

## SUPPLEMENT.

---

### ON A SERIES OF EXPERIMENTS AT PESARO.

---

#### I.

##### INTRODUCTION.

I propose to give some account of a series of experiments which have been carried on during a number of years at Pesaro, a small town on the east coast of Italy, a little to the north of Ancona. These experiments are partly concerned with automatic writing, partly with spirit-rapping, and partly with hypnotism.

It will conduce to clearness if some information is first given as to the persons concerned, and the materials from which my account of the experiments is drawn. Professor Rossi-Pagnoni is Director of the Ginnasio or Public School at Pesaro. In the year 1871 he was led, by circumstances which need not be here detailed, to take an interest in Spiritualism, and began daily to practise automatic writing under the advice and direction of a friend who had frequently obtained communications from spirits, as he believed, by that means.

In his experiments in automatic writing Professor Rossi used what is, I believe, the most usual method. He held a lead pencil in his hand, allowing its point to rest on a sheet of paper, but not touching the table with his arm, and waited for results. For the first 43 days of experiment the movements of the pencil were incoherent and unintelligible. On the 44th, a name was written; and from that time onwards the facility and distinctness of the writing increased, and communications of considerable length were often obtained.

These experiments, and also experiments in table-rapping, which had been tried by Professor Rossi and a small circle of friends, were discontinued in the year 1877, owing to the increased claims of scholastic duties upon the Professor's time. In 1886 he found sufficient leisure to resume them; and he was then joined by some former members of the circle, and also by others. Among these was Dr. Moroni, who has been for 30 years Municipal Doctor at Pesaro. Dr. Moroni had been in the habit of hypnotising a woman named Isabella Carzetti; and hypnotic experiments with this subject were added to the others. The hypnotic experiments were at first directed towards the observation of physiological phenomena. After a time, however, results

believed to be spiritualistic were obtained ; and spiritualistic séances, with Carzetti in the hypnotic state as a speaking medium, are continued regularly at the present time.

In the year 1877 Professor Rossi published a pamphlet entitled, *Intorno ai Fenomeni Spiritici, Lettera all' Onorando Signor Conte Terenzio Mamiani*. This contains, besides other matter, reports of the more striking results obtained in the earlier series of experiments, which were concerned chiefly with automatic writing. A second pamphlet, entitled, *Alcuni Saggi di Medianità Ipnotica*, was published in 1888, by Professor Rossi and Dr. Moroni. This contains accounts of hypnotic séances with Carzetti as medium. Professor Rossi has in his possession a number of documents bearing on the occurrences and experiments related in these two pamphlets. They are written and signed by persons concerned, and confirm, supplement, or correct the published accounts. Copies of these documents have been sent by Professor Rossi to Mr. Myers, with a legal certificate that the copies are correct, and that the originals bears the signatures of persons who are known and respected.

In November last I paid a short visit to Pesaro. I was most kindly and cordially received by Professor Rossi and his friends, and was present at three séances, with Carzetti as medium and Dr. Moroni as hypnotiser. I took notes of everything of importance that occurred at these séances ; and also had the opportunity of seeing and making extracts from the records of previous séances, and other documents. Among these were the original automatic manuscripts, which have been preserved from the beginning.

These, then, with the addition of several letters from Professor Rossi to Mr. Myers and myself, are the materials for the following account of the more important experiments.

## II.

### AUTOMATIC WRITING.

The following case, in which a similar message was received independently, in automatic writing, by Professor Rossi and a friend, is related by the former (*Letter to Mamiani*, p. 130) :—

One evening my hand unexpectedly wrote the name of a very dear friend who was dead. He gave me news of himself which was far from joyful. Some evenings later he returned, expressing himself to the same effect. I spoke of the matter in confidence to a friend, whose affection for the deceased was no less than mine, and whom I knew, from some words which I had chanced to hear, to be of like inclination with myself, and desirous to make trial of automatic writing. Some time passed, and one evening, while I was evoking my accustomed spirit [*i.e.*, another friend whose name frequently appeared in the scripts], my hand instead wrote the name of the dead friend mentioned above, who told me that his condition was happily

changed. The following morning (December 10th), as I was walking, I met in the Piazza the friend to whom I had confided the previous communications of the same spirit. He no sooner saw me than he asked, "How long is it since you had communication with so-and-so?" "*A propos!* he came yesterday evening and said that his state was changed for the better." "Know," replied my friend, "that yesterday evening he came to my house, too, and told me the same thing. I had set myself down for the first time to make a trial, without evoking anyone. Before telling you of this I asked you that question, because, as this communication of mine did not agree with your previous message, I suspected that either you or I had been deceived." We showed one another the scripts. At an interval of two or three hours we had both received the same unexpected announcement. My friend wrote with his own hand an account of the occurrence, and gave it to me.

In confirmation of this account are two documents, signed by Ferdinando Spadoni. The first is apparently the narration referred to by Professor Rossi. It bears no date, and runs as follows:—

On Saturday, December 9th, 1871, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, having desired to try for the first time to write by spiritualistic means, I did not expect any positive result from that experiment. However, when I had set myself to the attempt, without any invocation, to my extreme surprise I saw produced with wonderful rapidity the name of *Alessandro Paterni*, and in the second line, "God has pardoned me."

(Signed)

F. SPADONI.

The second document is dated December 26th, 1888. Ferdinando Spadoni states that he is "the friend" mentioned in Professor Rossi's account of the occurrence, and that the account is perfectly true.

It is to be noted that in this case Spadoni knew the name of the friend, and the purport of the former message: that the second message, though said by Rossi to be unexpected, was not an unnatural sequel to the first: that the wording of the messages was not the same:<sup>1</sup> and that the coincidence of time was not quite exact. Rossi's message was received at 8 p.m., and the interval, therefore, was four hours.<sup>2</sup>

The next case is somewhat similar in character (*Letter to Mamiani*, p. 131):—

In April, 1872, a friend asked Rossi to evoke the spirit of a relation, formerly living near Modena, who had been dead about two years. "I had never known her," says Rossi, "and my friend told me what I was to ask her on his account. I did as I was asked, and after the answer was obtained, to my great astonishment (for a similar thing had never happened before) I felt my hand impelled to draw, one after the other, two flowers, with their little leaves. After this *addio* was written, and the movement ceased. The

<sup>1</sup> The message written by Spadoni's hand was "Dio mi ha perdonato"; while Rossi's hand wrote, in answer to the question "Stai bene?", "Assai bene; in sesta."

<sup>2</sup> These facts appeared from the original record, which I saw at Pesaro.

following day I took the answer to my friend and told him of the curious drawings. 'Do not be surprised,' said he. 'Know that she was very fond of drawing, and also every time that she writes by my hand, she makes me draw something.'"

This account is confirmed by a document dated December 28th, 1888, and signed by Cesare Perseguiti, barrister, who states that he is the friend mentioned by Rossi, and that the account of the incident is perfectly true in all particulars.

With regard to the character of the writing produced, Rossi says (*Letter to Mamiani* p. 133):—

It is not necessary for me to say that my ordinary hand writing is ugly and always of one pattern. Nevertheless, when writing as a medium, I have had very various forms of caligraphy according as various beings made communication. When these beings presented themselves again, often unexpectedly and after a long interval, they reproduced their former handwriting. Moreover, in that uncomfortable position of hand and arm I have had caligraphic forms so perfect that I could not reproduce them when writing at ease.

This statement by itself is too vague to be of much value as evidence; but the following documents confirm it, and give more precise information as to the persons whose writing was reproduced, and as to the degree of likeness obtained:—

## I.

Pesaro, *January 1st, 1889.*

To Professor Rossi-Pagnoni:—

My dear friend Ercole Artazù, who has now been dead for some years, was a good writer, and a son of Luigi Artazù, municipal accountant and at one time public teacher of caligraphy, who died long since. I remember very well that one day, in conversation, my friend Ercole assured me that he had not before believed in Spiritualism, but that once he went to your house and you showed him certain communications written in pencil: that you said you had received these communications when evoking the spirit of his father Luigi, no other person being present; that in those pages he not only recognised the elegant form of his father's handwriting, very different from your writing, which is anything but beautiful; but that the flourish made underneath the signature was exactly that which his father used; and that he himself, who had for so long had it before his eyes, would have been unable to reproduce it, at any rate with equal rapidity and freedom.

(Signed)

CIRO GIOVAGNOLI  
(Telegraphic Official).

This evidence is second-hand, but it is the best obtainable, as Ercole Artazù is dead. It is worth reproducing, if it be considered in connection with the other documents which bear on the same point:—

## II.

Pesaro, *January 1st, 1889.*

I have a lively recollection of having come sometimes to your house in 1873, to take part in spiritualistic experiments with the table and with

writing. One evening, after some experiments with the table, I asked you to summon my dear writing-master, Luigi Brunetti, to write. He had at that time been dead for some years. . . . You set yourself to try the experiment, the pencil resting vertically upon the paper, and your wrist and elbow raised. When the motion of the hand, which you assured us was spontaneous, began, there appeared, after the signature of Brunetti, some lines of writing of various sizes. The first was extremely small—so that a magnifying glass was necessary to read it and to see its great precision. The following lines were of middle size, and the last large. This, I recollect, was a beautiful *versè*. I remember that I immediately bore witness to those present—in accordance with the truth—that, specially in the larger character, the manner of writing and the hand of my dear master were clearly to be seen.

So much for the truth, which now, also, I willingly confirm.

(Signed)

CLETO MASINI.

Professor of Writing and Book-keeping at the Royal  
Technical School of Pesaro.

When I was at Pesaro I saw the original MS. here referred to. The writing was pretty and regular, and entirely different from Professor Rossi's usual hand.

III.—This also is at second-hand, the original witness being now dead:—

Pesaro, *January 2nd, 1889.*

I, the undersigned, well remember having heard several times from my father, Pietro Romei, who is now dead, the following account: He once went to the house of Professor Rossi, who showed him, amongst others, certain communications which he (the Professor) said he had received from the spirit of Dr. Roberto Trafarti, who had long been dead. My father observed not only the complete resemblance of those signatures to one another, but also their entire correspondence with the actual signatures of the said Doctor, with which my father, as a chemist, was well acquainted. He observed, further, below the signature a reproduction of the flourish [or device—*la cifra*] generally used by him. He told this to the Professor, and, in confirmation of what he said, invited him to go to his pharmacy to see some prescriptions of that Doctor's, which were still preserved. In confirmation of the truth, I add my signature.

ROMEI ROMOLO, Chemist.

IV.

Pesaro, *January 2nd, 1889.*

I comply with your wish and willingly declare, as I have a lively recollection of the fact, that towards the end of 1873 I had occasion to go to your house. . . . You showed me certain communications, written in pencil, which you said you had received from the spirit of the lamented Signor Alessandro Paterni, uncle of my wife. I said that the writing of the name and surname seemed to me very like the real signature of my deceased connexion. You asserted that you had never seen his signature, and, in fact, it was very probable that it was entirely unknown to you.

PIETRO BONINI, Captain.

In the following cases messages, apparently telepathic, were received by means of raps and automatic writing.

(1) (*Letter to Mamiani*, p. 139):—

On November 14th, 1873, Professor Rossi was correcting the proofs of a pamphlet, when he heard a rap of a kind which he believed to be spiritualistic. In consequence, he sat down to write automatically, and was advised to omit some pages from the pamphlet by a message professing to come from the spirit of a person whose opinion he respected. Wishing to know whether the message really came from the source from which it purported to come, he went to a friend, who was a very good medium. "Without informing him precisely of the matter concerned, I told him that a short time ago I had had a certain spirit which had given me advice with regard to something I was printing. I affirm on my honour that I did not explain myself more fully. I added that the advice appeared to me good and wise; but in order to assure myself of the identity of the spirit, I begged him to evoke it by himself, that he might question it on this point." The friend undertook to send the answer by 8 o'clock next morning, and Rossi went home. Half-an-hour afterwards he heard another rap, sat down again to write, and received the following words, with the same name as before:—

"You were deceived in my name, and you did well to seek the aid of your friend, who will confirm the truth to you to-morrow."

Next morning Rossi received from his friend a note, containing the answer given by the spirit: "It was not I who communicated with Rossi, but another spirit, whom Rossi ought not to obey." Words were added, clearly allusive to the special advice, which was unknown to the friend. Rossi then compared the handwriting of the two messages which he had received, and in the first of the two found differences from the usual handwriting of the spirit.

The accuracy of this account is confirmed by a letter from the friend in question, dated January 2nd, 1889.

Here we have a similar communication, obtained by Rossi and his friend. The friend, however, was aware that Rossi had some doubts as to the genuineness of the original message; and consequently it is not surprising that each should receive a message confirming those doubts. The words of that part of the friend's message which alluded to matters unknown to him do not appear in the printed account. It is, therefore, impossible for us to form an independent judgment as to whether they can have been suggested by guess, or inference from the facts of the case so far as they had been communicated to the friend.

(2) (*Letter to Mamiani*, p. 143):—

On November 21st, 1873, about half-past 10 in the evening, Rossi was in his study. He had been correcting proofs for more than an hour, and was tired and rather cold. In consequence he intended, when his work was finished, not to go to the *café*, as was then his custom almost every evening about 11, but to warm himself a little with a walk through the streets. He then perceived two slight but very distinct raps close to him on a side door

opening into an inner room in which there was no one. He paid no attention to these, trying to persuade himself that they were due to natural causes. Half-an-hour afterwards he had finished his work and was going out; but at the moment when he had his hand upon the door of his rooms, to shut it after him, he heard a loud knock upon it as if given with the fist. He had no doubt that this was spiritualistic in character, and returning at once to his room, sat down to write. He fully expected to receive a warning against going out that evening for fear of some dangerous encounter. Instead, however, of any such warning the following message appeared: "My sincere friendship leads me to warn you that you are desired by S.<sup>1</sup> (i.e., Stanislaw Cecchi): go, therefore, to see him." This message was signed with the name of a dead person in whose name messages had been obtained on other occasions. Rossi considered it extremely improbable that Cecchi (an acquaintance with whom he was not then intimate) would wish to see him; but went at once to the *café* where he was generally to be found at that hour. As he approached, he saw Stanislaw and some friends coming out of the *café*. "He had no sooner seen me," continues Rossi, "than he came to meet me, and said he had need of a certain favour from me. Knowing from some conversations which I had had with him that he was a disbeliever (in Spiritualism), I caught at the opportunity and answered that I would willingly do him the service, on condition that he would at once accompany me to my house. . . . We went to my house together, we entered into the room together, and I showed him on my table the message which had caused me to go in search of him. . . . He subsequently gave an account of the occurrence to some friends, though without adopting my explanation, and so far as he was able, loyally bore witness to its truth."

Stanislaw Cecchi is now dead, and therefore direct confirmation of this account cannot be obtained. A sister of his, Clelia by name, is the wife of Dr. Luigi Frigerio, Director of the Lunatic Asylum at Alessandria. Dr. Frigerio was living at Pesaro in 1873, and Rossi, therefore, applied to him to know whether he or his wife would confirm the account. Dr. Frigerio writes as follows:—

*December 27th, 1888.*

Clelia remembers to have heard from Stanislaw the strange event of which you write to me. She does not, however, remember the particulars after 10 years [as a matter of fact it is 15]. I remember that Stanislaw talked to me about it in those days, and that when he was asked with reference thereto, he replied that it was impossible to doubt your convictions. . . .

FRIGERIO.

The second confirmation is more precise; but in estimating its value as evidence, it should be remembered that it is the record of a conversation retained in memory for 15 years, and that Rossi's

<sup>1</sup> I believe that the name, and not merely the initial, was written. The initial only is given in the printed account, because at that time Professor Rossi was not at liberty to publish the name.

account of the occurrence, printed in 1877, may have influenced to some extent the recollections of the narrator.

Pesaro, February 8th, 1889.

DEAR PROFESSOR,—According to your desire, I prepare with pleasure to narrate the inexplicable occurrence which happened between you and our excellent friend, the engineer, Stanislao Cecchi, of good memory, more than once told by him at that time to me and to others, with increasing wonder. I cannot remember the precise time at which the event happened, but I think about 1873, that is 15 years ago, when our deceased friend, you, and others, used to frequent the *Café Masetti*.

One morning Cecchi had no sooner seen me in the *Piazza* than with a very serious manner (unusual with him in speaking of such matters, in which, as he used openly to say, he did not in the least believe) he said to me, "Do you know, yesterday evening, there happened to me . . . really curious . . . a thing . . . he's lucky who can explain it. . . . Yesterday I had it in my mind to go to Professor Rossi's house for some business of mine, but afterwards I put aside the thought, with the idea of seeing him in the evening. As I came out of the *Café Masetti* late in the evening with some friends, I saw him coming towards me, and as I naturally went to meet him, I observed upon his face a certain expression of satisfaction, as if at something which happened according to his expectation. I begged him eagerly to do for me a little piece of work, for the marriage of a near relation of mine. After some hesitation Rossi agreed to my request on condition that I would go at once with him to his house, where he wished to show me something which would surprise me. Unwillingly I consented. We went at once to his house, and without speaking he gave me to read a short piece of writing which he said he had received from a familiar spirit of his. In this he was told to go instantly in search of me, since I wished to see him. . . . Observe also that I had not indicated my wish to see Professor Rossi in any way to any living soul."

This event, which Cecchi at that time told more than once to me and to others, made a very vivid impression, the more so that we all knew what a character for truthfulness, and I may almost say for rugged sincerity, our excellent friend bore. Sometimes, when discussing this matter with friends at the *café* he ended thus: "I don't believe anything, but here one cannot but say 'a fact's a fact.'"

I hope I have thus satisfied you, Professor, and I am glad to have been able to do so, since I still preserve a very clear recollection of the facts.

CARLO CINELLI.

(Cavaliere Carlo Cinelli, Member of the Communal Council, &c.)

The following is a summary of Professor Rossi's account of another occurrence, of a very similar character:—

(3) (*Letter to Mamiani*, p. 144.)

On the evening of September 3rd, 1875, Rossi had been at the *café* till 8, and had then gone home, not meaning to go out again that evening. After an hour he heard two light raps of the kind which he was accustomed to consider spiritualistic, and placed his hand with a pencil on the sheet of paper in front of him. The following message was written: "I am A.O."



(the name of a friend who had been dead about a year), "and I wished to warn you to return to the café, where your presence is desired." Rossi noted on the sheet of paper the hour and minute and went out. On the way to the café he met Signor Gaetano Tosi, a barrister, now filling a judicial post (Cancelliere della Reale Corte di Cassazione) at Palermo, and Signor Zaniboni, director of the Post Office at Pesaro. Tosi at once called to him by name, and said, "I was looking for you. I start for Messina to-morrow, and wished to say good-bye. I have been at the café for half-an-hour till just now, waiting for you to join us, and I have inquired about you also from the café-keeper." Rossi asked his two friends to come to his house for a moment. They came, and went with him into the room, where they read the "telegram," which was dated four or five minutes before.

Signor Tosi writes under the date November 11th, 1888, partly confirming and partly correcting this account. He says, referring to the passage summarised above: "The account which you gave in the Letter to Mamiani is not absolutely correct, if I remember right, for I have not got it with me at this moment. . . . I will correct the errors by narrating the facts afresh.

"On September 4th, 1875, I had to leave Pesaro with my family for Naples and Palermo. The day before I wished to take leave of all my friends. I could not see you in the day, but I hoped to meet you as usual at the club. The evening arrived, and at a rather late hour I found myself in the company of the lamented Cavaliere Zaniboni. I asked if he had seen you, and he replied that he had not. I said that I wished to go to your house to say good-bye, and Zaniboni offered to accompany me. We came to your house together. . . . We knocked, and Angelica (the servant) opened the door to us, remaining at the top of the stair with the light. While we were mounting the stair you appeared upon it; and it was then that you made us come into your room, and showed us the so-called 'telegram' of four or five minutes before, by which you were told to go to the café (where Zaniboni and I in fact were), because your presence was desired. It was then that I said that if I had been with you a little longer you would have turned my head. This I said on account of another circumstance also, which perhaps you do not remember. I did not find it mentioned in your letter to Mamiani, and from that I conclude that you have confused a little two separate occurrences.

"When we were living together in the Palazzo Mamiani, you will remember that almost every evening after midnight we were at the club, and went home together. One evening, in 1873 or 1874 (I do not remember the exact date), I had in vain waited for you at the club till about one in the morning, and started home alone. As I was passing through the Piazza my name was called by Cesare Perseguiti, a barrister, who was at the door of the café underneath the Palazzo Municipale. He said that he had been waiting there about an hour, having urgent need to speak with you, and hoping to see you pass with me. I replied that, contrary to our custom, I had not seen you, and went on my way. . . . A little afterwards . . . I met you. Being surprised at your coming out so late I asked the reason, and you answered that you were working and had not wished to go out, but that you had been compelled to do so, because a spirit had just warned you

that a friend of yours was waiting for you at the café. I was astonished, because I had not told you that Perseguiti was actually looking for you and waiting for you at the café, and only told you of it afterwards. . . .”

In a subsequent letter Rossi says that he may, perhaps, have confused the two occasions mentioned by Signor Tosi, and that this may account for the discrepancy as to the place where he met Tosi and Zaniboni.

We have, then, two cases, and perhaps three, in which Rossi was induced to leave his house by an automatic message telling him to go and meet a friend. The first question which occurs is, “Had Rossi any reason to suppose that the friend wanted to see him?”

In the first case, that of Cecchi, we have Rossi's direct statement that “the last thing which would come into his mind, and the most unlikely, was that Cecchi should be looking for him.” In the second case, Rossi must probably have known of his friend's approaching departure, and would naturally infer that he would wish to see him. In the third case, we have no information, and no means of judging.

The value of the second case as evidence for thought-transference or spirit-messages is thus much diminished, for if the thought that Tosi wished to see him was present even indefinitely in Rossi's mind, it might be produced in automatic writing. It may, however, be said that the two raps which he heard could not be produced in this way. I imagine that the same cause which on this hypothesis produced the automatic message, might also produce an auditory hallucination. But if we are to accept Tosi's corrections of Rossi's account, they may, perhaps, be explained in another way. Tosi says: “We knocked at the door,” meaning clearly the street-door at the foot of the staircase. It is not impossible that Rossi, intent upon his work, may have mistaken even so familiar a sound as a knock at the street-door for spirit-rappings. A little delay on the part of the servant in opening the door would give time for Rossi to write the message, and meet them on the stair. The “four or five minutes” which elapsed between the writing of the message and the entry of the visitors is not a serious obstacle to this view, for the vagueness of the expression shows that the interval was not precisely noted.

The first case, that of Stanislaw Cecchi, is much stronger. The rappings were repeated twice; the second time loud. The message was entirely unexpected; and there is confirmation of it, though necessarily at second-hand and after a long interval.

If the facts are accepted as accurate, I think there are only two admissible explanations—telepathic and spiritualistic; and if the former of these be adopted, there is some difficulty with regard to the raps.

It should be mentioned, further, that Rossi states that a message of

this nature, spontaneously given, has never proved false in his experience.

## III.

HYPNOTIC EXPERIMENTS, APPARENTLY SHOWING THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE  
AND SUGGESTION AT A DISTANCE.

I now come to the second class of experiments, viz., those concerned with hypnotism.

Only one subject has been employed. Her name is Isabella Carzetti ; but she is generally called Aminta instead of Isabella. She was born in 1845, and in 1870 she came to Pesaro as servant to a family there. In 1883 she left service, and since then has lived with an aunt, working as a sempstress and laundress. Professor Rossi and Dr. Moroni describe her as fairly intelligent, but uneducated. They say that she does not read newspapers, but has read a few novels. In 1871 she had frequent attacks of convulsions, and in 1873 a cataleptic stroke, caused by fright at an earthquake. Dr. Moroni treated her successfully with hypnotism, and in the course of his treatment observed other remarkable phenomena. Of these, apparently, no systematic account has been preserved ; but they seem to have been of the nature of clairvoyance. Dr. Moroni continued to employ her as a clairvoyant for the purpose of diagnosis, after hypnotism had ceased to be necessary as medical treatment.

In 1886 Dr. Moroni renewed these experiments, which had then been discontinued for some years, in company with Professor Rossi and the other members of his circle. The experiments were at first physiological, but after a time assumed a spiritualistic character. Professor Rossi, Dr. Moroni, and their friends continue to hold séances regularly once a week, with Carzetti as medium.

Among the accounts of these experiments there are several incidents which give evidence for the possession of clairvoyant powers by the medium.

On June 10th, 1886,<sup>1</sup> at the first of this second series of experiments, Carzetti came to Rossi's house for the first time. She saw nothing but the entrance-hall, in which she was hypnotised. In answer to questions, she said that between the hall and the other rooms there was a narrow passage, but not on the same level as the hall, since there was an ascent from it of five steps, two of masonry and three of wood. Then she said that in the last room she saw against the wall an arm-chair, and, in the middle, a little table. When asked the shape of the table, she said it was round, and was used for the evocation of spirits. The whole of this description was correct.

On August 6th, of the same year, she described correctly the malady of a

<sup>1</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, p. 5.

person whose portrait was placed before her; and at the same séance she described the appearance of the writer of a letter which was given to her.<sup>1</sup>

In several cases the medium, at a distance from the table at which some of the company were sitting, indicated beforehand the nature of the communication which would be made by raps.

Thus at the séance of June 10th, 1886,<sup>2</sup> after describing the shape of the table, which, it will be remembered, was in a room divided by a passage from an entrance hall in which the medium was sitting, she said that it was used for evoking spirits. She added, "There is now in that room a youth who demands to be evoked, and begs you to go there." Moroni and another remained with the medium, while Rossi and two others went into the room. The two sat at the table, and a communication came from the spirit of a young man who had been dead some months.

In this case those sitting at the table had heard the medium's statement. The experiment, therefore, is of very little value so far.

No sooner, however, was the message finished than the movements of the table became so irregular that no words were formed. At that moment one of the two who had been left with the medium came with a message from her, telling them to leave the table, for the place of the first spirit had been taken by an intruder, who could not or would not talk.

Here, again, we cannot be sure that the medium could not hear what was going on in the room with the table; and the indication of the moment at which the message came is not sufficiently precise.

Some other cases are not open to objections so obvious as these; and seem to show thought-transference either from or to the medium.

Thus on July 30th, 1886,<sup>3</sup> two friends (one of whom confirms the account) sat at the table, at some yards distance from the medium, evoking a spirit called Livia. The medium made gestures, indicating that she saw a spirit. Asked by Moroni in a low voice whom she saw, she answered, "A lady, related to the shorter of the two at the table."

A message was rapped out from Lucia, aunt of the person indicated by the shortness of his stature.

The medium then whispered to Moroni that the spirit of a young man whose name began with R had come to the table. A message was received from a young man whose name began with that letter.

Here it is not definitely stated, but it is certainly implied, that those at the table did not consciously hear the whispered remarks of the medium. It is, however, possible that they may have heard and reproduced with the table's raps indications of which they were not conscious.

Again, on August 6th<sup>4</sup> of the same year, two friends sat at the table.

<sup>1</sup> I do not give the details of these experiments because it does not appear certain that the information given by the medium could not have been derived from the conversation of those in the room, or from other natural sources.

<sup>2</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, pp. 6, 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, p. 8.

They evoked Lucia, and L was the first letter given. The medium whispered to Moroni that the spirit was Livia, and that the word *ringrazio* would be rapped out. Moroni took a note of this on a piece of paper, folded it without speaking, and put it on a table. The word was rapped out, and was found to correspond with that which Moroni had written.

The medium then told Moroni to take the place of one of those at the table. He did so. Another person went to the medium and asked her what spirit she would like. She answered, taking great care not to be heard, "The Doctor's sister." The table rapped out *Assunta*, the name of a sister of Dr. Moroni's, who was dead. She then whispered that Moroni's father wished to manifest himself; and the words, "I am thy father; I may call happy the moment of finding myself with thee," were rapped. She then said that the spirit would rap one more word; and one more word, *addio*, was given.

The same criticisms apply to this experiment, except that we are told that the medium took care not to be overheard. Nevertheless, more stringent conditions are to be desired.

Another experiment, of a slightly different kind, seems also to point to thought-transference. In this case we have an extract from the original record, made at the time, and attested by the signatures of those present.<sup>1</sup>

Two of the company sat at the table. The medium, who was not hypnotised, expressed disbelief in the *table-game*, as she called it; and said she would believe in it if it would rap her real name, which was not Aminta, as they believed. The name Isabella was rapped. The medium was surprised, and said that this was her real name. It was unknown to all those present except Dr. Moroni, who was not at the table.

In this case, however, it is not impossible that one of those at the table may have heard the name, and forgotten it. Experience shows that any fact once known, though entirely forgotten by the conscious mind, may be reproduced by the automatic methods of writing or table-rapping.

Next we come to cases of suggestion at a distance, and suggestion without communication between the suggester and the subject.<sup>2</sup>

On August 29th, 1886, in the course of a séance the medium, hypnotised, said to Moroni, "Wake me up now for 10 or 15 minutes. Then without saying anything you will send me to sleep again." She was waked, got up, and sat on a sofa. While the others kept her in conversation Moroni went into another room, on the pretence of fetching a glass of water. Thence he mentally suggested to her to go to sleep and to return to her usual seat. When he came in again he found her in hypnotic sleep, and said, "Why did you not obey completely?" She answered, "I perceived the order to return to my seat, but you did not leave me time to carry it out."

<sup>1</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Alcuni Saggi*, p. 12.

Here the hypnotic sleep may well have been the execution of a deferred self-imposed command; but this does not account for her knowledge of the second part of the order.

On September 5th, 1886, Rossi called out of the room a medical student who was present; and the medical student called out Moroni. Moroni tried from the neighbouring room to hypnotise the subject, who was standing talking to the others who were present. She all at once became silent and passed into the hypnotic state. One of those to whom she was talking came out and told those outside what had happened. Moroni and the student then agreed to try and transmit to her the command to shake Rossi's hand. The medium hesitated for some time, moving alternately towards Rossi and towards the medical student. Finally she went to the latter and shook his hand, to the surprise of Moroni, who saw his command disobeyed. The student then explained that, being afraid of collusion, he had mentally commanded the subject to shake his hand instead of Rossi's. The subject begged the hypnotiser's pardon for having disobeyed him, adding that she had perceived both commands, but had obeyed the first, both because it was stronger and also because it came from a disbeliever.

The force of this experiment is weakened by the fact that the two suggesters were in the room at the time, and may have unconsciously indicated by gestures the nature of the action to be performed.

On September 12th Moroni arrived before the subject, and was taken into another room. When Carzetti came, she was told that Moroni had not yet arrived. The Doctor made his passes from the room in which he was, and the subject at once fell into the hypnotic sleep.

Again, on October 13th of the same year, Rossi, Moroni, and Signor Dini met by chance. It had not been intended to hold a séance that evening, but these three agreed to try whether a suggestion could be transmitted from Rossi's house to Carzetti, who would probably be at home at that hour (about 8 p.m.). Moroni fixed his thoughts firmly upon Carzetti for some minutes, and then, exhausted by the effort, ceased, and said, "If she has perceived it, well—if not, patience." He then sat down to write automatically, and the following words appeared: "She has perceived you, but not so completely as to satisfy your wishes. Someone must go to her, to prevent her from passing a disturbed night. You will find her in the street, or at the window, waiting in indecision."

Dini went to see her, on some excuse, and came back saying that Carzetti was out, and that the aunt with whom she lived said that she had gone out a few moments before to do some shopping in the Piazza. The three then left Rossi's house at 8.30, and Rossi separated from the other two. These two met Carzetti walking with a friend, and Dini asked her, "Where are you going at this time of night?" She answered, "I have come out impelled by something, I don't know what, which made me think that someone was trying to magnetise me." "Do you feel well now?" "I am a little agitated; my heart beats fast, and I have a feeling as though my legs were tied." "And where do you come from now?" "Do not you see? I have come from the

Piazza into the Via Sabbatini, and if I had found the door open and a light on the stairs of Rossi's house, as on the evenings when there is a séance, I should have gone upstairs."

If this account is accurate—and the latter part of it is confirmed by an account written by Signor Dini, and dated Oct. 13th, 1886—there can be little doubt that we have here a case of suggestion at a distance.

#### IV.

##### HYPNOTIC EXPERIMENTS, SPIRITUALISTIC IN CHARACTER.

After a time the character of the séances changed. From the experiments already related it will be seen that the medium in the earlier period professed to see and hear spirits, regarding them as something external to herself. Soon, however, she began to speak in the first person, in the character of different dead persons; in fact, to identify herself with the spirits, or, as Professor Rossi prefers to put it, to act as the instrument through which spirits expressed themselves.

In this way, a large number of spirits—some of them professing to be historical or distinguished persons, others relations of someone present, or private persons who had died at Pesaro—have conversed through the medium with Professor Rossi's circle. Records of these conversations have been diligently kept, and a certain number of them are reproduced in the pamphlet, *Alcuni Saggi, &c.*

It may be useful first to consider for a moment the value of these conversations as evidence.

It is clear that the mere fact that the medium speaks in the character of certain dead persons proves nothing at all; nor is it of much value evidentially that these impersonations were, in the opinion of the auditors, decidedly successful. We must rely upon facts, not characteristics. If the medium, when impersonating a spirit, mentions some fact which was certainly not known not known to her by the ordinary channels of knowledge, we have at least something new, something which deserves further investigation.

It is, however, extremely difficult to prove that a particular fact is not known to a particular person; the more so, that experience seems to show that no record once made upon the brain is ever absolutely effaced, and that memories lost to the ordinary waking consciousness may be reproduced in the hypnotic, or other abnormal states. However faint the under-writing of the palimpsest may be, it may, at some time, reappear fresh and strong. Besides present knowledge, therefore, all past possibilities of knowledge must be taken into account.

So far as I could judge from my own experiences at three séances at Pesaro, I am decidedly of opinion that there was no conscious fraud on the part of the medium; but this, of course, does not exclude the use, in the hypnotic state, of knowledge derived from the conversation

of those in the room, or from other sources, for the purposes of impersonation.

If, after giving due weight to these considerations, we find that she mentions facts which she cannot have known through the ordinary channels of information, it will remain to consider what hypothesis, telepathic, spiritualistic, or other, is necessary to account for the phenomena. It seems to me, however, that, in the present case, it is unnecessary to go on to this further investigation, because it is impossible satisfactorily to establish the ignorance of the medium with regard to the facts mentioned in the conversations.

I will therefore only give one example of this class of phenomena:—

The spirit of a child, named Bettino, son of Professor Guidi, came several times. On one occasion the following conversation took place between Bettino and his father. "There is some one here who wishes me well—there are two." . . . (Who are they?) "I don't know them. I have seen one, papa, not the other. . . . I saw him with such a lot of flowers." (Where?) "Where so many people went—you were there, papa—It's he who wishes me so well." (Where did you see the flowers?) "Not where I am, where you are . . . when he was dead. . . . No—one cannot say dead."

The father then understood that he referred to the flowers which adorned the funeral procession of Mamiani, an Italian statesman, a native of Pesaro, who was buried there. (Where did you see the flowers? From the window?) "Yes, and in another place too." (In the *camera ardente*? Who took you there?) "My brothers, I think. . . . I saw him through a hole . . . the face." (There was in fact a glazed aperture in the coffin, over the face of Mamiani.) "She who wished me well was with me too." (What was her name?) "Santina."

The father confirms the truth of this account and adds, "When, at that séance, my Bettino said that he had seen Mamiani in the *camera ardente* through a hole and so on, taken there by Santina, I frankly told my friends who were present that I did not know anything of it, and did not believe that it had happened. When I reached home I asked my wife. She too knew nothing of it, and undertook herself to question the maid Santina. The maid confessed that, impelled by curiosity, she had gone at a late hour to see the *camera ardente*, accompanied by Bettino, whom she could not have left alone at home."

Could we be sure that Carzetti knew nothing of this, it would be very striking; but it is always possible that she may have been among the crowds which assembled to see the *camera ardente*, and may have seen the child Bettino there.

Other cases might be given, in which the detailed knowledge of facts exhibited is certainly difficult to explain as the effect of memories unconsciously revived. But though difficult, this explanation does not seem to me so clearly excluded as to render the proof of the action of an alien intelligence decisive; and I have, therefore, not thought it



desirable to extend an article already somewhat long by reporting these cases; though I shall watch with interest any further evidence of this kind which the circle at Pesaro may produce.

I have already said that by Professor Rossi's kindness I was enabled to attend three séances at Pesaro in November last. The séances were successful in one way, for the medium talked freely in the person of different spirits; but the matter of these conversations gave no support, so far as I am aware, to the spiritualistic hypothesis entertained by Professor Rossi and his friends. Some of the spirits impersonated by the medium professed to be friends or relations of mine; and there was therefore a good opportunity for the mention of matters of fact which were unknown to the medium. None such were produced. All the statements or allusions concerning my friends and relations were either vague or incorrect.

It is therefore unnecessary to reproduce here any of my records of these séances.

I must mention, however, two things which bear on the evidential value of the accounts of previous experiments published by Professor Rossi. During the greater part of the séances I wrote down, fully and carefully, the conversations which took place. This was possible, because the medium spoke slowly and with pauses. A comparison of my notes with those made by Professor Rossi and his friends gave me a favourable impression of the care and accuracy with which the séances were recorded by them. On the other hand, strict silence was not observed during the séances, and it appeared that sufficient care was not taken to avoid the giving of hints by conversation in the hearing of the medium, and by leading questions.

At the third séance I asked that some experiments in thought-transference and clairvoyance might be tried. Professor Rossi was unwilling that this should be done. No experiments of that nature had been tried for some time, and he believed the chance of success to be very small. Dr. Moroni, however, consented, and two experiments were tried.

(1) I had previously written a name, and enclosed it in an envelope. This was placed in the medium's hand and she tried to read it—first as a whole, and subsequently letter by letter, but without success.

(2) I wrote down another name, and showed it to Moroni, taking care that it should not be visible to the medium or to anyone else in the room. Moroni then tried to suggest the word to the medium; again, without success.

H. BABINGTON SMITH.

## II.

## DR. ALBERT MOLL'S "HYPNOTISM."\*

If it is true that a youth is interesting on account of his promise, and a man on account of his achievement, we may, if allowed to use this figure in speaking of the development of a science, safely affirm that hypnotism has now entered upon its manhood. For the investigation of hypnotic phenomena is really now in the stage of achievement. It is showing itself to be of service in the spheres of labour of psychologists and of medical men, of physiologists and of lawyers. This, however, has not been the case till quite recently. Only a few years ago, the knowledge of even the principal facts was confined to a very small band of workers, and even they were not able always to unravel and grasp the true significance of their conflicting experiences. It was not until some definite starting points were attained by the formation of schools that a freer outlook became possible. Charcot's coming forward in 1878 with a rigidly consistent system was a fact of the greatest *historical* significance, however differently one may estimate the value of his doctrines. But from that moment experimental and literary activity in this subject began to assume such extensive proportions that a comprehensive view such as had just been with difficulty achieved, threatened to become again an utter impossibility. It was under these circumstances that some time ago I saw the desirability of collecting the most important part of the widely-scattered material in the form of a bibliography ; but I could not shut my eyes to the fact that the second part of the impending task—I mean the formulating of the ideas already gained—would be incomparably more difficult.

It is therefore with all the more pleasure that I find myself able to point out to-day a work which fully meets all requirements as a standard text-book in the literature of Hypnotism.

Dr. Moll has already won celebrity through several smaller works, and also through his courageous action in relation to the Berlin Professors of Medicine. It was known that in the course of a long practice he had accumulated much valuable experience in our subject.

\* *Der Hypnotismus* von Dr. med. Albert Moll in Berlin. 280pp. 8vo., Berlin : Fischer's Medizinische Buchhandlung (H. Kornfeld). 1889.

But the work before us exhibits not only experience, but also a remarkable acquaintance with the literature of the subject, and an unusual skill in sifting the valuable from the worthless. His method of presenting the subject is purely descriptive. Herr Moll wisely refrains from giving any artificial system, which in the present state of things it would be impossible to render free from objections. He simply describes the phenomena and the theories, and attempts no causal explanation.

I will now take up several points, the discussion of which seems to me likely to be of general interest. A sketch of the contents of the book lies outside my task.

The historical survey which forms the beginning of this book is distinguished by the novelty of much, and the trustworthiness of all, that is said. As a rule these inevitable historical surveys are written with copying-ink :—the author borrows his information from previous compilations, and then proceeds to write as if he had most carefully studied the sources at first hand. But in the case of our book one is conscious that the author has really read for himself the chief writings in the original languages, and this enables him to correct many prevalent errors. The Society for Psychical Research also is here treated for the first time with due appreciation ; and in the course of the book, Edmund Gurney's remarkable work especially meets with thorough recognition. I am only surprised that no mention is made of Beard. Years before Schneider, the American neurologist advanced the concentration-theory ; in 1877 he attempted to classify the hypnotic symptoms into negative and positive, and expressed his opinion that the artificial trance, as a purely psychical phenomenon, ought to be studied psychologically—for which task none but psychologists were properly qualified.

Speaking in his second chapter of the induction of the hypnotic state, Herr Moll observes, in the first place—possibly moved to do so by a suggestion made in an earlier notice in this journal—that, in order to make a distinction between it and the method of inducing sleep medicinally, it should be called not hypnogenesis (*ὑπνος—γίγνεσθαι*) but hypnosigenesis (*ὑπνωσις—γίγνεσθαι*). It is to be hoped that this expression will come into general use, for it would prevent many misunderstandings. The author then states emphatically that much depends on individualising in hypnosigenesis. In agreement with the Nancy doctors, he considers that in each individual case those methods should be chosen by which the idea of the hypnotic condition, and the conviction that it has already commenced, should be suggested as vividly as possible to the patient. In this I entirely agree with him. Observation and experiment are

indispensable: a knowledge of a man's mental peculiarities is more important than a knowledge of anatomy and physiology.

I now come to a very difficult question, namely, the classification of hypnotic conditions. Dr. Moll divides them into three grades: In the *first* grade, the eyes are closed, and cannot, or can only with great difficulty, be opened, while the patient is generally subject to feelings of lassitude. In the *second* grade, the movements of the body, which at other times are voluntary, are either partially or entirely taken out of the patient's own control. In this state, too, the eyes are generally closed, but sometimes—i.e., in fascination—they are open. In the *third* grade the patient is susceptible to illusions, and these are always accompanied by the symptoms of the second grade.

I must in the first place remark at this point, that, in my opinion, a description of some typical conditions, arranged in order, would have been more adapted to the character of the book and to our present degree of knowledge. Dr. Moll might then perhaps have taken two or three of the most striking cases, and described them according to their mutual relations. Within each of these distinctly defined combinations of symptoms, the *intensity* of the symptoms would show the high or deep degree of the condition. But it would be very difficult to bring all the different kinds of artificial trance, lethargy, catalepsy, somnambulism, fascination, &c., into one category. It is for this reason that our author's classification is wanting in a thoroughly comprehensive basis, such as one must demand from the standpoint of logical method. For *both* the first grades, the inhibition of voluntary movements, and for the third grade susceptibility to illusions have been fixed upon as the chief characteristics. The distinction of the first from the second is one of degree, of the first and second from the third one of kind. And moreover the shutting of the eyes, which is characteristic of the first grade, does not occur in fascination, which is placed in the second grade, an inconsistency which becomes more striking when it is specified of the third grade that it includes all the signs of the second grade. The expression "grade of the hypnotic state" implies that the second grade includes all that the first includes with some addition, and that the third grade includes all that the first and second include with some addition. In Dr. Moll's scheme, however, this does not always appear to be the case. He might have spoken of three conditions or even, if he preferred, of three phases, but surely not of three deepening degrees of one and the same condition.

It seems to me, therefore, that in every instance the two first grades must be considered as one. They have in common a *degradation of the will-power within the motor-sphere*, while in the third class the *sensory-nervous system* becomes the theatre of the phenomena. That in most experiments the beginning of the hypnotic condition is indicated by the

shutting of the eyes, is not due to the nature of the experiment, but has its source in our *modus operandi*. We have had such a firm conviction that the shutting of the eyes belongs of necessity to the induction of the hypnotic state, that we have always accustomed ourselves to work at the beginning on the eyes either by fixation or suggestion. I do not think that this conviction is really justified.

On the contrary, I should consider it equally the sign of the beginning of a trance, if by somatic or psychical means we could prevent the subject from shutting his eyes. Let us once free ourselves from this tradition and from the idea of the analogy with sleep, and let us experiment on a person who is not at all familiar with these things, and who will therefore be devoid of any tendency to self-suggestion, and let us try at the beginning to influence some other set of muscles. On one occasion I began in the following way with a gentleman. I pressed his right leg firmly with my hand, and at the same time conceived the corresponding idea of his not being able to lift it up. As this experiment was crowned with success, I extended the treatment to the other leg and to the arms, and did not pass to the influencing of the movements of the eyelids until the end of the experiment. On another occasion I had to deal with a postman, whose business it was to stamp the letters. As a thorough induction of the hypnotic state did not take place in spite of repeated attempts, it occurred to me that I might attack the man by means of his daily occupation. I asked him to make the movements of stamping letters before me, and after two or three minutes I cried to him in an energetic tone of voice, "Now you cannot leave off doing it." And sure enough the man was incapable of stopping; and in this way a hiatus occurred in his consciousness, into which suggestion was able to make its way with such success that within a short time the complete somnambulistic state supervened. In short, it seems to me that the shutting of the eyes cannot be considered as an *essential* sign of the first grade, still less as a *specific* distinction. The connection between such conditions as lethargy, catalepsy, fascination, captation, charm, is the failure in all of them of the voluntary control of the centrifugal nerves, and the muscles respectively innervated by them. In another group of hypnotic conditions we may place the weakening of those sensations which are produced through the centripetal nerves. Whether this second group may be described as "a *deeper* hypnotic condition," depends, *first*, on whether it includes also without exception the phenomena of the first class, and *secondly*, on whether the second class is considered to be derivable theoretically from the first. The biological law that we may apply at this point declares that every evolution advances from the simple to the complex, and that dissolution takes the opposite course. We are then perhaps dealing in reality with a *natural* deepening of the *same* condition

and not one produced by the usual methods, and looking at it from this point of view, we may be able to gain many useful hints.

But we must now follow our author into his symptomatology of hypnotism, which is as impressive as it is comprehensive. It is here—in the exposition of the physiology and psychology of hypnotism—that the extraordinary merits of the book most strikingly appear. And there are only a few points here in which I cannot concur with Moll in his opinions. When Herr Moll, *e.g.*, defines *suggestion* as the influencing of a person through the presentation of an idea, and, corresponding to this, defines character as the sum total of our own suggestions, he only obscures the specific meaning of the words. He may perhaps be historically justified, after the English psychologists of the 18th and 19th centuries (Brown, &c.), in describing every conversion of a mental condition into an external act, or indeed every modification of one idea by another, as suggestion, but such terminology is, in the first place, antiquated, and secondly, is very much calculated to cause confusion. And in the same way, when a subject in the well-known experiment is unable to leave off revolving his hands, I should prefer to speak of this, not as *automatic* movement, but as *continuative movement*, because the first of these expressions is already in use for two other kinds of movements.<sup>1</sup>

In his symptomatology the purely descriptive method of our author is shown in a marked degree. For example, he is content to say that every kind of disorganisation of the faculty of language can be produced experimentally by suggestion, that we can take away from a subject the possibility of pronouncing the letter "a" and indeed deprive him of the whole idea "a." But it is just in problems of this kind that a more profound investigation would have been in place. It would have been very useful to have had the similarity pointed out of hypnotic phenomena to occurrences in ordinary life, such as in other places has been shown most skilfully by Herr Moll, and to have had a comparison made with pathological conditions. I may remind the reader of Trousseau's conclusions, according to which the aphasia of hysterical patients is always to be referred either to the loss of memory of sound symbols, or to a failure in the apparatus of articulation. If, with W. Ogle, we distinguish two kinds of word memory—one by which we become conscious of the idea, and another by which we become capable of its expression—we should have to class both of Trousseau's groups in the second of these divisions, and admit that in the hypnotic state the idea "a" still remained, though the power of the vocal and graphic expression of it had disappeared. And this seems to be the only

<sup>1</sup> Vide Dessoir, "Das Doppel-Ich."—Part II. of the *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Psychology at Berlin*, 1889, pp. 2-6, 21

possible conclusion from the standpoint of normal psychology. The patient who writes and says "*Momo*" instead of "*Mama*" still retains the idea "*Mama*," and merely uses another symbol for the sound "*a*." The association of his ideas is not false, only his memory of their expression. And as he is not at all aware of his mistake, he does not struggle against it, as do those in whom the power of articulation alone is weakened, who can clearly write the vowel "*a*," but who cannot make it pass their lips. The last case is, indeed, involved in the first, and we see a natural gradation from one to the other. But it would remain to be discovered whether abstract words are taken away by suggestion before concrete, and all notional words more easily than exclamatory sounds, as one would surmise from Max Müller's investigations into the psychology of speech. Many other interesting questions might also arise.

Some observations seem to support the theory just given. I have often noticed, for example, that when the use of the personal pronouns has been taken away from a subject by suggestion, and he has apparently quite forgotten them, he does not say, "Let—go away, now" (omitting "me"), but, "Jetzt fortgehen" (German idiom which cannot be literally translated), or "Charles must go away now." These skilful substitutions show clearly that it is only the form of the word, and not the idea of the personal pronouns, of which he is temporarily deprived. When I gave this particular order to one of my subjects E—stein, the young man got out of the difficulty by means of the English forms, with which he had been familiar from childhood. I have accidentally preserved a document relating to this, which is also in other respects interesting. On the same occasion when he was in the hypnotic sleep, I gave him the suggestion that he should dream in the night that he was on board a ship with a friend, Ewald W., and that a fearful storm should arise. Terrified at the vividness of the dream, he was to wake up, and immediately after waking was to write down what he had dreamt. When the next day Herr E—stein again paid me a visit, he could tell me nothing of any such dream. But after a somewhat long search, I found in one of his pockets the following letter, which I copy verbatim:—

"*I habe einen merkwürdigen Traum gehabt. I war mit E. W. zusammen auf der Ueberfahrt nach Amerika. We sprachen ueber das Verschiedenste, als sich (!) auf einmal ein grosser Sturm erhob. It wurde ganz finster, und I sah, wie die Wellen am Schiffe emporschlugen. Ewald wurde sehr seekrank und musste in die Kajüte geschleppt werden. I folgte ihm hierhin, und sah wie he schlimmer und schlimmer wurde und schlie. . . .*"

"*I have had a remarkable dream. I was on a voyage to America with E. W. We were talking about various things when suddenly a great storm arose. It became quite dark and I saw the waves dashing over the ship. Ewald grew very sea-sick and had to go down to the cabin. I followed him and saw that he grew worse and worse and . . .*"

Here the account breaks off: but it is interesting not merely as showing a spontaneous carrying over of a suggestion. But of this on some other occasion.

Very ingenious are Moll's numerous analogies from waking life with post-hypnotic suggestion. The author might perhaps have gone further and given us examples from the animal kingdom, which as far as I know has never yet been done at all. If I tease a strange dog to-day who is chained and cannot therefore defend himself, and I meet the same dog in the street a week afterwards, it may well happen that he at once flies at me and bites me. We generally speak on such occasions of the revengeful feelings of the animal, without considering that such an imputation of human sentiments is not justified without further proof. The event corresponds intrinsically much more to a post-hypnotic suggestion: the rage of the animal breaks out at a given signal, namely, the sight of the person. We need not think that the animal has carried about with him for a week feelings of revenge; it is enough if we consider his action as an act of memory, as a result of the association of ideas. A special signal raises a special idea. Exactly as in post-hypnotic suggestion.

The fourth part of the book treats of the theories about hypnotism. At the beginning the author says: "By explanation we mean tracing back the unknown to the known. But hardly anything is known of the real nature of psychical life, and from this arises the difficulty, nay impossibility, of giving any explanation of hypnotism, at least at present." This admission goes somewhat too far. Even if we grant that we know nothing of the peculiar nature of the soul-life, we may still give the phenomena of hypnotism a proper position in connection with psychical processes, without exactly penetrating into the essence of their being. The successful carrying out of such a work might quite justly be called an explanation, and in my opinion, Herr Moll might well have taken the first step in such a direction. A synthesis of the psychological theories, instead of a mere enumeration of them, would have shown that they all, in substance, run on the same lines. It sounds, indeed, very different to speak of condition of heightened suggestibility, psychical reflex activity, concentrated attention, or condition of mono-ideism, or of preponderating sub-consciousness, &c., but at bottom they all prove to be the same thing. A complete proof of this statement would in this place lead us too far.

The author's reference to physiological theories seems to me very excellent, he shows their insufficiency in a most striking manner. I was reminded, whilst reading these pages, of two sayings of famous men, which I may perhaps quote. Taine says somewhere: "The geography of the brain is still in its childhood. One perchance distinguishes a few of the bolder outlines, two or three ranges of



mountains, the course of the watersheds, but the network of streets, of roads, of stages, the countless flow of people which is continually circulating, struggling and grouping itself in them, all this wonderful, manifold, fine detail escapes the physiologist." And Lotze remarks opportunely, with keen irony, that he had for a long time made in secret the statistical observation that the great positive discoveries of exact physiology possessed on an average an existence of about four years each.

One feels that the remarks that Herr Moll makes about simulation in hypnosis are those of an eminent practitioner. Very just is his dictum that one should never conclude that the failure of any particular symptom is a proof of simulation. But the emphasis that he lays on the power of dramatic expression in a hypnotised person, seems to me less to the point. This section, however, might perhaps have gained in impressiveness by the insertion of individual examples. I can think at once of one quite classical case, which is reported by Professor Ch. Richet. "One day B. arrived at my house suffering much from an obstinate attack of bronchitis. She was coughing incessantly. When she was asleep she left off coughing, in consequence, probably, of the general anæsthesia which affected also the larynx and the bronchial tubes. As soon as she woke up the cough began again, obstinate and unbearable. On that day I put her into a hypnotic sleep two or three times, and observed, without having said anything to her on the subject, the same phenomenon of bronchial anæsthesia, which lasted during the patient's sleep, but ceased immediately on her waking." Could one think of a better refutation of those ignorant people who are continually blowing the trumpet of simulation?

I must entirely pass over the chapter relating to forensic matters, but I will mention two or three points in the medical chapter. Herr Moll shows very clearly that by means of suggestion the *appearance* of the most various diseases may be produced, but that hypnosis is not therefore to be considered identical with these diseases. The condition in itself is not pathological, not dangerous to health, it only becomes so under the unskilful hands of the inexperienced operator, who generally overlooks the importance of removing suggestions before rousing the patient. But this remote possibility of danger should not prevent the physician from making therapeutical use of it, for it may be asserted of any remedial agent or method whatever that it is also capable of doing harm. It is advisable in practice to let some preliminary trials precede special therapeutical experiments, and always to bear in mind the psychological bias. "Psychology must be the basis for a *rational* treatment of the nerves." It therefore follows that physicians have not an exclusive interest in hypnotism. "Just as medicine must leave the investigation of chemical and physical re-agents in part to the

representatives of other sciences, so we must not only allow psychologists to make a thorough examination of hypnotism, but it is precisely they who must attempt it."

The last section of the book deals with animal magnetism, telepathy, clairvoyance, and similar phenomena not yet generally recognised. In spite of the strong objectivity of the author, it seems to me that every now and then a little *a priori* reasoning peeps out. Herr Moll would like to have a stenographer present at telepathic experiments, because each word may be a source of error. But would he in reality be content with a shorthand report? Might he not then maintain that as the reader has no means of knowing the *movements* of those who took part in the experiment, this is still not free from objections? In Guthrie's experiments, *e.g.*, the author finds no objections to make, but nevertheless "he has the subjective conviction that sources of error were overlooked in those experiments and that *suggestion* was in some way or other at work." Against such purely subjective convictions it is difficult to find cogent arguments.

In conclusion I must point out that Dr. Moll's book is characterised by the admirable comprehensiveness of its arrangement and by two excellent indexes. And, moreover, it is written with a transparent clearness which has no equal. I do not think that a single sentence out of the 261 pages leaves the reader in any uncertainty of its meaning. I took up the work with the highest expectations, and I laid it down again with sincere satisfaction, and it is my firm conviction that every one who reads it will feel himself stimulated and benefited. And as no book exists either in the English or French languages which can be compared with this comprehensive account, I must express the sincere wish that before long Dr. Moll's foundation-laying work may find a translator.

MAX DESSOIR.