to her room, saying to her servants that she had a bad cold. They were young, and there was no one in her house to whom she would have spoken confidentially as to her state. All

that can be known, then, of her condition at this moment is that she was alone in her room—whether asleep or awake we do not know—and that next day she sent for the doctor, and was fatally ill. There was a strong affection between her and myself.

I may add that the figure which I saw had a bonnet and veil on, the veil being tied back round her bonnet, as was my sister's wont. The lamp was bright, and so clearly did I see the figure that I observed the freckles on the nose. My sister had fine, expressive eyes, and their look in the apparition was full of anxiety and pain. The figure did not disappear instantaneously, but seemed to thin away into air.

It is my belief that at many times of pain or crisis to one member of our family others have had impressions of distress, though at a distance. I recall one incident of this. In 1870 my brother (since deceased) broke his leg very badly when out hunting. The accident happened at about 4 p.m. He was taken to an inn and lay there all night in real danger. On that day Mrs. Gardiner, who was joining in a friendly gathering, felt a quite unique depression from 4 p.m. onwards. And that night, contrary to my habit, I could not sleep; and while lying awake was astonished to see my father come into my room and ask for some help and comfort, as he was sleepless and in distress. He was at that time in good health, and had never thus appealed to me before. I got up and gave him some brandy and water (which I had never done before), but all that night we both of us continued causelessly wretched.

Miss Maud Cowpland describes her experience as follows:—

*April 14th, 1888.*

The year my father died I went to spend a few days with my aunt, Mrs. Treloar. The second night, after wishing her good-night, about a quarter-past ten, I retired to my room, and while having my bath I felt an unseen power compel me to turn towards a couch which stood at the foot of the bed, at the head of which (I mean the couch) stood a figure dressed in crape, whom I immediately recognised as Miss Cowpland, and exclaimed: "Why, Aunt Annie, how is it you are here?" Then the figure gradually disappeared.

In answer to questions Miss Cowpland adds:—

1. I have never seen anything before Miss Cowpland's appearance, but often before and afterwards, when alone, have felt people, or, I think I should say spirits, around and near me. One afternoon last summer, a feeling came over me as of a hand, with long, soft fingers, stroking my face.

2. The crape seemed to fall in thick folds from the crown of the head to the ground, but those folds over the face, instead of hiding, threw the features out most distinctly. I cannot say exactly how long it stayed; perhaps half a minute; not longer.

3. I am ashamed to say I felt most horribly afraid. . . .

I mentioned it to three people, Mr. and Mrs. Treloar, and the servant, whom I asked to sleep with me, as I was too much of a coward to do so alone after that, in that particular room. Yes, I remember Mrs. Treloar telling me what she had seen; it was after that that I told her my experience.

L. 821.

Mr. Myers writes :—

“The following series of apparitions is of interest as illustrating the tendency of veridical hallucinations to recur in the same family. The Ellis family, here concerned, are in no way of an imaginative or emotional type. They have given no attention to any phenomena of this type except those actually occurring to themselves. To the best of the knowledge of the surviving members of the family, none of the percipients concerned ever experienced any other hallucinations. In the first case the precise night on which the son saw the father’s figure cannot now be recovered with certainty. It was a few days after Christmas—about December 29th—and the Misses Ellis feel sure that it coincided either with the last day of illness or the day of the death of their father. The *hour* of the son’s vision was about 3 a.m., and considering the father’s remarkable experience at a corresponding *hour* in England, it seems not unreasonable to assume a connection between the two incidents, and to class the case as “reciprocal.” If it be so considered, the evidence of the Misses Ellis, who were with their father when *his* vision occurred, is equal to first-hand for one side of the reciprocal experience. An independent, and almost exactly concordant account of the incident was sent to us by Mrs. Robert Ellis (widow of the son in Australia) from her recollection of her husband’s narration.

Brighton, *June 23rd*, 1887.

“I hear from Mrs. R. Ellis that you wish to have the account from us of my father, who was dying in Kensington, seeing my brother Robert, who was at the time in Australia. It was on Wednesday, December 29th, 1869, that my father, who was dangerously ill at the time, awoke from a sleep, and raising himself up in the bed pointed and looked most intently to one corner of the room and said to us (my sister Mary and me) ‘Look ! don’t you see ? it is my poor boy Bob’s head !’ then turning to me he said, ‘Norman Town, don’t forget, Gulf of Carpentaria.’ He then sank back exhausted. This happened about 3 p.m. We found, after his death, he had entered the address in red ink in his pocket book—my brother having left Bourke Town and gone to Norman Town—so that the next packet of letters were sent there. My father died on Thursday, December 30th, 1869. When my brother returned home from Australia a few years after, he told us that one night, whilst camping out, he had gone to rest and had slept, and he awoke seeing my father’s head distinctly in one part of his tent. It made such an impression on him that he went to his mate in the adjoining tent and said, ‘I have seen my father, you must come and stay with me.’ By the next mail he received my letter telling him of my father’s death.

My brother said it must have been about 3 a.m. when he saw my father. Would not that correspond with our 3 p.m. ? I always think they must have seen each other at the same time.”

(Signed) { ALICE ELLIS.  
MARY ELLIS.

In conversation with Mrs. Ellis, senior, and Miss Alice Ellis (at 43, Silswood-road, Brighton, November 2nd, 1888), I learnt that Mr. Ellis

was in no degree delirious in his last days. He lay in a state of exhaustion, from which the sudden movement and speech above described formed a marked, though momentary, rally. He was very deeply attached to the absent son.

The next case is given in Mrs. Robert Ellis' words, but was confirmed to me by Mrs. Ellis, senior, and Miss Alice Ellis. It is, of course, not demonstrable that the vision was more than purely subjective. But in connection with the previous case it seems worth recording. The 'three o'clock' was taken by those present as 3 p.m., but it does not appear that they questioned the dying man as to whether p.m. or a.m. was meant. He died at about 3.10 or 3.15 a.m. on the Wednesday.

"After the death of Mr. Robert Ellis, senior, which took place as before stated on December 30th, 1869, at his house No. 29, Addison-gardens, South Kensington (now re-numbered No. 11) his eldest son—who felt the loss of his father very deeply—told his mother he had a presentiment that he was 'the next to go.'

He, Mr. Lloyd Ellis, had symptoms of lung disease at the time but not to a degree to lead his friends to expect a fatal termination soon. But his health declined rapidly towards the end of the year, and in the month of January, 1870, he was in a dying state.

Lying in an apparent sleep one night (one *Monday* night, I believe) he woke up suddenly and asked his mother—'Where is my father?'

She answered him, tearfully, 'Lloyd dear, you know your dear father is dead. He has been dead for more than a year now.'

'Is he?' he asked, incredulously. 'Why! he was in the room just now, and I have an appointment with him, *three o'clock* next *Wednesday*.'

And Lloyd Ellis died at *three o'clock* on the following *Wednesday* morning."

The next case is almost on a par with first-hand, as Mrs. Robert Ellis, whose account (abbreviated) follows here, was present with Mr. R. Ellis when he saw the apparition, and observed his excitement, although she was not informed till afterwards of its cause.

"In the autumn of the year 1875 my brother, John Phillips Clemes, a mining engineer, left England and went to Northern Mexico, in the employ of Señor Don Francisco Alsna, the proprietor of a silver mine in the Province of Sonora. He left England with the full intention expressed to me of remaining abroad but three years, although the position he filled was an extremely lucrative one.

Mr. Robert Ellis, to whom I was then engaged to be married, had made the acquaintance of my brother whilst he was in London, and entertained for him the warmest liking and respect. Indeed, the two men, though most dissimilar in character, had formed a sudden and warm friendship for each other.

It was in Christmas week—Tuesday, December 19th, 1876,—and Mr. Ellis had called to see me, and spend the evening, as he generally did, twice a week. We were to have a small party of a few friends on Christmas Day,

and on this evening I was discussing some of the small festive arrangements with him—the pudding especially as I remember, and laughing about it, and we were both unusually mirthful. The hour was between 6 and 7 p.m., and we were alone in the drawing-room after tea, Mr. Ellis being seated in a low occasional chair with his back to the door.

I was standing beside him, and the room was brightly lit with gas. I saw him suddenly look over his shoulder with a startled, almost terrified, look, two or three scared glances, and upon my asking him hurriedly what was the matter, he passed his hand over his eyes, and stammered that he had imagined he saw some one coming in at the door, which was standing slightly ajar.

He refused to say any more, though I questioned him closely, and declared it must have been something the matter with his eyes.

Two months afterwards, when the sad truth was all known to me, Mr. Ellis told me that what had occurred to startle him that evening was this. As he was sitting, a sensation came over him of someone standing at his back, and, looking over his shoulder, he distinctly saw, for the space of a few seconds, a tall, dark figure, a man's figure, draped in black, as it appeared. He could not distinguish features in the brief time, and in his own agitation.

In the month of January, 1877, there came the news, by telegram, of my dear brother's sudden death by fever on Tuesday, the 19th of December. He expired after being quite unconscious for fourteen hours, at seven o'clock in the evening."

---

#### NOTES.

The Fox Sisters, now Mrs. Kane and Mrs. Jencken, who in 1848 were the heroines of the "Rochester Knockings" with which the movement called Modern Spiritualism began, have been confessing to Reporters of American newspapers and to American public audiences, that their performances have been fraudulent from the beginning, and that the raps were made with their toes. But little weight can be attached to what such people say on one side or the other; but they seem to have given experimental demonstration of their capacity to make raps in this way, and what they now state is entirely in accordance with the results obtained by investigators as early as 1853, as well as with facts alleged by a connection of the Foxes in 1851.

---

An interesting case of "Telepathic Clairvoyance" is communicated to *Sphinx* for November, by Professor Elliot Coues, of Washington. If the percipient,—a hypnotic subject of Professor Coues, whose name is not given,—can be trusted, she became aware of his surroundings on a certain evening, when he was at a party in a distant town in a curious way;—partly by verbal information received from an apparition of him which seemed to stand beside her in her room and converse with her, and partly by a vision of the party. Professor Coues had no corresponding impression on his side, and was awake and in full possession of his normal faculties at the time. The form of the experience is an unusual one.