

Dr. MACKENZIE—180 grains in twelve hours.

The CHAIRMAN—The gratifying thing about sulphonal is this—that while it quells excitement as efficaciously as hyoscyamine, the man when he awakes is much better. Hyoscyamine does no permanent good; that is the experience of most people; but it is said that after sulphonal the patient emerges another man altogether. That is a great matter. But 180 grains in twelve hours is something solemnizing; it is something very much further than any of us in the North have dared to do so far as I know.

It was resolved to hold a joint meeting with the English members at Manchester in March, instead of the usual spring quarterly meeting in Glasgow.

THE NEXT QUARTERLY MEETING.

This will be held in Manchester, in March, 1890. The Honorary Secretary, Dr. Fletcher Beach, Darenth, Kent, will send out a notice to every member, with full particulars as to time and place.

CONGRÈS DE PSYCHOLOGIE PHYSIOLOGIQUE.

During this last Exhibition year, with its more than forty Congresses, Paris has played her part admirably—a most courteous and attractive hostess, with the rare gift of putting her guests completely at their ease, and of affording them every opportunity of getting to know her and each other. In almost every branch of knowledge there was a Congress, and it is not surprising, therefore, that on one subject in which the French are deeply interested, “*La Psychologie Physiologique*”—or, as the English not inaccurately translate it, *Experimental Psychology*—there was a Congress which lasted five days, and was successful beyond the hopes of those who planned it. Some eight years ago such a project was talked of, but no attempt was made to carry it out, as it was feared it was not likely to excite a wide enough interest to secure success, and that it might launch its projectors on too wide a sea with too many sunken rocks. But the last eight years have made a very great difference in the spread of interest and knowledge in this subject throughout Europe. The Chair of *Psychologie Physiologique*, which M. Ribot so well fills, has been created; the *Société de Psychologie Physiologique*, under the Presidency of M. Charcot, with MM. Paul Janet and Ribot for Vice-Presidents, and M. Ch. Richet for General Secretary, was founded in 1885, and has included many well-known men in science and literature—M. Helmholtz, M. Taine, M. Sully Prudhomme, M. Wundt, M. Donders, and from England Mr. Galton, Professor Bain, Dr. Bastian, Dr. Broadbent, Dr. Hack Tuke, Dr. Ferrier, Mr. Sully, Mr. G. J. Romanes, and others. Its Bulletins, though not widely noticed in England, have contained many valuable contributions from first-rate observers to the very difficult subjects of experimental psychology. In England in 1882 the Society for Psychical Research was founded, under the Presidency of Mr. Henry Sidgwick, Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Cambridge, with Professor J. C. Adams, Lord Rayleigh, Professor Oliver Lodge, Professor Alex. Macalister, Professor J. J. Thomson, Professor Barrett, and Dr. Lockhart Robertson now on its Council, and which has not been by any means inactive, and similar societies have since risen up at Berlin, Munich, Moscow, Boston, U.S.A., and elsewhere with the same objects, showing a rapid growth of interest in these subjects of *Experimental Psychology*.

An attempt at an International Congress on these matters was boldly resolved upon at Paris in the spring of last year with M. Charcot as President, and M.

Ch. Richet as General Secretary. The invitations for the Congress were widely circulated, and about 200 answers were received from persons anxious to attend. It was a very busy summer season, for there were other Congresses, and many things to be attended to at the same time (August 6-10), but about 150 of those who had entered their names and paid their small fees were in attendance when the opening day came.

It was a truly International Congress. Its members came from many countries, among them from Germany, Russia (including Finland and Poland), Austria, Belgium, England, Italy, Switzerland, Roumania, Holland, Sweden, Chili, Mexico, and Brazil, and many well-known men were present, including Ballet (Paris), Benedikt (Vienna), Bernheim (Nancy), Binet (Paris), Bourru (Rochefort), Carus, Danilewsky (Kharkoff), Déjerine (Paris), Delboeuf (Liège), Drill (Moscow), Espinas (Bordeaux), Ferrari (Paris), Fontan (Toulon), Forel (Zürich), Galton (London), Gley (Paris), Grote (Moscow), W. James (Cambridge, U.S.), Pierre Janet (Havre), Jules Janet (Paris), Lapontine (Moscow), Liégeois (Nancy), Lombroso (Turin), Münsterberg (Freiburg), Nieglich (Helsingfors), von Schrenck-Notzing (Munich), Séglas (Paris), H. Sidgwick (Cambridge), Sperling (Berlin), and Tokarsky (Moscow).

M. Charcot was unfortunately not able to be present at the Congress, and at the first meeting on August 6th M. RIBOT, as Vice-President, took the chair, and delivered a short address of welcome to the strangers, and explanation of the hopes and objects of the Congress. It was, he said, at least a novelty. There had never been one like it before. This was an age of Congresses in almost every subject—of chemists, physicists, biologists, and many others, but not once had they had such a meeting of Experimental Psychologists. It was hardly necessary to repeat to such an audience what was so generally recognized now, that the natural task for psychologists was constant and accurate observation of what they saw around them, and experiment under very rigorous conditions. It was this method of objective experiment which was the most essential basis of their Congress, a method which gave them a hitherto unparalleled opportunity of exact observation in their sensations—sight, hearing, and many other things hitherto too vague, the association of ideas, the control of movements, and that group of studies which before all others had raised in later years the keenest interest among psychologists, viz., the phenomena and results of Hypnotism. What most deserved consideration in that department he should leave it to their Secretary General, M. Ch. Richet, to lay before them.

M. CH. RICHER then rose to explain what was the plan that the Committee for the organization of the Congress had adopted. They had thought it would lead to the best furthering of knowledge, and the greatest social convenience of all assembled, that some subjects should be selected from the vast mass that fell under the head of Experimental Psychology, and that in each of these selected subjects some clearly-worded hypothesis or statement should be laid before them for discussion, and, if possible, for an opinion. With the help of MM. Gley, Marillier, Magnan, Ochorowicz, and P. Brissaud, he had drawn up a short *résumé* on nine points originally, but, as he saw that with such a large gathering that would be too much, he would reduce them to four, viz:—(1) Muscular Sense; (2) the Statistical Study of Hallucinations; (3) some results of Heredity; and (4) Hypnotism—the causes of mistake in observation of its phenomena; the sensibility to its induction; the distinction between normal and hypnotic sleep; automatic writing; disturbance of unconscious movements; the alterations of personality; the phenomena of transference and the action of magnets; and finally, the best terminology of Hypnotism and the accurate definition of the words used. In the statistical study of hallucinations they would all feel the loss of Mr. Gurney, who had started the inquiry five years ago in England. It was a subject that needed united effort from many observers. So also was Heredity. It was a subject on which Mr. Galton would be thankful for an army of observers. As to Hypnotism, he was glad to

be able to say that their Congress had brought together representatives of every school, and so in itself represented no school, for it represented all.

For the convenience of business the members of the Congress were asked to put down their names for service on one or more of the four Committees on Hypnotism, Heredity, Hallucinations, and Muscular Sense. The Committees met at nine a.m. for three hours, and a general meeting was held at two p.m. for three hours to consider and discuss the reports of the Committees. As the Committees on the three last-named subjects only sat for one or two days each, it was found quite possible and convenient for their members to attend the Committee on Hypnotism also, and both this and the general afternoon meetings were very fully attended.

The Committee on Muscular Sense met under the presidency of Professor W. JAMES, of Harvard University, and discussed a short statement that had been drawn up by M. Gley. They agreed that the so-called Muscular Sense could be reduced to a group of centripetal sensations, but were not completely of one mind as to the limits of the accompanying intellectual phenomena.

In the Committee on Heredity, Mr. FRANCIS GALTON took the chair, and proposed the wide distribution of a paper of questions which he had himself very carefully drawn up on the influence of maternal impressions on birth-marks, the inheritance of habits acquired by the parents, and certain points of retrogression and variations, and this, after some discussion, was adopted as a practicable way of collecting information.

M. GRUBER afterwards, in describing some very remarkable associations of particular colours with particular sounds (*P'audition colorée*) obtained the assent of the Congress to the circulation of a similar question paper.

The Committee on Hallucinations, with Mr. F. W. H. MYERS as Chairman, discussed an analogous "census paper" which had been circulated lately in England by Professor Sidgwick, and in France by M. Marillier, the French Secretary of the Society of Psychical Research. It contained only a single question, viz.: "Have you ever, when believing yourself to be completely awake, had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a living being or inanimate object, or of hearing a voice, which impression, so far as you could discover, was not due to any external physical cause?" It was to be laid before as large numbers as possible of all classes and countries, and to be answered only by "Yes" or "No," and a signature of name and residence. It was not proposed to publish the names without special permission. Of those persons who might answer "Yes," a few other questions in a second paper were to be asked. It was intended to exclude insanity and delirium. The object of the inquiry was, in the first place, to ascertain approximately the proportion of persons who have had such experiences, and, in the second place, to obtain details as to the experiences with a view to examining their cause and meaning. For the first object, it was important that the question should be very widely asked, and of all sorts of people, not only of those who are thought likely to have had such an experience, or of those who are thought likely not to have had it. The answer "Yes," and the answer "No," were equally important. Up to August, 1889, 2,038 answers had been obtained in England, of which about 12 per cent. were "Yes;" in France, out of 345, about 20 per cent. had been "Yes."

M. PIERRE JANET wished to extend the circulation of the paper to the morbid and insane, and to restrict the collection of the statistics to medical men and psychologists.

Professor W. JAMES preferred the original plan, as making the collection of facts from a very large body of healthy persons, perhaps 40,000 or 50,000, possible; and after a little discussion the Committee agreed to invite the sanction of the Congress for the original question paper, with a few verbal modifications, and with the possible addition of some more specialized information in some morbid cases.

M. MARILLIER presented this report to the General Congress, and after some explanation it was unanimously agreed to continue the inquiry into the statistics of hallucination as they had been begun, and as the Committee had recommended.

The Committee of Organization subsequently selected Prof. Grcte, of Moscow, M. Marillier, von Schrenck Notzing, Prof. James, and Prof. Sidgwick, to superintend the work in Russia, France, Austria, the United States, and England.

The Committee on Hypnotism found that it had much the most work before it, and met on every morning of the Congress, besides occupying much of the time in the afternoons. It was very regularly attended by some 40 members, as well as by some large additional numbers occasionally in the afternoons. On the first morning Professor Delboeuf (of Liège) was asked to take the chair for the day.

Professor CHARLES RICHTER brought forward a discussion of the most desirable terminology. He had drawn up with M. P. Brissaud definitions of most of the words commonly used. Hypnotism, he said, was a word introduced by Braid, and should be defined as a state of somnambulism induced by physical causes; whilst magnetism was a similar state due to the action of special influence or will. Somnambulism was a condition analogous to sleep, but differing from it in retaining more signs of external impressions from the surroundings; and distinct from a normal waking state by an alteration of personality and a complete amnesia. It might be idiopathic, or artificially induced. When idiopathic, it was correctly a pathological condition most frequent in young subjects, and generally coming on in the course of natural sleep. When artificial, it was sometimes due to some manipulations called "magnetic," whose action was ill-defined, sometimes to a suggestion, sometimes to a physical action, such as fixing the eyes on a bright object, etc., and most frequently to a combination of several of these causes. "Animal magnetism" was a phrase that was in common use in various meanings, and was best applied generally to all the causes which induced somnambulism.

Exact definition such as would suit the wishes of a large meeting was naturally not found easy to frame, and Professor LIÉGEOIS urged that the term "Animal Magnetism" should be given up altogether, as it often led to the false impression that there was something in common between the phenomena of hypnotism and the phenomena of magnetism now accurately known, which was admitted by all physicists to be a mistake.

Professor BERNHEIM thought that our knowledge of what were the limits of hypnotism was at present too imperfect to allow of any complete definition, but was inclined to retain "animal magnetism" in the description of some past phenomena, of which we could not now ascertain the complete conditions.

After some hours of discussion, it was decided not to sanction the use of "hypnotism" and "animal magnetism" as synonymous terms, and the feeling of the meeting was in favour of employing hypnotism in future for a large group of symptoms, of which the exact limits would need much further study.

On the following morning (August 8), when M. Ballet was in the chair, M. OCHOROWICZ read a paper on "La Sensibilité Hypnotique." It could not be admitted that all persons were hypnotizable. The extent of their susceptibility could be shown by various standards, viz.: (a) the readiness with which they could be hypnotized; (b) the depth of sleep which could be obtained; (c) their relative sensitiveness to suggestion when in a hypnotic state; and (d) the varied character of the hypnotic symptoms in the same subject. He had come to the conclusion that variations of susceptibility were innate, and in some cases at least hypnotism could not be reached anyhow. He showed a hypnoscope which he had himself invented, and often used, and which consisted in a bar magnet bent into a thick ring and worn on one finger. When

this had been worn for a few minutes the finger often became cold and stiff, and that was, in his opinion, a valid test of the susceptibility to hypnotism whether the phenomenon was produced by suggestion or by magnetism.

Professor BERNHEIM had found, after a very wide experience, that a few people were at least very difficult, and perhaps impossible, to hypnotize. Some of these were to be found among the hysterical patients, and he did not at all agree with some authorities who were inclined to think that hysteria and susceptibility to hypnotism went together. The educated classes were more difficult to hypnotize than the uneducated.

Professor CH. RICHTER quite agreed in these remarks, and thought we might add that some races, *e.g.*, French and Italian, were much more susceptible than the English and German, but considered a much wider observation on this point necessary.

Professor DELBORUF had found about 75 per cent. of all classes in Belgium hypnotizable.

Professor SIDGWICK suggested that it was advisable to make sure first whether all hypnotizers had equal power.

Professor FOREL (of Zürich) had found no difficulty in hypnotizing about 85 per cent. of the Swiss on whom he had tried, and Wetterstrand in Sweden, and van Renterghem and van Eeden had met with about the same results in Amsterdam.

Professor CH. RICHTER thought it almost impossible to answer Professor Sidgwick's question, although it was a very important and a very complex one. He thought it probable that there were differences between agents as well as between percipients.

Mr. F. W. H. MYERS described experiments devised to cut off the subject from any communication by the known senses with several experimenters who held their hands equally near several of the subject's fingers, contact being strictly forbidden, and the observations varied in several ways. Under these conditions a particular experimenter—the only one who could hypnotize him—was found to succeed in stiffening the finger near his hand so very much more frequently than would have been possible by chance, and as he considered fraud excluded by carefully arranged conditions and frequent experiments in private, he was obliged to conclude that there was some specific influence, of whose exact nature we were as yet ignorant. In the experiments there had been no hyperæsthesia to ordinary sensations.

On the morning of Friday, August 9, M. BERNHEIM took the chair, and M. CH. RICHTER introduced a description of the conditions altering the personality, commenting on the difficulty of setting the limits to suggestion, and ending by calling attention to some evidence, which was gradually increasing, of telepathy, or influence at a distance, and mental suggestion or thought transference without communication through any of the known senses. He did not think any such theories should be lightly adopted, but considered that the evidence was worth attention.

Professor SIDGWICK thought the cases of (a) animals, (b) babies, and (c) persons at a distance offered opportunities where suggestion of all kinds might be excluded by adequate care.

Professor BERNHEIM himself maintained that suggestion was an adequate hypothesis to explain the facts at present proved. The conditions produced in animals and considered hypnotic, he preferred to term cataleptic. With some babies at the breast he had seen M. Liégeois' great influence, but in them he thought the influence of suggestion might begin at any age, however early.

Professor DANILEWSKY went on to read a long and careful paper on hypnotism in animals, which he had produced in many, from the shrimp and crab upwards to the guinea pig and rabbit. Among many details he pointed out that when involuntary rotatory movement had been induced by injury to

the semi-circular canals in the higher animals it could be stopped by this hypnotism.

On the last day of the Congress, Saturday, August 10, Professor ESPINAS, of Bordeaux, was asked to act as Chairman, and he called on M. Babinski to explain the views of the school of the Salpêtrière.

M. BABINSKI said he was glad to do so, though they had been lately published in the *Arch. de Neurologie*, 1889, Nos. 49 and 50. They did not admit that hypnotism was confined to hysterics, but only best studied in them. He admitted that he had seen little of hypnotism in non-hysterical patients; but he could not admit that all the phenomena were due to suggestion, as for instance anæsthesia often was found when it was not suggested. He had heard it said that M. Charcot's three stages of lethargy, catalepsy, and somnambulism were only to be found at the Salpêtrière, but he could call Tamburini, Seppili, Viziosi, and others as witnesses to the contrary.

Most of the speakers who followed him considered it an incomplete study of hypnotism to observe it only or chiefly in the hysterical cases, when the inferences were specially difficult.

Mr. F. W. H. MYERS described some experiments in thought-transference, which he had carried out with hypnotized subjects, when the experimenters, who alone knew the piece of knowledge sought (such as a number drawn by accident from a bag, or card from a pack) could be carefully isolated from all communication by the senses at a distance from the subject. A large amount of varied experiment had shown with a few subjects such an immense superiority of correct guessing to what could be calculated by rules of chance, that he thought there was certainly some other agency at work than hyperæsthesia, or fraud, or chance.

Professor CH. RICHERT had been for some time familiar with these experiments, and had conducted many like them himself, and considered them of great importance, as thought-transference of this kind, if true, was a very great truth.

Professor SIDGWICK and Professor DELBOEUF both agreed in the importance of carrying out such experiments carefully on a large scale.

After some discussion as to the best place of meeting of the next Congress of Experimental Psychology in 1892, it was agreed that it should be held in London, in August, 1892, and an *ad interim* Committee was appointed, who were to meet about Christmas, 1891, to complete the arrangements. The Committee were chosen only from those present in Paris, in order to secure immediate consent, and consist of MM. Beannis, Benedikt, Bertrand, Bernheim, Danilewsky, Delboeuf, Espinas, Forel, Ferrari, Galton, Gley, Grote, Gruber, Herzen, W. James, Lombroso, Marillier, Münsterberg, F. Myers, Nieglich, Ochorowicz, Ribot, Ch. Richet, von Schrenck Notzing, Sidgwick, and Sperling.

A. T. M.

BEER IN ASYLUMS.

Dr. Hearder, in the Twenty-third Report of the Joint Counties' Asylum, Carmarthen, says:—"It is now eight years since you ordered that the use of beer as an article of diet should be discontinued in your asylum. There was at that time only one county asylum in which the dietary did not include beer. At the present time malt liquor is included in the dietary of only a decided minority of asylums, and this number is growing smaller year by year. In this asylum the change has been decidedly and absolutely beneficial; it was effected with the entire concurrence of the whole staff of attendants, and it was not accompanied by any friction or discontent amongst the patients. A few years previously, in 1876-7, the use of alcoholic stimulants, in the treatment of disease and as an