IV.—FURTHER PROBLEMS OF HYPNOTISM. (II.)

By EDMUND GURNEY.

IN my last paper (MIND No. 46) I drew attention to the subject of hypnotisation at a distance, as one which certain recent cases had made it as impossible for students of Hypnotism as it must in any case have been for students of Telepathy to overlook. I advanced the view that these telepathic entrancements necessitated no hypothesis of will-power or 'psychic force' capable of producing effects in external matter—*viz.*, the organism of B, the 'subject'—which differed from their cause in A, the hypnotiser; that the phenomenon might be perfectly well regarded as a genuine instance of thought-transference or mental suggestion—certain mental movements of A's, and certain brain-movements correlated therewith, being sympathetically reproduced in the mind and brain of B, who was entranced by the idea of trance in association with the idea of A, just as he might be entranced by those ideas when suggested by A's voice and presence. I further pointed out that it is quite in accordance with what we know of telepathy in other directions that these ideas, when transferred, should take effect in some secondary plane of the 'subject's' mind—a plane segregated off from the conscious self as ordinarily understood.¹ And I must now resume the discussion by recurring for a brief space to the connexion between telepathic hypnotism and other forms of telepathy, which occupy the greater portion of *Phantasms of the Living*. I may begin by showing how, on the view which I have advanced as to the former, a certain difficulty, or rather a certain lacuna, which the latter present, seems to be removed.

To state the position briefly—the principal telepathic phenomena dealt with in that book are (1) experiments in thought-transference, where 'agent' and 'percipient' are near one another, and where some prominent idea in the 'agent's' mind is reproduced in the 'percipient's' mind as an idea simply; and (2) cases of spontaneous occurrence

¹ For further proofs of the reality of mental processes carried on apart from the normal stream of the individual's consciousness, and in that sense without his knowledge, see Mr. Myers's paper on "Automatic Writing," and my own on "Peculiarities of certain Post-hypnotic States," in pt. xi. of the *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*.

(i.e., not, as in experiments, deliberately sought) where the 'agent' and 'percipient' as a rule are far apart, and where an impression representative of the 'agent' is made on one or more of the 'percipient's' senses. These two sorts of occurrence seem, on the face of them, very different; if they are fundamentally akin, they seem to need a connecting link; and we can imagine various intermediate phenomena which would serve the purpose. The link might consist in experiments similar to the ordinary experiments in thought-transference, except in the point that the two persons concerned are *far apart* instead of near together. I have to admit the absence, and also the urgent need, of such experiments. They would, however, be difficult and tedious to carry out; and a long series of results, such as would be required, could hardly be obtained except by the aid of telegraph or telephone.¹ Another sort of link would be if the 'agent's' conscious idea *spontaneously* reproduced itself (without the coincidence being fairly attributable to chance) in the mind of a distant percipient. Now of this *Phantasms of the Living* contains a good many well-attested specimens. It is true that the idea reproduced has not been exactly of the same order as those reproduced in thought-transference experiments; that is, it has not been of anything quite so simple and unemotional as a card, number or diagram; but

¹ An excellent form of experiment for the purpose would be the guessing of numbers, in the way exemplified in *Phantasms of the Living*, vol. ii., pp. 653-4. If the two persons concerned in that series would try a similar series at a distance, the necessary information as to when each guess had been made and a fresh number might be taken being conveyed by telephone, and if successful results were obtained, the fact would be of the very highest interest and importance. "Why then," I may be asked, "do you not get the trial made?" The reason is typical of difficulties which only those actively engaged in 'psychical research' can appreciate. Their material for study consists in human beings with occupations and wills of their own, and as a rule with no independent interest in the subject. Even supposing two quiet rooms connected by the necessary apparatus to be secured at the necessary hours, the plan proposed would demand a considerable amount of trouble, and perhaps in all (counting time for going and coming back) an hour and a half of time, on each of about 15 days. Now to any *bonâ fide* psychical researcher, this expenditure of time and trouble would of course seem the merest trifle. But I would ask each of my readers whether he feels able confidently to make such a demand of any couple, taken at random, among his female acquaintance, in the interest of an inquiry of which they do not understand the bearings, and of which their only idea is that it is bothersome and scientific. At present the persons who would be willing to take the trouble are probably nearly as rare as the persons sufficiently endowed with the necessary faculty to give the experiment a chance; and assistants in whom both conditions are realised are clearly not likely to be found every day, or even every year. But of course the desirability of finding them will be steadily kept in view.

as a rule has represented sights or sounds which have been occupying the 'agent's' senses at some moment of crisis or excitement. This difference, however, can hardly surprise us. For in the first place we should expect some exceptional affection of the 'agent' to be a necessary condition of the spontaneous transference, just as an exceptional and often painful concentration of attention is necessary in the card- and diagram-experiments. And in the second place, spontaneous transferees of ideas unconnected with any specially-marked moment might occur between the same persons every day, without ever having a chance of exciting attention or being recorded. In the mind of a 'percipient' who was not (as in the experiments) deliberately putting himself into a passive and receptive attitude, a transferred idea would probably at most reach the bare threshold of consciousness, where it would meet and jostle with a hundred others, while bearing in itself no sign of its origin: what, then, is the likelihood that the 'percipient' would pick it out, note it, and ask all his absent acquaintance whether their minds were fixed on a similar one at that particular time? And even if some sporadic correspondences of the sort were noted, they could scarcely be presented as 'ostensive instances' of telepathy, considering the immense range for accidental coincidence that the world of ideas common to all of us contains. I think therefore that the ostensive instances which I have mentioned present in their content as much affinity to the experimental transference as could reasonably be expected.

But yet a third link of connexion between the experimental and the spontaneous cases would be of this sort—if an impression representative of the 'agent' were made on the 'percipient's' mind, without any affection of his senses. Such a case would resemble the majority of the spontaneous transferees in the nature of the idea transferred, and the majority of the experimental transferees in the absence of sensory affection on the 'percipient's' side; and the type would indirectly afford a strong indication that the sensory affections—phantasms of forms and voices—which characterise so many of the impressions that have coincided with the death or danger of friends at a distance, are really mental creations of the 'percipient's' own (or, as I have never hesitated to call them, *hallucinations*), in which he invests the idea of the 'agent' that has telepathically reached him. Now the cases of distant hypnotisation, explained as I have here endeavoured to explain them, supply exactly this transitional type. They are truly experimental, inas-

much as the attempt to exercise the distant influence is deliberately and consciously made by the 'agent'; and the idea of him which reaches the 'subject's' mind, sometimes above and sometimes below the threshold of consciousness as we understand it, does not in either case emerge into sensory form. I may add that cases are on record where yet further links or gradations appear; for instance, a person noted for his mesmeric powers succeeded in producing a strong impression of his presence, which nevertheless contained no sensory element, to two friends at a distance, who were not in any degree hypnotised by the impression.¹

One further point remains, in which a comparison of the phenomena of hypnotisation at a distance with those of non-hypnotic telepathy seems to throw light on both. In *Phantasms of the Living* I have drawn attention to the *impulsive* quality which seems often to characterise a telepathic impression; and which seems to be shown equally in the forms of experiment where a motor-impulse is produced, as, *e.g.*, in the palmary instance of Mr. and Mrs. Newnham referred to in my last paper; in one or two spontaneous cases where the impulse similarly was to write, and the transferred idea appeared in the writing; and in other spontaneous cases where a definite and peculiar impulse to movement or action was conveyed; but also more generally, I venture to think, in that very fact of the frequent externalisation of the impression as a sensory percept, which has been mentioned in the preceding paragraph.² Ordinarily, of course, our ideas of our friends, when they occur to us, do not project themselves outwards as hallucinations representing the friend's forms or voices; how is it that telepathic ideas so constantly do so? The fact cannot, I think, be disputed by anyone who accepts the telepathic evidence, unless on the hypothesis—not likely to be entertained by readers of *MIND*—that what is perceived is a material body, capable of emitting or reflecting light and of setting sound-waves in motion. I at any rate see no escape from the alternative that it affects the percipient's senses either by

¹ *Phantasms of the Living*, i. 99. It should be noted that it is by no means invariable, in the spontaneous cases, for the idea of the 'agent' to be externalised in the senses. Sometimes the simple idea of his death is conveyed (*e.g.*, in the cases numbered 45, 87, 401); but inasmuch as that idea may reasonably be supposed to have been present in his mind during the approach of death, such cases may as fitly be referred to the class where the 'agent's' idea is literally reproduced as to the class where the *idea* of him, rather than *his idea*, is the subject of transfer.

² See *Phantasms of the Living*, i. 537-8.

stimulation from without or by projection from within. Now if we accept this forceful quality, this tendency to push on into an extreme form, in one class of telepathic effects, we shall naturally look out for it in another class; and the recognition of it as a tolerably general characteristic is perhaps the only sort of explanation that it at present admits of. What sign then do we find of it in the hypnotic cases? No conclusive sign, at first sight, it must be admitted. For the mere idea, the mental suggestion, of the trance-condition, in association with that of the hypnotiser's personality, has been already represented as an adequate ground for the supervention of the trance, alike whether the idea be suggested by the hypnotiser's words and presence or by telepathic transference—the exceptional effect being accounted for by the exceptional sensitiveness of the previously-hypnotised 'subject,' who is in a state, so to speak, of highly unstable equilibrium. It would clearly then be illegitimate to supplement this view by attributing an exceptional impulsive quality, or vigour of impact, to the telepathically-transferred idea, *unless* we were able to suppose some similar condition in the cases where the hypnotiser's words and presence are ostensibly the only cause that works on the 'subject'. Well, the point is now reached at which this very supposition can not only be intelligibly made, but shown to be in some instances at any rate indispensable.

It will be remembered that in speaking of verbal or physical suggestion of the idea of trance, I pointed out that this alone was not enough to induce the state even in a sensitised 'subject,' who might meet with the idea in a book without undergoing any effect whatever; and that the idea of the original hypnotiser's personality was at any rate an indispensable element. But it may be urged with equal reason that something more still is needed; for this other idea might also be met with in a book—*e.g.*, the 'subject' might read a printed account of his previous entrancements by his special hypnotiser without a fresh entrancement ensuing. What, then, makes the difference? Is it the sense of the operator's authority, which the 'subject' is made to feel either by his tone and manner or by a general belief in his power? Very often, probably, this is enough; but the French cases epitomised in my former paper clearly show that it is not always enough, and no single point in them is more instructive than this. Prof. Pierre Janet, Dr. Héricourt, and Dr. Dusart all observed that the 'subject's' *belief* that the entrancement was being then and there attempted and willed by the special hypnotiser was ineffective, if the hyp-

notiser was not really concentrating his mind in the manner supposed. This fact seems explicable only on the hypothesis that, when the effect is produced, some cause is at work beyond the ostensible cause of verbal and physical suggestion; and the cause which, on the grounds of analogy and of parsimony of assumptions, at once presents itself is surely no other than *mental suggestion*—telepathic, even though the two persons are in the same room, as being transferred otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense, and carrying with it the impulsive quality, which now involves the further development into trance, as in other cases it involves the further development into hallucination. In this way that inscrutable something which has been described as specific 'mesmeric' power would reduce itself (for the cases in question) to identity with the more comprehensible and general sort of telepathic 'agency'; and its peculiar effect on the 'subject' is simply a pushing on into an extreme form in the direction of *least resistance*, which is here determined as that of hypnotic trance by the pre-established sensitiveness to this particular idea. Such an agency is no longer specific in the sense of being an occult mode of influence which a few specially endowed persons have always at command, and can bring to bear at a moment's notice on any favourable 'subject'; it receives its specialisation at the *receiving* not at the *transmitting* terminus.

"But," the 'mesmerists' might object, "does not this view of the hypnotic cases ignore the palpable fact of the *rapport*? Is it not mere juggling with words to deny any specific quality to 'mesmeric' agency, if the *rapport* which puts the 'agent' in connexion with the 'subject,' and which has been mesmerically established, remains specific? And how can that description be denied to it if, as usually happens, each of the two persons concerned is indispensable to the other—if A can at that particular time be entranced by the suggestion of no one in the world except B, and B's suggestion can at that particular time entrance no one in the world except A?"

Now, in the first place, a certain ambiguity lies in the word *rapport*. When A's thought or sensation has been transferred to B, we may say, if we like, that A and B were in *rapport*; but this is merely to coin a useless definition, and to throw away a useful word, unless we mean by *rapport* something which is *different* from the transference, and which has *conditioned* the transference. Taking this latter sense, I have no doubt that such a thing as hypnotic *rapport* exists, and I have no objection to the word *specific*

as applied to it; but I believe the true application to be quite remote from any theory of occult or 'mesmeric' influence. For why need we assume the parties to be connected by any more mysterious bond than the one before defined (MIND No. 46, p. 228) in connexion with hypnotisation at a distance—the permanent impression of their past relations to one another? On the view of psychical transference (as opposed to physical effluence) which I have founded on the distant cases, it is hard to see that any further condition is either possible or required. That this permanent impression in the hypnotic cases is peculiar, I should fully admit; but only, I conceive, in so far as the *relations themselves* are peculiar. Now, their peculiarity is sufficiently patent: the 'subject's' mental abandonment to the idea of his hypnotiser, with all the oddities of conduct to which this one-sided engrossment leads, are phenomena quite special to the hypnotic state.¹ And inasmuch as rare

¹ This engrossment is implied, of course, in that abnormal responsiveness to the hypnotiser's suggestions which I regard as the most distinctive mark of the hypnotic state. But it is shown also in other ways. The 'subject' will often seem blind and deaf to the presence and voice of everyone else, and can only be made to see and hear some other person by the hypnotiser's pointedly bringing such person to his notice, so that the two become associated in his mind. A sensitive 'subject' will frequently follow the hypnotiser about the room or the house, will show uneasiness when he disappears, and will even feel a strong impulse to rejoin him after an interval of a day or of several days. The same peculiarity seems to be shown in a fact which has not, I think, been enough noticed, but as to the reality of which I would appeal with confidence to anyone who has assisted at hypnotic experiments conducted by a good many different operators at a good many different places. I mean the readiness with which what may be called *hypnotic fashions* are established. A group of 'subjects' in one place, who have been a good deal under the influence of the same operator, will develop a quite different set of habits from another group in another place. A rough instance of this is where one group prove more or less unamenable to methods of entrancement or of awakening which are specially successful with the other; as, e.g., I have found the 'subjects' of one operator wake with certainty at a smart blow or sudden command, while those of another seemed recalcitrant to everything except the flicks of a towel or large handkerchief to which they were accustomed. But their behaviour during the trance often shows a far more subtle conformity to what the operator expects; so that there come to be veritable *schools* of hypnotism—the phenomena taking the course marked out for them by the operator's general view of the 'subject'—a view which may really have originated to a considerable extent in accidental peculiarities of individual subjects. I should be inclined, for example, to account in this way for much of the difference between the observations of Nancy and of the Salpêtrière, and, in consequence, for much of the difference in the theories associated respectively with the two localities. But I cannot pursue this subject in a footnote. What I wish to point out is simply that these facts seem to imply a far more continuous and minute attention, on

causes may naturally have rare consequences, there is no difficulty in supposing that a consequence of this special relation is a special subsequent penetrability (so to speak) of one mind by the other—a partial weakening, in a single direction, of the barrier which normally isolates individuals, and confines the experience of each to sensations received through the recognised channels or ideas originated by his own activities. Not, of course, that we should have had any right to *predict* such a consequence: telepathy could never be deduced *a priori* from anything else. But when, as a matter of fact, we find psychical transferences taking place between certain persons after, and not before, their minds have been in a certain peculiar relation to one another, it is impossible not to suspect that this relation is a vital condition of the transference; and if this relation has ceased to show itself in any recognisable form at the time when the transferences are observed, we can but seek the immediate condition in the permanent impression which it has left. This permanent impression, then, and nothing else is the *rapport*; and it will be seen how everything exceptional and mysterious has now disappeared out of it. In the line of conditions the only exceptional part was found to lie elsewhere—in the well-recognised psychological peculiarities of the hypnotic state; and the *rapport* itself, as the abiding latent sense of past relations, proves to be fundamentally the same in kind as that which has pre-existed in a large majority of the spontaneous telepathic cases—where the ‘agent’ and ‘percipient’ have been connected by ties of affection or acquaintance, which we may equally call specific, in the sense of being personal to each pair, but not with any more occult reference.

And if *rapport*, as a hypnogenetic condition, is not exceptional in *kind*, neither does it seem necessary to suppose it exceptional in *strength*—to suppose, that is, that it facilitates the telepathic transference in a higher degree than is possible or common in cases unconnected with hypnotism. For we must distinguish the transference as such from its further

the part of the ‘subjects,’ to the substance and tone of remarks made by the operator in their presence, and a far stronger impulse to satisfy him, than would be exhibited by persons of the same degree of intelligence and education in ordinary life, or than would be guessed from the appearance of dulness and apathy which is usual to a hypnotised person when no direct appeal is made to him from outside. I am glad of this opportunity of modifying some expressions in a former paper (*MIND* ix. pp. 489-90) where a too large concession was made to the idea that psychical functions are abolished, or nearly abolished, in the lethargic stage of hypnotism.

effect on the 'subject'. It may very likely be the case that the hypnotisers and 'subjects' who, if the necessary trial were made, would yield us examples of telepathic hypnotisation, are more numerous in proportion to the total number of hypnotisers and 'subjects,' than are the persons who at death produce a marked telepathic impression on some friend or relative, in proportion to the total number of persons possessing friends and relatives. But this seems quite sufficiently accounted for by the fact, already noticed, that the hypnotic 'subjects' are hit (so to speak) at a specially explosive spot. The idea that reaches them has been associated on former occasions with precisely the marked consequence that now again ensues; whereas the idea of a friend, or even of a friend's death, has not on former occasions been associated with any marked consequence, such as a hallucination suggestive of his presence. The hypnotic 'subjects,' in short, have been adapted by artificial means to respond strongly to the telepathic stimulus; while of people at large it is only a small minority in whom the natural condition for such strong response exists. And here let it be specially observed that it is by absence of *response*, not absence of *stimulus*, that we shall most readily and reasonably account for the rarity, in comparison with the numbers who die, of telepathic affections of the friends and relatives of dying persons. That rarity has been felt as an initial obstacle to the whole telepathic theory; and there is no doubt that telepathic action becomes more comprehensible the more universal we can consider it. Now if, as analogy would indicate, the marked cases of telepathic phantasms are only the 'ostensive instances' of a class of events which may occur with all degrees of diminishing intensity, we may fairly suppose some of the degrees to be *sub-liminal*; and if so, numbers of spontaneous transferences might naturally take place, conditioned by the normal bonds of affection or acquaintance, which fail to produce any recognisable effect—fail, that is, to make their way into normal consciousness as clear ideas or sensory hallucinations—through a lack of some necessary condition in the recipient mind.¹

This may, perhaps, be made clearer by an illustration drawn from certain further facts of hypnotism, which are

¹ On this view, it will be seen, telepathic phantasms (and possibly telepathic affections of every sort) can be represented—no less than the special classes above-mentioned—as *emergences* or *developments* of ideas which have in the first instance affected an unconscious part of the percipient's mind.

also worth noting on their own account in connexion with the subject of 'rapport'. A hypnotised person will sometimes be able to detect the faint whisper of his hypnotiser, amid a babel of sound which makes it absolutely indistinguishable to anyone else.¹ How is this fact to be accounted for? Certainly not by hyperæsthesia of the sense of hearing; for no such condition is observed in relation to any other sound. We must again fall back on *rapport*—but again on *rapport* of a quite comprehensible kind. It will consist, not now (as in the cases of hypnotisation by suggestion) of the 'subject's' memory of his *past* relations to his hypnotiser, but in his sense of the *present* relation—the pervading dominance of the idea of that one particular person in a mind whose reflective and discursive powers are in abeyance, and whose passive absorption is undisturbed by competing images. This dominant idea is now the vulnerable spot; and consequently a stimulus which strikes that spot—in other words which impresses the sensorium in a manner previously associated with impressions of the hypnotiser—wakes a reverberation which detaches itself in consciousness. But for the purpose of my illustration the point to observe is that the *stimulus* acts equally on the other persons present; for in the midst of perfect stillness they would hear the whisper, and, as an element in the total of sound that is being produced around them, it must undoubtedly affect their sensorium; only, not falling on any vulnerable spot, it is totally unobserved. Just so, I conceive, the psychical stimulus in the cases of telepathic transference: the transference may take place, and produce a certain psychical result; but, without the appropriate condition, that result will not reach any appreciable strength. The condition of response might be compared to a sounding-board: a number of strings may be faintly stirred by the telepathic wave; but only those which are backed by a sounding-board will reverberate audibly. That only a small minority of minds should naturally present this condition is not a point of any difficulty—or at any rate is one admitting of just as much and just as little explanation as that a small minority of persons should be hyper-sensitive in any other direction. But where the condition exists, the *rapprochement* of the rare natural hyper-sensitiveness of the ordinary telepathic percipient to the rare artificial hyper-sensitiveness of the hypnotic 'subject' appears to me to be both legitimate and instructive; while the rejection which it involves of the idea of 'mesmeric' *rapport*, as anything

¹ *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. i. 255-6.

per se and exceptional, tends still further to the simplification of the telepathic theory.

Before leaving the subject of hypnotic *rapport* and its effect on the telepathic transference of ideas, I must point out that I have been speaking exclusively of *hypnogenetic* ideas. In respect of other phenomena of thought-transference, exhibited during the actual duration of the trance, it would be rash, I think, to assert that the *rapport* with the operator is not a condition of transference more favourable than any that spontaneously presents itself. I at any rate do not know of any results of experiments conducted with persons in a normal state which can be compared, for scope and complexity, with some of the hypnotic cases—*e.g.*, with the important set of observations recorded in *Phantasms of the Living*, ii. 336-43; where an exceptional facility of communication seems to be shown in two ways,—(1) by the great frequency and certainty of the effects; and (2) by the idea communicated being often one which passed through the hypnotiser's head when she was not in the least thinking of her patient or of attempting a transference, and upon which therefore she was not concentrating any special energy of attention. The very fact, moreover, that the phenomena of 'community of sensation' were observed with hypnotised persons many years before they were obtained with others may seem to point in the same direction; and in most of these cases it looks as if the results were directly dependent on the establishment of the hypnotic relation. At the same time it must be remembered that 'community of sensation' is a very rare phenomenon even with hypnotised 'subjects'; while, on the other hand, we are not yet at all in a position to decide what proportion of unhypnotised persons might show high susceptibility to this and other forms of thought-transference, if only the necessary experiments were widely made. It should be noted, moreover, that quite as striking results have been obtained in the particular line of 'community of sensation' with non-hypnotised as with hypnotised 'subjects' (*Phantasms*, i. 52-8); and that several forms of transference have been obtained exclusively with persons in a normal state. On the whole, the conclusion seems to be that the effect of the hypnotic state in facilitating and strengthening telepathic impulses, though occasionally very decisive, is very far from constant. We should probably gain a clearer view on the subject if persons who have shown themselves to be susceptible when in one state were subjected to experiments when in the other; and if hypnotisers who have obtained community of sensation with their 'sub-

jects' would experiment with other persons who have proved to be sensitive 'percipients'. But such suggestions would be totally impractical unless we might hope that as psychical research gradually becomes legitimised, the human material available for study will become less rare.

To return now to the special hypnogenetic problems: I have shown grounds for believing that in some cases of hypnogenetic suggestion—where the parties are together and the suggestion is conveyed by physical means, no less than where they are separated and the suggestion is psychical, a true psychical or telepathic agency is exercised, of a sort foreign indeed to the hitherto-accepted theories of hypnotism, but equally remote from 'odetic' or 'mesmeric' effluences. But if in these cases the first indispensable conditions of the effect present themselves as *mental* phenomena, the question naturally arises what relation, if any, do mental phenomena hold to the other hypnogenetic methods, where the entrancement takes place (as with fresh 'subjects' it almost always does take place) after the application of distinct physical processes? I have purposely deferred these cases of primary hypnotisation till those of the secondary (or suggestional) class had been discussed, as being at the very outset harder to discriminate—for this obvious reason: that while we can be sure that there is no effective exercise of *bodily* energy, when the 'subject' is sitting apart or alone and the mode of influence is ostensibly mental, we cannot similarly be sure that there is no effective exercise of *mental* energy, when the operator takes him in hand and the mode of influence is ostensibly bodily. In the latter case, therefore, the actual or possible complication of causes makes analysis very difficult. The question is really a triple one; for we may ask (1) whether the hypnotiser's mind has some direct share in the effect, originating a psychical transference in the sense of 'psychical' before explained (MIND No. 46, pp. 222-3); or, supposing his body alone to act directly, by touch, passes, &c., whether (2) the effect is purely mechanical and due simply to the pressure or the gentle stimulation which his muscles bring to bear, or (3) is of a more inscrutable and nervous sort; in which last case, we must observe, his mind may condition it, as in the first case, though less directly—since from whatever part of the body the nerve-force be supposed to act, the total of energy evolved may include certain cerebral changes of which certain mental facts, such as concentration, may be the necessary correlates. The *second* of these hypotheses is, of course, the one in favour of which physiologists

have unhesitatingly pronounced. This has been almost inevitable; for the first of the three was not likely to occur to them, until the reality of 'psychical' or telepathic transferences was proved irrespectively of hypnotism, and by examples where the possibility of bodily influence was excluded, either by the form of the experiment, or by distance; while the last of the three, though not equally outside the range of physiological conceptions, and though nowhere so strongly suggested as in the immediate facts of hypnotism, is so indefinite as to seem more like a phrase than an explanation;—what can science have to say about inscrutable nervous influences? The second hypothesis, moreover, undoubtedly offers a satisfactory account of many of the ordinary cases; while its adequacy has seemed almost guaranteed by the fact that not infrequently a person has succeeded in hypnotising *himself* by the purely mechanical process of fixing his eyes immovably on some near object.

As to the first hypothesis—that of direct 'psychical' agency—there is not much to detain us; simply because where physical processes are simultaneously brought to bear, psychical agency could never be *proved* to be the really effective element; while the fact that only one case¹ is on record of silent concentration, unaccompanied by any physical processes, producing hypnotisation in a person never previously entranced, leads us to suspect that its influence would at most be supplementary to that of the other means adopted. That it sometimes has an influence of this supplementary sort seems likely enough; for though with a fresh 'subject' there is no specially 'explosive spot'—the result of previous hypnotisation—to be affected, yet, if the working of the transferred idea be of the sort above suggested, we can readily conceive that a soporific impulse, strong enough at any rate to facilitate the passage into trance, might be 'psychically' conveyed to a sensitive recipient. It must be remembered that in discussions of that part of the hypnotic process which is peculiar to the 'subject' it has been the almost invariable rule to attach some distinct importance to mental elements—to eke out the supposed influence of physical immobility, or of an inward and upward squint, by that of attention or willingness to yield to the novel impulse; and for a believer in telepathy it is impossible to assume such mental elements as these without admitting the possibility at least that they may be reinforced,

¹ See MIND No. 46, p. 214, note.

if not actually initiated, by a psychical transference. And that is all, I think, that can at present be said.

But as regards the second and the third hypothesis, the issue can be made more definite ; and it is really possible, I think, to fight it out to a conclusion. In any particular case, there either *is* or *is not* some specific physical influence at work, beyond the merely mechanical effect of the muscular processes involved. Now, obviously the question of the possibility of a specific physical influence of one organism on another is not necessarily confined to cases of hypnotism ; but if in any shape whatever the reality of such an influence were made apparent, the difficulty of supposing it to be operative in hypnotism would practically vanish—just as the difficulty of conceiving hypnotisation at a distance vanishes when the reality of telepathy is recognised in other ranges of phenomena. I have a purpose in this remark ; for, as it happens, some of the cases which to my mind have seemed the most suggestive of a specific physical influence of one human organism on another have not been connected with attempts to hypnotise, though the results have to a certain extent resembled those of hypnotism ; and I am glad to have an opportunity of directing attention to these facts. They have all occurred in the course of what is known as the ‘willing-game’—i.e., under conditions which involved not only contact but concentrated desire on the ‘willer’s’ part. The following are specimens of what the accounts that have reached me lead me to conclude has happened, in a more or less marked form, on many occasions when this game has been played. The *Lancet* for Oct. 11, 1884, thus reports a case related by Mr. Wherry, F.R.C.S., to the Cambridge Medical Society :—

“Mr. Wherry was sent for one evening to see an undergraduate who had become suddenly ill during the willing-game. It appeared that his friends had blindfolded him in the usual manner and were willing him to do some simple action, when suddenly he became weak in the knees and had to be helped to a seat. The handkerchief was removed at once, but the patient did not seem at all himself. He found him leaning against the mantelshelf, looking fixedly downwards in a dogged and morose attitude ; he answered questions in monosyllables in a hesitating way, not stammering, but with a jerk and without expression. Usually, his friends said, his manners were natural and polite. The pupils were dilated, with no action to light, and his memory was a blank as to the details of the game. He was sent to bed, and when seen the next morning he was better ; his pupils were normal and active to light, but his manner was still odd and his speech remarkable. When advised to leave Cambridge for a few days’ change, he refused rudely, but was afterwards persuaded by his friends, and returned quite well.”

On the same evening another medical witness, Mr. Deighton, reported that “in November, 1883, he was summoned in urgent haste to see an under-

graduate. He found him surrounded by his friends, who said they had been playing the willing-game, and that he had been blindfolded and willed; soon afterwards he became tottering on his legs and went into a state of convulsions. When seen he was tossing about on a sofa, with face slightly flushed, the movements of the arms and legs being most irregular, almost equally exaggerated on both sides. The muscles of the face and neck were least affected, but he spoke in a jerky way, and on putting out his tongue it was protruded and withdrawn suddenly. He was quite conscious, clear and collected, and said that he tried to prevent himself tossing about, but could not help it. The pupils acted to light and were natural in size. He was ordered a bromide draught and told to go to bed. The next morning he was quite well. He said he had spent a bad night, tossing about until 5 A.M. before he went to sleep, but there was now only an occasional twitching in the legs. He was of a nervous and excitable disposition, but never had fits, rheumatism, or chorea."

About the same time the Master of Selwyn College told me of a very similar incident which had happened among his own undergraduates. I will add one more case which I owe to Mr. F. H. Matthews, of Ivy Villa, Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood. The narrator is his sister, and the narrative has been fully confirmed by the lady in whose house the incident occurred, and also by Mr. Matthews's independent recollections of what his sister had told him.

"February 14, 1886.

"On the evening of Tuesday, December 8, 1885, we were playing the willing-game, and upon being asked to try, I left the room, whilst something was thought of. When I returned I was blindfolded, gave my right hand to Miss S., who was to lead me. Almost immediately I started forward, and went straight towards a young lady, and fell on my knees before her. Then, unfortunately, my thoughts returned to me, and I was conscious that I should kiss her. The knowledge, it seems, prevented my performing the action, and the next moment I fell on the floor with the full consciousness of what had happened to me." She lay for some minutes, unable to speak or move, and breathing with great difficulty. "When my dress was unfastened, the relief was so great that I broke into crying, and I could hear myself how loudly I sobbed, feeling even ashamed, yet not able to check myself." Revived with brandy, &c., she had a violent fit of trembling, which left her with an inclination to sleep. This, however, was resisted; and after forcing herself to walk upstairs, which she did with assistance, she returned to a normal state.

While this paper is passing through the press, a friend tells me that on the only occasion when she was ever "willed" in this way, she fainted and fell almost immediately on being touched.

Such results as these seem at any rate to deserve attention. Nothing like them has ever occurred in experiments in thought-transference proper, without contact; and it is very difficult to believe that what was regarded as a mere pastime should have produced a psychical state of tension and emotion sufficiently *sui generis* to account for the occur-

rence of such unique effects in healthy persons. May not something be said for seeking the cause of the unusual effect, or some part of it, in that part of the prior conditions which was itself unusual—that is to say, the continued physical contact of the ‘subject’ with a person who was in a state of concentrated expectancy? The cases are in one way more suggestive of specific influence than some of those of hypnogeny proper, just because the character of the *attouchements* in their mechanical aspect was so entirely simple and *unspecial*. When a person is seen pressing his ‘subject’s’ head or body at carefully-defined spots,¹ or making passes over him in a methodical or elaborate fashion which professors of the art get money for teaching to others, one naturally concludes, if remarkable results follow, that the special place or mode of the manipulation has something to do with it; but the casual mode and variable place of the touch in these amateur diversions would lead us to suppose that the contact, if specialised at all, is specialised by the will-force which accompanies it, and in something other than its mechanical aspect.

But it is naturally in connexion with professedly hypnotic cases that the more conclusive proof of the inadequacy of the mechanical explanation must be sought—and may, I believe, be found, though to find it may require a somewhat wider outlook over the hypnotic field than has been always easy or possible for persons who have been chiefly occupied with their own experiments. This at any rate applies to a general argument which I have used before (MIND ix. 505-6), but which is worth repeating, if only that it may, if possible, be refuted. There clearly could not be a better *a fortiori* proof of a specific influence pertaining to the human organism than if it were shown to be specific in the further sense of pertaining to some organisms and not others. Now the mechanical hypnotic processes, by which it is customary to supplement the effect of immobility and a fixed gaze, should apparently be equally effective *whoever applies them*; whereas, as a matter of fact, different persons exhibit in this

¹ There are, however, professedly hypnotic cases which may very likely be entirely parallel in character to those just cited. Such a case was supplied to me by Mr. James Gudgeon, of Stowmarket, and completely confirmed in writing by two gentlemen who witnessed it. Mr. M., a tall and robust man, who had been ridiculing mesmerism and had defied Mr. Gudgeon to mesmerise him, in less than ten seconds after Mr. Gudgeon placed his hands on his head, “fell on the floor in a state of perfect and complete coma”. This was followed by an attack of violent convulsions when water was thrown over him, and medical aid had to be sought.

matter very different degrees of efficiency. The processes themselves, however, need to be carefully distinguished. They consist for the most part of passes over the upper part of the person, and of pressure on the globe of the eye, or between the eyes, or on the vertex. It is common for the hypnotiser to combine the *passes* and the *pressures*; but the grounds of their efficacy are very different. The *pressures* seem undoubtedly to be mechanical in their action: they are applied to certain particular spots, and stimulate certain particular nervous *foci*, which presumably are intimately connected with the effect, and which physiologists therefore can label as 'hypnogenetic,' and then leave; for physiology does not profess to do more than assign to special localities and special tissues their proper functions. But the virtue of *passes* cannot be accounted for in any such fashion; for they touch no specialised springs in the organism. Yet passes were a mode of operation which physiologists found in possession of the field, identified, for many years before they took up the subject, with 'mesmerism' and theories of occult influence; and which therefore they could not avoid recognising and attempting to explain in some other way. The attempt has not been fortunate. It has consisted simply in treating passes as one of the forms of 'monotonous stimulation,' and in assuming the power of monotonous stimulation to produce hypnotic trance as an ultimate fact. I am inclined to question both the ultimate fact¹ and its application. Out of many possible forms of monotonous stimulation, only two, seemingly quite arbitrarily selected, have ever seemed to have any hypnogenetic efficacy—namely passes, a form which has very frequently been employed, and the ticking of a watch, a form which has comparatively rarely been employed. So far, then, from passes being explained by being called a form of monotonous stimulation, the burden of supporting the credit of monotonous stimulation, as a hypnogenetic agency, seems to fall almost entirely upon them. Yet an unprejudiced inspection of the ordinary procedure of passes will really make it seem absurd to find the peculiarity of their influence in the cause assigned—for the simple reason that there is often next to no monotony, and next to no stimulation, about them.

There seems in this matter to have been a confusion of things which are only superficially alike. Where *contact* is employed, as in gentle strokings and rubbings, the unaccus-

¹ On this question see the remarks of Mr. Myers, *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, pt. x. 145-8, with which I heartily concur.

tomed peripheral stimulation, produced by purely mechanical means, has at any rate a first claim to be considered the sufficient cause of the result that follows, whether that result be hypnotic trance or local anæsthesia or rigidity. Here, then (as in cases where actual pressure is applied to the supposed hypnogenetic spots), the rival or supplementary hypothesis of a more specific influence must depend mainly on the difference (above referred to) between the capacities of different manipulators, or of the same operator when working with concentration and attention and when working indifferently and mechanically.¹ But passes are very frequently made without any contact at all, or with very slight and irregular contact; so that the 'subject,' if he shut his eyes, might be unconscious that they were going on or that they were going on with any regularity. The stimulation, therefore, if anything, must be optical. But as the 'subject's' eyes are frequently fixed on something else,² and not on the operator, the fact that the arms of the latter are moving more or less rhythmically within his field of vision could hardly overpower his organs in any specific manner, even if the movement were uninterrupted and long continued. This, however, is rarely the case: as a rule the procedure conforms rather to the practice of Dr. Liébeault, who has probably hypnotised more persons in the course of his life than any other operator, and with whom (as Mr. Myers has justly observed) "the passes and touches made are brief and variable". On the whole, then, so far as mere passes without contact can be held to be effective, the fact is a positive and direct argument in favour of a specific physical influence.

So far, however, we have not got beyond cases where the 'subject's' own mental state is, or may be, one of the conditions involved. We may suspect that the importance of this condition has been sometimes exaggerated. It is very difficult, for instance, sweepingly to attribute the different

¹ See *Phantasms of the Living*, i. 88; and the experience of the French hypnotists whose accounts were epitomised in my last paper (MIND No. 46, pp. 218-19).

² This fixation of the eyes cannot itself be classed as one of the efficacious modes of monotonous stimulation, since the speciality of it, as Braid observed and taught, is the strain caused by the particular position of the eyeballs; and the concurrent stimulation of the retina by light is, for hypnogenetic purposes, a mere accident. It is worth noting that, as regards actual entrancement, the fact that the 'subject,' by his fixation of his eyes, may be distinctly contributing to his own hypnotisation, tends to mask the difference in the capacities of different operators, which (as we shall see a little later) is better displayed in local and therapeutical effects.

degrees of success or unsuccess of different operators in entrancing, stiffening, anæsthetising, &c., to the 'subject's' varying moods of belief or distrust; for it is not a monopoly of those who succeed as hypnotists to inspire the emotions of faith and expectation, which, before their success, they themselves are often far from feeling; while those very emotions have often been brought to bear on other operators, or other proposed means of alleviation, without having any result. Still, complete exclusion of the subjective factor will no doubt add indefinitely to the force of the evidence. The exclusion will tie us down to experiments of very special types. As a rule, of course, contact must be wholly avoided; for it could hardly fail to reveal to the 'subject' what is being attempted. There is, however, one class of persons with whom this objection does not apply—namely, very young children; and I will begin with evidence drawn from that class.

As usual, one has to deplore the lack of exhaustive experiments. The very last quality that competent persons can be expected to bring to bear on any hypothesis connected in their eyes with the mesmeric heresy, is patience; and patience is undoubtedly required to devote ten minutes of laying-on of hands to each of a long series of suffering infants. As far as I know, Dr. Liébeault, of Nancy, is the only well-known practitioner who has taken this amount of pains;¹ and his conclusions are the more valuable in that they are opposed to the view maintained by him previously for many years—that the therapeutical influence of hypnotism is always and wholly a matter of suggestion and imagination. In his *Étude sur le Zoomagnétisme* (Paris, Masson, 1883), he describes experiments with 46 sick children of 4 years old and under (the large majority being under 3), in all of which some amelioration, and in most very distinct amelioration, followed his manipulation. The cases are not all of a crucial kind, the ailment having simply been diarrhoea or failure of appetite, which might have been about to mend in any case. But the cumulative force of the record cannot be denied; and some of the individual cases are striking enough. One interesting feature was the frequent production of sleep, either during the contact or after it

¹ Dr. Liébeault attributes the idea of his own experiments to information of similar successes which he received from a M. Longpretz of Liège; and in part also to the account given long ago by Dupotet (without sufficient detail for scientific purposes) of movements and contractions which he induced in sleeping children by movements of his own hand in proximity to their bodies, in spite often of the intervention of the bed-clothes.

at unusual times, or for an unusual length of time. Thus, one child, aged $3\frac{1}{2}$, on returning home, slept for 17 hours consecutively, and even then did not wake spontaneously. Another, aged 1 year, had been crying day and night for 4 weeks, with snatches of sleep of only 5 or 6 minutes, owing to obstinate colic and constipation. "During one of her short sleeps, and consequently without her consciousness, I prolonged this condition, keeping my hands on her for 20 minutes, till she showed signs of waking. From that moment the crying stopped, as if by magic; she slept during a great part of the night, and when she was brought next day, she was quiet, and the constipation had been relieved." I have not space for further citations; but, as to the results, it will be noted that it at least sufficed to bring a man whom none that know him will accuse of pretension or exaggeration, and who had long pursued the path of orthodoxy, to a candid confession of the belief that "the organic changes produced must have been due to a transmitted nervous influence". He considers the alternative hypothesis, that the effects were due to the heat of his hands; but not only had the children been kept warm—and were probably as warm as his hands when he touched them—but, as he remarks, they "had often remained for long hours in their mothers' hands, without any amelioration". Thus the results, if they prove specific influence at all, would go to prove an influence which is specific not only in the sense of being peculiar to living organisms, but in the further sense of appertaining to particular individuals.

To pass now to experiments with older persons, where contact must be avoided. These could hardly ever take the ordinary form of entrancement; for it would be difficult so to arrange conditions that passes should be continuously made near a person's face without his knowledge and consent. The *waking* from trance can, no doubt, be carried out in this manner; and I have myself on a good many occasions seen a 'subject' awakened by gentle upward passes, not near enough to his face or head, one would have thought, to produce any sensible current of air.¹ But by far the most

¹ Berger and Gscheidlén have described the transformation of natural into hypnotic sleep by the holding the hand near the sleeper's head. Gscheidlén professes to have succeeded in 8 cases out of 15—the test of the change of state being that the sleeper no longer reacted to the tickling of the soles of his feet (see the *Deutsche Medicinische Wochenschrift* for 1880, pp. 92-3, and Malten's *Der magnetische Schlaf*, p. 13). Berger, however, says that warm metal plates produced the same effect—one of the startling statements, too numerous in the history of hypnotism, which seem never to

crucial cases known to me have been of the *local* sort—specific effects produced, without entrancement, in special parts of the body, which the ‘subject’ did not know was going to be operated on. I will give a brief outline of these experiments, which have been carried out with three ‘subjects,’—the hypnotiser in every case being a gentleman who has for some years been acting as my secretary and has my complete confidence—Mr. G. A. Smith.¹

The ‘subject’ was made to put his arm through a thick screen, extending high above his head, and to spread his ten fingers on a table in front of him. The fingers were thus completely concealed from his view, and exceedingly quiet passes were made (or the operator’s fingers were simply held) an inch or two over one and another of them, according to my selection—with the result that in a very large majority of cases the finger so treated, and that finger alone, became rigid, and insensible to extremely severe treatment in the way of stabs, burns, and electric shocks. From my knowledge of the ‘subjects,’ and of the circumstances, I regard simulation as practically out of the question. But this is not really important, for the hypothesis of simulation has no application to the frequent cases where the rigidity was tested *before* the anæsthesia. The ‘subject’ was told to double his fist; and no desire to deceive could have taught him which particular one of his ten digits was to remain recalcitrant.

There seem to be only two possible ways in which the ‘subject’s’ finger could have felt the proximity of Mr. Smith’s hand—(1) by currents of air due to the passes; and (2) by a sense of warmth—Mr. Smith’s hand being warmer than the surrounding air. Such perception would have involved very decided hyperæsthesia in persons with tolerably pachydermatous hands, who (it must be remembered) were in a normal not a hypnotic state. I made trials once with three co-experimenters and none of us could in the slightest degree detect similar passes made over our own fingers; and the ‘subjects’ professed a similar ignorance. Still, the possibility of hyperæsthesia needed to be faced. In many of the earlier trials, to prevent the detection of Mr.

have been confirmed by other observers: Berger’s account of the stiffening of a sleeping person’s arm by passes closely resembles a case which I have observed (*Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. i., pp. 259-60; but in Berger’s case the effect was produced through the clothes).

¹ For a fuller account of the earlier trials, see *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. i., pp. 257-60; vol. ii., pp. 201-5; vol. iii., pp. 543-9. The later cases are described here for the first time.

Smith's passes by currents of air, someone else made similar and simultaneous passes over another finger. But it might still be objected that some imperceptible difference in the manner of making the passes produced differences in the currents of air; and a far better method which I have employed in 20 later trials (as well as in a few of the earlier ones) is to dispense with passes altogether. Mr. Smith has held his hand perfectly still about a couple of inches over the selected finger; and the diminution of sensibility, though less in degree than when passes were made, has in every case (with possibly one exception) been quite unmistakable, while in nearly all the cases the rigidity has been sufficient to prevent the finger being quickly flexed.¹ Here, then, the only means of direct perception left open seems to be warmth. Perception by this means would involve hyperæsthesia in an extreme degree; and in this connexion I may mention that a scientific friend at Cambridge (whose results will in time, I trust, be published) tells me that he has produced similar effects, under similar conditions, with two sheets of glass between his hand and that of the 'subject'. But I believe that I have sufficiently guarded against the conveyance of information through warmth by holding my own hand, at the same distance as Mr. Smith's, over another of the 'subject's' fingers. After we have been for some time together in a warm room, Mr. Smith's hand and mine do not perceptibly differ in temperature; yet mine never produced any effect on the 'subject'.² Another fact of great significance is that I have now got both the 'subjects' on whom these recent experiments have been made to attend to their sensations during the process. They used to profess unconsciousness of any change whatever; but they are now able to detect which finger has been the subject of experiment by what they describe as a slight feeling of *cold*. That this should be the direct effect of the proximity of someone else's warm hand seems inconceivable, especially since the feeling lasts after the hand is removed; but it is perfectly easy to account for as a secondary result of the increasing numbness and loss of normal sensibility. It should be noted further that the effect was removed in just the same manner—that is to say, the proximity of Mr.

¹ In two cases the corresponding finger on the other hand, and in a third case an adjacent finger, was also slightly affected.

² I propose in some future experiments to apply the same test when the temperature of Mr. Smith's and my hands has been distinctly lowered and raised by immersion in iced and heated water.

Smith's hand was effective on a finger which had just proved insensitive to pretty vigorous pricks, and would not therefore be likely to be extraordinarily hypersensitive to warmth.

Now here what hypotheses are left as alternatives to that of direct influence? May the idea of the selected finger be conveyed to some 'unconscious' part of the 'subject's' mind by thought-transference, and there produce an expectation of anæsthesia and rigidity which works out the appropriate results? This seems excluded by the fact that the physical proximity of Mr. Smith's hand proves to be a necessary condition: the effects do not follow if he simply stands and *wills* their occurrence. Consequently the 'unconscious' perception will have to include the discerning of the approach or proximity of Mr Smith's hand; and this, combined with the certainty of the results and the fact that the 'subjects' have shown little or no aptitude for thought-transference in other forms, is a strong reason for supposing the mode of communication to be physical, not psychical.¹ The alternative, then, to the hypothesis of a direct influence seems to be that an 'unconscious' discernment through the finger's ordinary sensory apparatus is followed by 'unconscious' expectation of particular physiological results, which in turn is followed by those results. Of this hypothesis I can only say that it seems to me extravagantly improbable, for three reasons. (1) It attributes to 'unconscious' expectation an effect which conscious expectation cannot bring about. I have on a good many occasions led the 'subjects' to believe that a particular finger was being operated on, when it was not; but no change in its condition ever ensued. Still, I would not press this particular point too far; as we are not justified in assuming an exact similarity between the capacities of the conscious and 'unconscious' divisions of the mind. A more serious objection is (2) that even in the 'unconscious' mind expectations cannot form without some grounds; and before confidence was established by experience, the 'subjects' were much more likely to expect that they *would* feel the very sharp inflictions to which their fingers were submitted than that they would *not*. This specially applies to a female 'subject' of very nervous temperament, who had no acquaintance with the physical phenomena of hypnotism, and who was ready to shriek at the very idea of a prick on

¹ The particular sense in which I use these words, and the word 'unconscious,' was explained in my last paper.

her fingers.¹ (3) The initial supposition, that a person whose conscious self is unaware of certain faint stimuli is 'unconsciously' hyperæsthetic to those very stimuli seems to me wholly unsupported and extremely dubious. I conclude, therefore, that the balance of probability is greatly in favour of a direct physical influence in which the ordinary channels of sense are not concerned. Whether this conclusion be right or wrong, I earnestly hope that the experiments may be widely repeated by persons who have proved themselves effective hypnotisers; for no conceivable explanation of the facts could deprive them of their exceptional interest.

There is one other alleged type of effect produced by physical proximity, without sensory communication, which deserves mention, though it has not yet, I think, been quite conclusively tested. Dr. Babinski, of the Salpêtrière, believes himself, and is believed by Dr. Charcot and other authorities, to have established the fact that a hysterical affection, produced in one 'subject' by hypnotic suggestion, can be transferred to another 'subject,' not in contact with the first, under the influence of a neighbouring magnet. The French *savants* do not seem completely aware how absolutely different such a phenomenon would be from those to which they compare it—the widely-alleged effect of a magnet in transferring hysterical affections from one side of the body to the other; but this is unimportant provided only they prove their facts. The objection to some, at any rate, of their experiments is that sufficient account does not seem to have been taken of the acuteness and cunning which hysterical women may bring to bear in some well-defined channel, while ostensibly in a state of hypnotic lethargy and inattention; without intending to deceive in any way involving real responsibility, such persons may still be quite capable of detecting what the expected effects are, and of producing them by clever collusion and simulation. This, however, is now becoming better realised; and I can vouch for the striking result of one trial, in which Dr. Babinski was good enough to allow Mr. Myers and myself to arrange the conditions. The two 'subjects' were placed in two rooms separated by a thick door; and a strong contracture of the foot produced in one of them certainly reappeared in the other. The only flaw was that the woman first affected made an exclamation in which the word *piéd* occurred; but she did not speak loud, and the remark was quite inaudible

¹ I was only able to have half a dozen trials with this 'subject,' as her fingers, when stabbed, bled to an extent which made me fear that they would cause her subsequent pain or annoyance.

to normal ears on the other side of the door, where a good deal of noise was going on.

And now a final word as to what the nature of the specific influence in these various results can be supposed to be. If it exists, as a property of living tissue, there can be no doubt, I think, that the tissue concerned is that of the nerves. This would be a probable surmise from the analogy of electrical induction, and from the affinity supposed to exist between nervous and electric currents—an affinity which would be manifest, even apart from the electrical properties of nervous currents, in the mere fact that the nerves are the only part of the body through which anything of at all the nature of a current (in the physical sense) passes. But a stronger argument is that immediate dependence of the influence on the brain, which is strongly suggested by nearly all the cases. The proximity of Mr. Smith's hand to the 'subject's' finger proved as ineffective, unless his attention was likewise concentrated, as his attention and 'will' had been without the aid of his hand; and, moreover, as I have said, exactly the same proximity of the hand which *produced* the effect also *removed* it—the only change being in the operator's intention. Similarly in the 'willing-game' cases, the agent's concentration seemed to be the express condition of the curious effect; and whether or not the same can be stated of Dr. Liébeault's therapeutical successes, it has at any rate been widely observed by other hypnotisers. It would seem, therefore, that the nerve-currents must receive their specific character, in part at any rate, from the character of the cerebration which accompanies this concentration; and, if so, then the influence is clearly *physiological* in character, not merely in the sense of belonging to a living tissue as such, but in the sense of being evoked at special moments by a special form of vital action. It has no analogy, for instance, to the alleged effects of particular substances, such as metals, applied to the human body; nor is it due to a material emanation with peculiar properties, such as would come into play if the effect were produced through the organ of smell. Though finding its nearest analogue in induced electric currents, and though best, perhaps, described as nervous induction, it is essentially vital and *sui generis*.

This very general statement is all, I think, that can be advanced with any positiveness. As soon as we try to analyse the processes further, our means fail. The cases described, though they agree in pointing to the power of one organism specifically to affect another, are puzzlingly dif-

ferent in their details. Dr. Liébeault considered that the nervous influence which he brought to bear "re-established the physiological functioning" of his 'subject's' organs. But how little apparent relation such a result has to the hysterical disturbances of the willing-game, or to the stiffening and anæsthetising of a young man's fingers! As to all difficulties of this sort, it seems enough for the present to remark that they ought not to be regarded as affecting in the slightest degree the general question as to cause and effect. Inasmuch as our ignorance concerning the details of the nervous governance of the human organism is very nearly complete in respect of processes where the fact of the governance is universally admitted, the absence of a satisfactory physiological account of the intermediate stages ought not to weigh a feather in the decision whether the ostensible affection of one organism in some unknown way by the proximity of another is demonstrated or demonstrable by evidence. That, even if the general fact were incontrovertibly established, its various modes of manifestation and their complete physiological history should remain obscure is exactly what we should *a priori* expect. I will only add that cases of the Salpêtrière type, and cases of a sanative influence produced by an operator who is himself in vigorous health, would accord with the view advanced in my last paper as to the transmission (supposing it to have any physical basis) of telepathic impressions,—namely, that the process resembles those where a physical force, acting by vibrations through a medium, *reproduces* itself at a distance in its original form, as in the case of sympathetic tuning-forks or induced magnetism. The resemblance does not hold, however, in the other results—*e.g.*, in the finger-experiments, where the hand operated on assumes a quite different condition from that of the hand that operates; and so far as the evidence supports a definite view, it points to another or a further process than the sympathetic or simply reproductive, as involved in many of the cases of supersensory transference where the organisms concerned are in close proximity to one another. I cannot forecast whether science will ever address itself with success to such problems as these. I should be content if any of my readers were led to regard as within the possibility of scientific acceptance the broad fact that certain supersensory and non-mechanical transferences take place, which belong to the domain of physical and physiological, and not merely of psychical, research. Such transferences stand a better chance of consideration as examples of 'nervous induction' than as a branch of telepathy.