

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
New Members and Associates .. .. .	449	On Physical Tests and the Line between	
Meetings of Council .. .. .	449	the Possible and the Impossible .. .. .	466
Report of the General Meeting, June 26 ..	451	Prediction of Recovery in Mesmerism ..	467
A Conference .. .. .	460	Cases Received by the Literary Com-	
Report of the General Meeting, July 10..	460	mittee .. .. .	469

### NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

#### HONORARY MEMBER.

THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., Hawarden, North Wales.

#### MEMBERS:

- BENTALL, F. W., Holloway Road, Heybridge, Maldon, Essex.  
 GREIG, REV. DAVID, M.A., Addington Rectory, Winslow.  
 PORTAL, SPENCER, Malshanger, Basingstoke.

#### ASSOCIATES.

- BOLLAND, MRS., 7, Cranbury Terrace, Southampton.  
 BRILL, ALICE B., M.D., New York City, U.S.A.  
 EADY, MRS., Combe Royal, Kingsbridge, South Devon.  
 EGERTON, MISS MARY L., Whitwell Hall, York.  
 KNIGHTLEY, LADY, Fawsley, Daventry.  
 LEAF, ARTHUR H., Old Change, London, E.C.

### MEETINGS OF COUNCIL.

At a Meeting of the Council, held on the 26th of June, the following Members were present:—Professor W. F. Barrett, Messrs. Alexander Calder, Edmund Gurney, Richard Hodgson, F. W. H. Myers, Frank Podmore, Professor H. Sidgwick, and Mr. J. H. Stack. Professor Barrett took the chair.

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

On the proposition of Mr. F. W. H. Myers, seconded by Professor Sidgwick, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., was elected an Honorary Member of the Society.

Three new Members and four new Associates, whose names and addresses appear above, were elected.

The usual Cash Account for the month, made up to date, was presented, and various accounts passed for payment.

It was agreed that a General Meeting should be held on the evening of Friday, the 10th of July, at the Suffolk Street Rooms, the chair to be taken at 8.30 p.m.; and that a Meeting of the Council should take place on the same afternoon at 4.30.

At the Meeting of the Council on the 10th inst., the President in the chair, the following Members were also present:—Professor W. F. Barrett, Messrs. Edmund Gurney, Richard Hodgson, Edward R. Pease, and Frank Podmore.

After the Minutes of the previous Meeting had been read, two new Associates were elected, whose names and addresses appear on the preceding page.

Three books were on the table, presented to the Library, for which a vote of thanks was passed to the donors.

A series of resolutions which had been unanimously agreed to at a Conference, held on the previous day, (see p. 460) was presented to the Council. After full discussion, they were adopted as follows:—

1. That Professor Barrett, Mr. Edmund Gurney, Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, and Professor Oliver J. Lodge, be requested to draw up a series of form, colour, and position tests, for thought-transference experiments, and that these be printed.

2. That a vigorous attempt be made to enlist Members and Associates in the experimental work, and that forms and directions be sent to all those who express a willingness to help.

3. That a brief statement of results already obtained in thought-transference, and of the difference between thought-transference and muscle-reading, be included in a paper sent to Members and Associates.

4. That a note be added to this paper and printed in the *Journal*, inviting contributions from Members as to facts coming within their own observation, or critical discussion of the results already obtained by the Society. Also that the author of any paper accepted for publication in the *Proceedings*, shall receive gratuitously as many copies of his paper as he desires up to 100.

Information was brought before the Council of the establishment of the "Western Society for Psychical Research," at Chicago, the Secretary and Treasurer being Mr. J. E. Woodhead, who is an Associate of the Society for Psychical Research. A minute of the Council of the Western Society was read, instructing their Secretary to take the necessary steps to secure reciprocity and co-operation with the Society for Psychical Research, and a letter desiring that an arrangement might be made which would enable their Members to obtain the *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychical Research on favourable terms. It was agreed to offer the Western Society the same mutual arrange-

ments and terms as had been made with the "American Society for Psychical Research."

The next Meeting of the Council was fixed for Friday, the 7th of August.

---

### REPORT OF THE GENERAL MEETING.

A General Meeting of the Society was held on the evening of Friday, June 26th, at the rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, S.W.

The chair was taken by Professor Sidgwick.

The first item in the proceedings was the second part of a paper by Mr. E. Gurney and Mr. F. W. H. Myers on "Some Higher Aspects of Mesmerism." The topic dealt with on this occasion was silent "willing" and "willing" at a distance. The effects considered were (1) the definite induction of trance; and (2) the performance by a "subject" of some act "willed" by his controller, but of which he had received no intimation. Among other cases, a striking one of Esdaile's was quoted, where a blind man was mesmerised from a distance of 20 yards. As regards the control of actions, it was pointed out how fallacious the instances are which are popularly supposed to illustrate the power; but some apparently genuine cases were given. Another topic—the production of actual hallucinations by the will of some absent person—was also touched on; but such cases do not seem to be specially dependent on definite mesmeric influence. A summary was then given of the way in which the authors' treatment of mesmerism, as so far published, differs from that of other writers; the main points being (1) that "hypnotic" and "mesmeric" phenomena are both admitted as genuine, while carefully distinguished; and (2) that mesmerism is shown only to determine with special certainty events which are found also capable of spontaneous occurrence. Finally, the great desirability of extended experiment was urged. Much wearisome failure and deceptive ambiguity must be expected; but by their power of throwing the mental machinery slightly out of gear, hypnotism and mesmerism may advance our knowledge of the more obscure mental phenomena in ways which would be impossible to direct introspection.

The Chairman said that he did not propose to invite discussion on the paper which had been read, as it was likely that several of those present would wish to address the meeting in reference to what Mr. Hodgson would have to say, but at the close Mr. Gurney would be glad to answer any questions on the subject he had treated of. He now asked Mr. Myers to take his place as Chairman, as he was about to read the conclusions of the Committee on the alleged phenomena attested by members of the Theosophical Society.

Mr. F. W. H. Myers having taken the chair, Professor Sidgwick proceeded, on behalf of the Committee appointed to investigate the alleged marvellous phenomena connected with the Theosophical Society, to read the following statement of their conclusions:—

That of the letters put forward by Madame Coulomb, all those, at least, which the Committee have had the opportunity of themselves examining, and of submitting to the judgment of experts, are undoubtedly written by Madame Blavatsky; and suffice to prove that she has been engaged in a long-continued combination with other persons to produce by ordinary means a series of apparent marvels for the support of the Theosophic movement. That, in particular, the Shrine at Adyar, through which letters purporting to come from Mahatmas were received, was elaborately arranged with a view to the secret insertion of letters and other objects through a sliding panel at the back, and regularly used for this purpose by Madame Blavatsky or her agents. That there is consequently a very strong general presumption that all the marvellous narratives put forward as evidence of the existence and occult power of the Mahatmas are to be explained as due either (*a*) to deliberate deception carried out by or at the instigation of Madame Blavatsky, or (*b*) to spontaneous illusion, or hallucination, or unconscious misrepresentation or invention on the part of the witnesses. That after examining Mr. Hodgson's report of the results of his personal inquiries, they are of opinion that the testimony to these marvels is in no case sufficient, taking amount and character together, to resist the force of the general presumption above mentioned.

Accordingly, they think that it would be a waste of time to prolong the investigation.

As to the correctness of Mr. Hodgson's explanation of particular marvels they do not feel called upon to express any definite conclusion; as on the one hand, they are not prepared to endorse every detail of this explanation, and on the other hand they have perfect confidence in the impartiality and thoroughness of Mr. Hodgson's investigation, and they recognise that his means of arriving at a correct conclusion are far beyond any to which they can lay claim.

There is only one special point on which the Committee think themselves bound to state explicitly a modification of their original view. They said in effect in their First Report that if certain phenomena were not genuine it was very difficult to suppose that Colonel Olcott was not implicated in the fraud. But after hearing what Mr. Hodgson has to say as to Colonel Olcott's credulity, and inaccuracy in observation and inference, they desire to disclaim any intention of imputing wilful deception to Colonel Olcott.

The Chairman then called on Mr. Hodgson to continue his Report on the phenomena connected with the Theosophical Society.

Mr. Hodgson, in doing so, dealt chiefly with letters declared to have been received "phenomenally." The mental queries to which it was alleged instantaneous replies had been given were always, so far as he could learn, such as might easily have been anticipated by Madame Blavatsky. The envelopes in which Mahatma writing was found, and which were declared to be absolutely intact, might easily, in the cases he had been able to examine, have been opened and the contents abstracted, &c. Mr. Hodgson described in detail the appearance of one of these envelopes, which showed clear traces of its having been opened surreptitiously; and mentioned a case described to him by Mr. Ezekiel, a Theosophist at Poona, which corroborated his own conclusions, but the details of which Mr. Ezekiel was unwilling to have published. Some of the letter-phenomena were probably arranged in the manner described in the *Journal* for April, where an account was given of a letter caused by the Coulombs to fall on Mr. Hodgson's head. The Mahatma letters which appeared at the headquarters after Madame Blavatsky's departure for Europe might in all cases have been arranged by Mr. Damodar, and Mr. Hodgson gave instances of this. Other instances of falling letters had occurred in Bombay, when the Society's headquarters were there; some of these letters might have been pushed through the interstices of the ceiling of the room where they fell, as Mr. Hodgson ascertained by examining the premises; or in other cases through a slit in the ceiling-cloth, no inspection of which seems to have been made by witnesses of the phenomena. The disappearance of letters and other objects from the top of a bookcase could be easily accounted for by the fact that behind the bookcase was a venetian door near Babula's rooms, and Babula could have removed the letters, &c., by passing his hand through the venetians. It was in this way probably that the packet in the *Vega* case was made to "evaporate" while the witnesses were out of the room.

Mr. Hodgson then referred to the Koot Hoomi writing, and said that after a minute and prolonged examination of the writing, he considered it to be in most cases the handiwork of Madame Blavatsky, but in some cases that of Mr. Damodar. In various documents which had been kindly furnished by Mr. Sinnett for examination, numerous characteristic traces of Madame Blavatsky's handwriting were obvious, and the gradual elimination of some of these was manifest in successive letters, suggesting that Madame Blavatsky acquired by degrees greater skill in the practice of the disguised hand. Mr. Hodgson illustrated his remarks on some of these characteristics by means of the blackboard, and quoted the positive conclusion of Mr. F. G. Netherclift, the well-known caligraphic expert, that the Koot Hoomi series of documents furnished by Mr. Sinnett were unquestionably written by Madame Blavatsky.

The Chairman said that Mr. Hodgson would now be prepared to answer questions as to his Report, and Professor Sidgwick as to the Report of the Committee. But first, it seemed fitting to invite the remarks of a gentleman to whom all present would listen with respectful attention on the subject of these phenomena. He begged leave to call on Mr. Sinnett for any observations which he might wish to make.

Mr. Sinnett said that at the conclusion of his interesting paper, Mr. Gurney had spoken of the ridicule and opposition which everyone engaged in psychical inquiry was liable to encounter, and suggested that in raising an easy laugh at the expense of some of the phenomena he had endeavoured to investigate, Mr. Hodgson had afforded a prompt illustration of the justice of his colleague's remark. He, however, desired to approach this subject in a serious spirit, as a Member of the Society for Psychical Research not less than as a Theosophist. It appeared to him that in this inquiry the Society had taken an entirely new departure. Hitherto when the guiding Members of the Society thought they had found evidence illustrating the reality of psychic phenomena, they had proceeded to investigate it, and if they found it calculated to support this idea they brought it forward. If, on the contrary, they found it inconclusive they put it aside. In the present case an entirely different course had been pursued. The Society for Psychical Research had not considered the whole Theosophical position, but only certain incidents. The important point in a matter of this kind was to prove the existence of occult power. The value of a single item of positive evidence was not impaired by any amount of negative evidence. Mr. Hodgson had collected with great care a vast amount of negative evidence, which in his (Mr. Sinnett's) opinion was of exceedingly small value. Mr. Sinnett, speaking for himself and others, said that they had studied occurrences of the kind treated of for many more years than Mr. Hodgson had months. Mr. Hodgson had undertaken his inquiry, moreover, under disadvantageous circumstances, when the group of persons at the headquarters of the Society had been demoralised by the long absence of their leaders. He had no experience of India to guide him in conducting a difficult investigation with natives concerned. The series of events examined in a case like this was not to be tested by the weakest, as a chain was tested by the strength of its weakest link, but the question whether psychic agency really entered into the matter should be determined by reference to the most important and conclusive incidents. He ventured to say that in many of the cases he could bring forward no elements of suspicion could be found. He considered that Mr. Hodgson had proceeded on a totally wrong principle. A large quantity of miscellaneous evidence had been given by persons whose statements

were of no value, and who were in the position of servants. Mr. Sinnett then went on to speak of the "court" before which the inquiry took place, and that practically prosecutor, counsel for the defence, and judge were all one and there was no cross-examination by persons representing opposite sides. Speaking of the Committee, Mr. Sinnett referred to its constitution as not including any who by reason of being acquainted with or from having sufficiently studied the whole Theosophical movement might have been in a position to direct its inquiries aright. He thought the Committee was as little qualified to form a judgment as Mr. Hodgson himself. As he was not able to be at the previous meeting, he might perhaps be allowed to refer to the report of its proceedings. He thought many of the conclusions drawn were wholly unsupported. Reference was made to the position taken by the editor of the *Christian College Magazine*, who was commended for having performed a delicate task with much tact and temper. In reality the editor in question had paid money to obtain the letters which he employed as a weapon against the Theosophical movement. Coming to the question of handwriting, Mr. Sinnett said that he now learned with great pleasure that the experts had given an opinion to the effect that the so-called "Koot Hoomi handwriting" of the letters he had received from the Mahatma was produced by Madame Blavatsky. He was glad of this because it was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the argument derived from the opinion of the experts to the effect that the letters alleged to have been written by Madame Blavatsky to Madame Coulomb were genuine. This declaration had been the subject of much concern and bewilderment for Theosophists at first, but it was now retrospectively discredited by the present opinion about the Koot Hoomi handwriting. There were great masses of letters in that handwriting in his possession, and a large part of this correspondence had been seen by many persons besides himself. He believed that all these persons would agree with him in regarding the hypothesis that the contents of these letters had emanated from Madame Blavatsky as absolutely grotesque in its extravagance. No caligraphic evidence in such a matter would have weight for anyone who might fairly take into consideration the substance of such letters. In conclusion, he argued that the report now brought forward dealt exclusively with mechanical details of certain phenomena connected with the Theosophical movement. It was impossible to solve the questions before them without paying attention to the character of the movement in its higher aspects. The psychic phenomena with which the movement had been associated were of merely collateral interest. By the philosophical teaching of which the Theosophical Society had been the channel, light had been thrown upon the inner meaning of a great mass of Indian literature which, now that it was thus interpreted, was seen to bear

out the theory of Nature that had been introduced to the world by means of the Theosophical Society as the Esoteric Doctrine. The great value of the work thus accomplished had been very widely recognised, and whatever gratitude was due for the benefits conferred on modern thinking in this way, was due primarily to Madame Blavatsky, through whom the results had been attained. Whatever might now be alleged in regard to the matters Mr. Hodgson thought he had investigated, no one could deny that Madame Blavatsky had devoted a life which might have been spent in an easy and honourable station, to the service of the cause which the philosophical achievements of the Theosophical Society represented, and her whole career was thus a demonstration of the fundamental nobility of her character.

The Chairman said that there were one or two points in Mr. Sinnett's speech to which he felt bound briefly to reply. Mr. Sinnett had made a strong point of the supposed fact that the editors of the *Christian College Magazine* had bought the Blavatsky letters from the Coulombs, as though they had been thus tempted to make the most of a costly purchase, and to insist unduly on the importance of the letters. In saying this, Mr. Sinnett could hardly have been cognisant of a passage in the *Christian College Magazine* for April last (which the Chairman now read to the meeting), in which the editors explicitly denied having bought the letters, and stated, on the contrary, that the letters had been lent to them by the Coulombs without any conditions, except that they should be ultimately returned. The editors distinctly stated that from first to last they had paid the Coulombs only 150 rupees, that being about the ordinary rate of remuneration for copying and other actual work done by them.

Again, Mr. Sinnett had urged that the Committee, before investigating the more dubious phenomena, should have paid attention to what he considered as the conclusive and indisputable phenomena which showed Madame Blavatsky's power over nature without a doubt. But this was precisely what the Committee had done. Before Mr. Hodgson's visit to India was resolved upon, the Committee had expressly invited the attendance of any Theosophists who had striking phenomena to recount, and had caused their depositions to be taken down by a shorthand writer, and afterwards printed for consideration. Colonel Olcott, Mr. Mohini, and Mr. Sinnett himself, had in fact responded to this invitation, and a great mass of evidence given by them had been printed. All this evidence, as well as all the evidence that already existed in print, had been most carefully weighed by the Committee, with the result that they had, in an *ad interim* and provisional report, expressed their conclusion that a *prima facie* case for further investigation existed, and had recommended that such investigation should be pursued in India. The Committee had thus done



precisely what Mr. Sinnett urged that they ought to have done. The only difference between Mr. Sinnett's view and the Committee's was as regards the absolute value of the evidence supplied by himself and others. The Committee, while showing by their subsequent action that they attached *some* value to these accounts, were quite unable to consider them as so conclusive and irrefragable as Mr. Sinnett and his friends appeared to do. On the contrary, they saw various weak points in even the strongest parts of the evidence; and the results of Mr. Hodgson's visit to India had in several particulars confirmed the suspicions which the examination-in-chief of the primary witnesses had itself excited.

Mr. Sinnett had spoken of Mr. Hodgson's scrutiny as though it had not embraced the whole field of the phenomena. The field covered by the Blavatsky-Coulomb letters was surely wide enough, and he (the Chairman) would much like to know by whom Mr. Sinnett and his friends now supposed those letters to have been written? The only hypothesis of which he had heard on the side of the defence was that the letters had been written by "black magicians." Now he was prepared, as a Psychical Researcher, to keep his mind open to a variety of strange hypotheses; but if he were called upon seriously to suppose that a whole series of letters,—which according to all human canons of evidence were in the handwriting of a well-known person, corresponded with her circumstances, and expressed her character,—to be in effect the work of a *black magician*, he should retire in despair from the task of endeavouring to get at any truth in a region so remote from the laws of ordinary human intelligence. He begged to call on Mr. Mohini for any remarks which he might be disposed to make.

Mr. Mohini, in responding to the Chairman's invitation, complained of the method adopted in taking evidence both in India and here. All details regarding phenomenal occurrences were elicited by cross-questionings by those who were utterly ignorant of the times and places of those occurrences. Upon this information, necessarily obscure, Mr. Hodgson proceeded in his investigation, and considered himself justified in rejecting evidence whose chief defect was a want of precision which ought not to have been expected. Regarding Dr. Hartmann's contradictory statements, there was no reason for preferring the earlier to the later one. For if Dr. Hartmann was capable of a falsehood there was nothing to prevent him from using it as the means of separating philosophical doctrines from phenomenalism with which it had been illogically mixed up. He emphatically protested against the course Mr. Hodgson had taken in attacking a dead man on hearsay evidence, as he did when he stated that Mulji Thackersy confessed on his death-bed to having told lies at the instigation of Madame Blavatsky. Then, again, he would draw attention to the fact that Mr. Hodgson never

saw the Shrine, and that the drawings he had shown were made from information given him by the Coulombs. In his opinion, Mr. Hodgson had brought forward much that he had not proved. In fact, Mr. Hodgson had examined how far the statements of the Coulombs were true, and not how far the phenomena were genuine. He had put forward the statement of the Coulombs as to the surreptitious introduction of letters through crevices in the ceiling, because he found some of these crevices filled up in the way described by the Coulombs. Mr. Hodgson had accepted what the lawyers would call mere matters of prejudice as good evidence. It was unnecessary to go into details. The special difficulties of investigations of this kind were well known to those who had inquired into the phenomena of Spiritualism, and to these difficulties no attention had been paid. The Committee had entirely ignored evidence resting upon the abnormal experience of psychics. The Committee had entirely ignored subjective evidence. This would not have been surprising if the inquirers had been materialistic men of science. But the Committee either did or did not believe in psychic experience. If they did, he did not consider their conclusions fair to themselves. For his part he thought many questions must still be left open, and for many reasons he did not believe that Madame Blavatsky wrote the Coulomb letters. Other explanations were possible. Unquestionable cases of abnormal production of people's handwriting had occurred within the experience of inquirers into Spiritualism. This was the black magic to which reference had been made by the Chairman. He should be glad to know if Mr. Hodgson showed the Coulomb-Blavatsky letters to Madame Blavatsky herself.

Professor Sidgwick remarked that Mr. Sinnett's complaint that the Committee included none of the persons who were already committed to the genuineness of the phenomena, could hardly be seriously entertained.

Mrs. Macdonald, who described herself as only a student in these matters, thought Theosophy had much to answer for, in having given false views of Buddhism, and for having turned away the attention of so many from the beautiful philosophy and teaching of the older writings.

Mr. Keightley and Mr. Henslow having made some brief remarks, Mr. G. P. Bidder said he had listened with care to Mr. Sinnett and Mr. Mohini, but he had heard no answer to the report of Mr. Hodgson as to the facts. He could not at all agree with what Mr. Sinnett said as to the course which had been pursued by the Society. The first thing to be done was to sift the phenomena. This was what was done in other branches of the Society's work. Nor could he follow Mr. Sinnett's argument as to the value of the weakest links in a chain of this kind. If it were found that a certain portion of the phenomena were tainted

with fraud, the greatest possible doubt is thrown on the remainder. He could not conceive that those who were conscious of the power of producing phenomena by genuine means should have recourse to fraud. He thought that any impartial person carefully reading the reports which the Committee made last year would come to very similar conclusions to those at which Mr. Hodgson has arrived. Mr. Bidder proceeded, in support of this view, to refer to two instances in particular, viz., the falling of a letter referred to in p. 57 of the Report, and the instance of the appearance of Mr. Damodar to Mr. Ewen in London.

Professor Barrett defended the strictly scientific position which the Society had taken. As presenting somewhat of an analogy he referred to papers in the early history of the Royal Society, some of which consisted largely of what might be called negative evidence, but which were of value in clearing the ground, and in leading to subsequent positive results.

Mr. Hodgson, in replying, agreed with much that Mr. Sinnett had said concerning the value of psychical phenomena on the higher planes, but joined issue with him as to the value of the phenomena connected with the Theosophical Society. Mr. Sinnett had offered no specific reply whatever to the charges which had been brought against these phenomena, except to say that the Report largely depended upon the statements made by the Coulombs. This was quite contrary to the fact, as he had in no case relied upon the evidence given by the Coulombs, though he had found all their essential statements corroborated by independent evidence. In reply to the chief statements made by Mr. Mohini, he said that whether Dr. Hartmann's final statement concerning the destruction of the Shrine was true or not, made no difference to the results of the investigation; but that the Shrine had disappeared, and the explanation offered by Dr. Hartmann was the only one forthcoming. If, as Mr. Mohini apparently suggested, Dr. Hartmann's last statements concerning the Shrine were false, then one of the leading Theosophists at headquarters was still taking part in deliberate dishonesty. He had not depended upon the decision of caligraphic experts alone in the question of the Blavatsky-Coulomb documents; he had examined carefully the circumstantial evidence offered by Theosophists, and had questioned Madame Blavatsky herself at great length upon the letters and statements printed in Madame Coulomb's pamphlet. Nor was it true that the diagrams exhibited were given by the Coulombs. Nearly all the drawings exhibited had been enlarged from sketches which depended on measurements made by himself. It was only the half-panel of the Shrine which depended merely on the statements made by the Coulombs. Further explanations concerning these and other points would be left to the judgment of the readers of the complete Report shortly to be published.

The Chairman, in a few concluding remarks, said that he trusted that the meeting would not separate with the impression that the Committee of the Society for Psychological Research were in any way disposed to feel exultation in the exposure of the frauds involved in these phenomena, or antagonism of any kind towards those who might still cling to some kind of belief in them. Their feeling, if feeling might be alluded to in a discussion which turned entirely upon evidence to facts, was one of disappointment at the closure of what had seemed a possible avenue towards the attainment of some of that further knowledge of the secrets of the universe which Theosophists and members of the Society for Psychological Research desired with equal earnestness, though it might be with somewhat different standards of proof. Most assuredly there was no touch of *triumph* on the one side, and he earnestly trusted that there would be no touch of *resentment* on the other, but that all should still feel themselves united by a disinterested love of truth.

---

#### A CONFERENCE.

On the invitation of Professor Barrett, some members of the Society for Psychological Research held an informal conference, at 14, Dean's Yard, on the 9th inst. Professor Balfour Stewart presided, and among those present were Mr. Pearsall Smith, of Philadelphia, the Hon. Percy Wyndham, M.P., Mr. R. H. Hutton, and Professor Lodge. The chief subject of discussion was the importance of securing the extension of experimental work, especially in thought-transference, and of enlisting the further aid of Members and Associates. The result of the views expressed was embodied in a series of resolutions, which were substantially adopted by the Council at its Meeting on the following day.

---

#### GENERAL MEETING.

The last General Meeting of the Society for the present season was held on the evening of Friday, the 10th inst., at the Suffolk Street Rooms.

The President took the chair, and in his opening address he gave a sketch of the experimental work which has been done during the last few years in the subject of Thought-transference, and strongly insisted on the importance of seeking for fresh "subjects."

Mr. Edmund Gurney made some remarks on "Retractions and Alterations of View," which will appear in the next *Journal*.

Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, J.P., then read an account of some further experiments on the transference of ideas and sensations, conducted during the last year with one of his former subjects, Miss R.

The President made a few remarks on one very interesting and important feature which Mr. Guthrie had described; namely, the *time*

which appeared to be necessary in some cases for the impression to assume a definite form. He called upon Professor Barrett for some remarks.

Professor Barrett said that the same thing had been remarked in some of the former series of experiments. He had sometimes found that the image would float up again, as it were, when the attention of the mind had gone into something else. For instance, a name thought of by the agent had produced apparently no effect on the percipient. Some little time afterwards, when another matter was in hand, the percipient had suddenly said, "Oh, was the name so and so?" giving the right one.

The same feature had been strikingly observed in some of Mr. M. Guthrie's experiments in the transference of tastes. Salad oil, Worcestershire sauce, and bitter aloes being successively tasted by the agent, the percipient did not describe the salad oil until the agent was tasting the Worcestershire sauce; and the taste of the Worcestershire sauce was only perceived when the agent had gone on to bitter aloes.

The President referred to the frequent occurrence of being unable by mental effort to call up a familiar name, which afterwards rose up spontaneously when the attention was turned in another direction.

Dr. Guthrie said he should like to testify to the extreme care with which his cousin, Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, had conducted his experiments. On one occasion, when he himself had been present, the conditions were not such as to allow him to come to an absolute conclusion, and he had not had the opportunity of pursuing the subject in a way which would entitle him to express any personal opinion on so important a question; but as to his relative's thoroughly scientific mode of conducting the work he had no doubts.

The Meeting then assumed a conversational character.

---

The following letter from Mr. Sinnett relates to the discussion that took place at the General Meeting on June 26th:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

SIR,—Time did not allow me at the meeting of the 26th to answer certain comments on my remarks made by subsequent speakers. May I ask your permission to add a few observations to any report of the proceedings you may publish? I never supposed or hinted that any sum of money had been given for the letters, by the editor of the *Christian College Magazine*, that would be considered large by prosperous people in this country. But the 150 rupees actually paid, according to Mr. Myers' statement, would be an important payment amongst the people concerned. The letters were not the less bought because the originals may have been returned to the Coulombs after they were printed. Their publication in the magazine was the result

paid for, and under the circumstances it would be a mistake to overlook the fact that they were purchased weapons in the fierce paper war which rages in Madras between the missionaries and the Theosophists.

As to the view taken by Mr. Myers of the Committee's action, it appears to me that the *prima facie* case for believing that Madame Blavatsky has in some cases shown true psychic power, which he recognises as having been established by the examination of the witnesses in London, is not touched by the examination of other witnesses concerning other transactions in India. The examination in chief of A. by B. at one time and place is not efficiently crossed by an examination of C. carried on by D. at a totally different time and place. It is just because in this way Mr. Hodgson's investigations have not grown in any legitimate way out of the incidents to which they attach importance that Theosophists generally seem to put his results aside as irrelevant; for those of us who have an intimate knowledge of the places and people concerned, they are discredited in other ways.

Professor Sidgwick thought my objection to the composition of the Committee disposed of by regarding the Committee as a tribunal which ought not to include members committed to definite opinions on the question to be tried. But that was not the position occupied by the Committee. It was not a tribunal, for it never had to face any representatives of the accused persons whom it affected to try. Its evidence was collected in secret by one of its own number, whose present attitude, at all events, is very decidedly antagonistic to the persons whose conduct is being investigated. Its views have been formed in a consultation which has not been assisted by the suggestions of any one whose sympathies would render him an efficient critic of Mr. Hodgson's Report. I think I am not exaggerating the general opinion of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, in assuring you that for these and other reasons we regard the methods by which this investigation has been carried out as altogether vitiating its results.

Mr. Bidder hardly seemed to catch my meaning about the principles on which psychic inquiry should be conducted. If the question was, "Is Madame Blavatsky's character immaculate?" then we should address ourselves to incidents that suggest suspicion. If the question is, "Are psychic phenomena possible?" it is wise to examine the facts which seem to suggest that conclusion, in preference to those which do not promise to afford evidence for it.

Permit me, in conclusion, heartily to reciprocate the feeling which Mr. Myers so admirably conveyed in his concluding remarks.

Yours very truly,

A. P. SINNETT.

---

Mr. Sinnett's letter gives me an opportunity of clearing up some misapprehensions, under which he seems still to labour, both as to the action of the Committee and as to the grounds on which it has been based.

I must begin by saying that I do not quite understand his argument as to the money paid by the editor of the *Christian College Magazine* for the Blavatsky-Coulomb letters. Had he maintained that a large sum had been given for them, I should have supposed that he was attacking the editor on

the ground of the somewhat difficult ethical question as to how far it is justifiable to bribe impostors to betray their accomplice. But since it is not denied that the payment was on the ordinary scale for work done for the magazine, I fail to see what ground of attack there is. The opinion of Mr. Myers as to the tact and temper shown by the editor is founded, I believe, on the moderate tone of the articles that have appeared in the magazine on the subject; and I think that all impartial persons who read these articles and consider the strength of the case in the editor's hands against a bitter enemy to the cause he represents, will agree with him in this view. Perhaps, however, the object of Mr. Sinnett's remarks is not so much to attack the editor of the *Christian College Magazine* for giving work and wages to the Coulombs, but rather to depreciate the trustworthiness of the recipients of the wages. If so, it is sufficient to say that no part of the conclusions, either of the Committee or of Mr. Hodgson, rest in any degree on the assumption that the Coulombs are trustworthy witnesses.

With regard to the second question discussed in Mr. Sinnett's letter, I think that he understands the expression *prima facie* case in a different sense from that in which it was used by Mr. Myers and the Committee. We do not regard the establishment of a *prima facie* case as implying a definite conclusion that certain phenomena were genuine, but only as a reason for investigating further. Moreover, we considered this case to rest, so far as the Indian phenomena were concerned, chiefly on the testimony of certain native witnesses who were not available for examination in London. As regards phenomena experienced in India by Mr. Mohini, Mr. Sinnett, Colonel Olcott, and the greater number of witnesses, English and Indian, we did not consider that it had been shown that they could not have been deceived by a combination between Madame Blavatsky, the Coulombs, and servants. We thought it possible, however, that our views on these points might be modified if, through one of our number, we could obtain that knowledge of "times and places" which, as Mr. Mohini justly remarks, we did not possess. Mr. Hodgson accordingly went out to India with instructions to examine, and have examined by experts, the Blavatsky-Coulomb letters; to ascertain, so far as possible, the degree of value that was to be attached to the statements of certain important native witnesses; and to examine localities and witnesses with a view to ascertaining whether various phenomena, such as the falling of letters from the ceiling, and appearances of Mahatmas, could be accounted for by fraud in the ways that had suggested themselves to the members of the Committee, or in other ways. This, Mr. Hodgson has done, and the Committee, with the results of his investigation before them, have arrived at the conviction that their *prima facie* case has broken down; a conviction, it may again be stated, which in no degree depends on the assertions of the Coulombs. I find it difficult, therefore, to understand why Mr. Sinnett should consider that "Mr. Hodgson's investigations have not grown in any legitimate way out of the incidents to which Theosophists attach importance." His impression on this point may possibly be due to the fact that Mr. Hodgson's Report has as yet been only laid before the Society in a fragmentary and incomplete form. If so, the matter will be much clearer when this report is published in full in the next number of the Society's Proceedings. But I cannot so account

for Mr. Sinnett's assertion "that Theosophists generally seem to put Mr. Hodgson's results aside as irrelevant." If they put aside as irrelevant the whole of the cumulative argument by which Mr. Hodgson has supported his conclusions, (1) that the Blavatsky-Coulomb letters are genuine, and, (2) that the Shrine at Adyar was constructed and used for the production of spurious phenomena,—then it is difficult indeed to conceive the kind and degree of evidence that would induce them to abandon their confiding attitude.

Finally, Mr. Sinnett repeats in a modified form his objections to the constitution of the Committee. His complaint now is that the Committee did not contain any person adequately in sympathy with the Theosophic view of things. It must, I think, be obvious that any objection of this kind ought to have been raised, if at all, when the Committee was first constituted more than a year ago, and not now, after it has reported unfavourably on the Theosophic marvels. But I need not press this point, for I have no fear that Mr. Sinnett's complaint will be regarded as well founded by any impartial reader of our First Report. I am much more afraid that most sensible persons will criticize our action from the opposite point of view, and will consider that with the evidence which was even then before us of trickery on the part of Madame Blavatsky, we were hardly justified in the expenditure of time and trouble involved in our Indian investigation. To this criticism my answer would be that we did not regard ourselves—as Mr. Sinnett seems to suppose—as a "tribunal" to try the question "whether Madame Blavatsky's character is immaculate." The question we had to deal with was both wider and more difficult; we had to consider whether any part of the whole mass of evidence offered in connection with Theosophy could be made available for the establishment of any of the psychical laws hitherto unrecognised by science, which it is our function to investigate. The negative conclusion at which we have arrived on this point is one which we were bound to state with perfect unreserve; but we have no right and no desire to call on the members of our Society to accept it merely on our authority. The evidence on which it is based will be shortly placed before all who are interested in the question; and if, after reading it, any member of the Society should still think it a profitable pursuit to fish for "psychical" phenomena in these troubled waters, it is perfectly open to him to do so, and to bring his results before us.

There is one other point in Mr. Sinnett's letter to which I must refer. He speaks of Mr. Hodgson's evidence as "collected in secret." It seems, therefore, worth while to state that we took care to make it known to all concerned that Mr. Hodgson had gone to India to collect this evidence on behalf of our Society; and that his unfavourable view of the evidence was communicated to the leading Theosophists at Madras, before his departure from India.

H. SIDGWICK.



ON PHYSICAL TESTS, AND THE LINE BETWEEN THE  
POSSIBLE AND THE IMPOSSIBLE.

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

SIR,—The article under the above heading, in the June number of the *Journal*, is of so much interest in relation to the question of evidence of “occult” phenomena, that I hope you will allow it to be subjected to some examination; which is the more desirable as the argument of the article is extremely specious, and is likely to be accepted without reserve by those who have not already considered the subject from a somewhat different point of view.

With regard to the first point, the confusion of moral with physical evidence, I have nothing to object, nor have I ever seen the justification of tests in the medium’s own interest better stated. Testimony to character is mere *opinion*, and is so treated—though admitted for the defence—in criminal trials. It can have no place as evidence in strictly scientific investigations.

But I feel more difficulty in assenting to the proposition as to the *onus probandi* in its application to the “margins” claimed for known physical agency. No doubt, in the physical agency we have a *vera causa*, and we are not entitled to resort to hypothetical causation for any effect to which the former is adequate. But there is a legitimate *à priori* presumption against the adequacy of a physical cause to any effect which it has never been known to produce apart from the disputed case; while the presumption against a new or unknown agency arises only from the absence of facts requiring it. It is not necessary to contend that any such other agency is at once *proved*; only that a *prima facie* case for it is established, and the *onus probandi* shifted. This shifting of the burden of proof in the course of evidence is of frequent experience in courts of law, while on the main issue, of course, it remains true that this burden is on the plaintiff. So, I conceive, in scientific research a fact greatly exceeding former experience would at once put the experimenter on a re-testing the capabilities of his known agencies, that he might not have to suspect the existence of an unknown one. He would not *anticipate* this, unless the disproportion between the old known capabilities and the new observation were very great, but he would not feel justified in making presumptions which would dispense with trial. He would recognise a fact not yet actually accounted for.

And still more, I submit, must this be the case when the known lesser capability of the recognised agency is itself of exceptional occurrence, that is, under rare and peculiar conditions; when it was itself opposed, in the first instance, to legitimate presumptions of what

was possible. For the margin justifiably claimed for the possible may fairly be said to have been exhausted when we got the originally improbable. At first, we should require demonstration before accepting the alleged fact that a hand could be squeezed through a rigid circumference in *any* very appreciable degree less than its own. If we get the demonstration, but only for a very few exceptional hands, the positive presumption against a much greater squeezability is then *increased* by the rarity of the easier case.

But the question now at issue—on whom is the burden of proof in such a case—may be tested in another way. Suppose that there was no suggestion of any other than the known physical agency, but that it was important to ascertain whether a phenomenon alleged to have happened by means of it really had happened at all, it being one greatly in excess of all former experience, yet *ejusdem generis* with former experience. Would not demonstration be required as the condition of belief? But why, unless for the reason that we declined to *presuppose* such a margin of possibility as would be necessary for the phenomenon alleged? On what ground, then, do we allow the presupposition when, the fact being admitted, the only question is between an agency not otherwise proved to be adequate and an agency not otherwise proved to exist? Yet if the presupposition is not made, the fact is unexplained until and unless we get positive proof *aliter* that our known agency is adequate to it.

The "Spiritualist," then, I submit, has got thus far on his way in the particular case, excluding, of course, all other experience which would tend to establish the agency he affirms as a *vera causa*. He has not, indeed, shown positively and certainly that his fact is inexplicable by the physical agency, except for those who reject the doctrine of very large "margins" altogether, or at least in such cases. But he has established a strong *prima facie* case. He has put us to the alternative of showing that the physical agency is adequate, or of admitting that his fact remains simply unexplained positively. *He* has only got to prove the negative up to the point where adverse probabilities on the physical side come to his aid. Those probabilities, adverse to the physical agency, are not less now, because the *fact* to be explained is admitted, than they would have been had the fact itself been disputed. They are not less now, because we are face to face with an alternative hypothesis of causation, than they would have been if the alternative had merely been the unveracity of a witness.

If there is a fallacy in this reasoning, it will, no doubt, be detected and pointed out by the able contributor whose proposition I have ventured to question.

C. O. M.

## PREDICTION OF RECOVERY IN MESMERIC TRANCE.

The following case is translated from communications in French sent to us by Dr. Nicolas, Count Gonémys, of Corfu. His MS., which contains further theoretical discussion of clairvoyance, may be had on loan by application to the secretary.

In a former paper I had the pleasure of describing to my readers a cure, which I succeeded in effecting in the year 1869, when I was attached to the garrison of Zante. To-day I am going to tell you of another, which I performed in the same year, and which, on account of some singular circumstances connected with it, was of peculiar interest to all concerned, and won for me considerable fame in the neighbourhood in which I then resided. My patient, in this case, was a girl of about 20, named Denise Zyros, who, since the age of 14, had suffered from that form of hysteria which is generally known by the name of hysterical melancholia. Every kind of treatment during these eight years had been tried for her in vain; the doctors at last pronounced her case hopeless; and the parents could only try to reconcile themselves to the fact that their daughter was incurable. The poor girl for years had ceased to exist as an animal being; she seemed simply to vegetate, and, but for a few unconnected words which she sometimes muttered in a low voice, one would have supposed every spark of reason in her to have been extinct. Sitting in a chair with closed eyes and bent head, she appeared utterly unconscious of all that took place around her. She had even forgotten how to eat and drink, so that to sustain life her parents were obliged to force open her jaws and compel her to swallow a few mouthfuls of some nutritious substance. Although, apparently, she was no longer in pain, yet a continuous trembling of the whole body was observable; her eyelids when raised showed only the whites of the eyes, the cornea being lost in the sockets. From all information I could obtain as to the girl's former state of health, I was confirmed in my opinion that this was a severe case of melancholia, and one, indeed, that was rapidly drawing near its closing scene. I made a thorough examination of the case and was unable to discover a trace of anything radically wrong in the organic system. This examination took place on the 29th of July, and on that day I mesmerised her for the first time. In the course of half-an-hour she fell into a deep sleep, which sleep was preceded by a relaxation of the limbs, a cessation of the usual trembling, and of the habitual low murmuring. I let her sleep for an hour, and as I saw no change in her expression during that time, I thought it better not to disturb her by addressing her. I certainly had not expected to produce so quick an effect on an organism which, one may almost say, had lost all right of domicile in this physical world, so utterly insensible was it to all surrounding agents.

The next day I mesmerised her again, and this time she not only went to sleep as she had done the previous evening, but she even became clairvoyante. She told me she was sleeping, and that she saw a dazzling light which emanated from my eyes and fingers, and which thrilled her whole body. She asserted that I should succeed in curing her in 17 days, and moreover was able to fix the exact date of her recovery, telling me that I must

mesmerise her twice every day, morning and evening, and that she should than be able to walk to Mass on the 15th of August—which would be the Feast of the Assumption—accompanied by her brother, all of which facts did actually take place precisely as she had predicted. When I left my patient, after first awakening her, I happened to go down to the dispensary, where I found several doctors and other persons assembled. I turned to the former, and asked them if they were acquainted with the case of the afflicted girl Zyros. They replied that they knew her well, that they had used every means in their power to bring about her recovery, and that they had eventually given up her case as hopeless. I told them that I believed them to be mistaken in their opinion, that in 17 days she would be able to go out, that she would be completely cured, and that they might see her at Mass on the Feast of the Assumption. They all burst out laughing at this unexpected assertion, and unanimously agreed that I must be out of my senses. Gossip spreads quickly in a small town, and in a short time this affair became the subject of general talk in Zante. Opinions varied greatly. Some called me a quack and a humbug, whilst others were inclined to exalt me to the skies; in fact public opinion seemed to know no happy mean.

Meanwhile I continued to mesmerise my patient morning and evening, and found her improving in health daily. At last the 15th of August, the much-talked of day, arrived. The cathedral bell announced to the faithful the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and a crowd collected round the Zyros' house to see Denise walk to church—or rather to see the quack unmasked! What, then, was their astonishment to see the girl presently walk downstairs, and appear amongst them in perfect health and good spirits. The crowd was electrified; a loud “hurrah” was heard on all sides; whilst I, putting her arm in mine, led her victoriously towards the church, followed by all the bystanders, who cheered us vociferously.

From that date, I am confidently able to affirm that the girl has continued in good health.

I do not pretend for a moment to be a partisan of those demonological ideas which must have inspired St. Augustine when he wrote his “*Civitas Dei*.” At the same time, I feel bound to state openly all that I observed in this case, without deducing from it any conclusions, which might be premature in the present undeveloped state of physiological and psychological science.

The third time I mesmerised the girl, as soon as my influence acted on the nervous system, and even before she was asleep, a great change in her was observable. Her eyes opened wide, she made hideous grimaces, and used excessively coarse language. She defied my mesmeric power, and attempted by such violent efforts and contortions to oppose my actions, that I was obliged to tie her down. As soon, however, as she had fallen into a mesmeric sleep, she would cry bitterly, and excuse herself for what she had just said by assuring me that it was not she who had previously spoken.

Now, we have here before us a case of partial clairvoyance—a clairvoyance, that is to say, relating solely to the patient's own recovery. We know that she had been living for many years in total mental obscurity; that she had lost all idea of time, and all consciousness of outward events; we must, therefore, it seems to me, make a distinction between the two

phenomena presented, that is to say, between her prediction as to the duration of her malady, and the sudden awakening of the mind to the consciousness of time, which enabled her to fix the 15th of August as the day on which her sufferings would terminate. The first of these phenomena I should call subjective, the second entirely objective. The one might be connected with intuition or instinct, the other is independent of any such action. It may be suggested by some that my patient was able to read my mind, that she learnt the day of the month from my thoughts, and was able consequently to make her calculations from this given point. To this I reply that I was not thinking of the day of the month; that, as a matter of fact, I did not know whether it was the 2nd, 10th, or 20th; neither had I the least idea that the 15th of August was the day of the Assumption. Again, it must be noted that no one was present at these séances. I call attention to this fact, to remove all suspicion from the minds of those who would say that the somnambulist learnt from the bystanders the information she required to enable her to fix the date of her prophecy.

---

#### CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

(Continued.)

We will first give two cases belonging to a quite distinct type—one which involves no *time*-coincidence at all. Evidence that certain hallucinations have been telepathic, and not purely subjective, in character may be afforded by a coincidence of another sort—namely, that several persons, at different times, have had a hallucination representing the same person, though that person was apparently in no abnormal state on any of the occasions. Clearly it would be difficult to regard a *repetition* of this sort as accidental. It being comparatively a rare event for a sane and healthy person to see the form of an absent person at all, that two or more sane and healthy persons at different times should see the form of the *same* absent person, is, on the theory of chances, so unlikely as to suggest a specific faculty on the absent person's part for promulgating telepathic impulses.

The point is important from its bearing on the question whether the peculiarity of organisation which conduces to telepathic transferences belongs rather to the percipient or to the agent.

To decide this question we should naturally ask which happens the more frequently—that the same *percipient*, or that the same *agent*, is concerned in several telepathic incidents. Now, of repetitions to the same percipient we have several good examples; but that the same agent should figure repeatedly is made unlikely by the very nature of the ordinary type of case, which implies (over and above any natural peculiarity of organisation) an exceptional *crisis*—indeed more often than not the crisis of death, through which no one can pass more than

once. The only chance for a dying agent to show a special faculty for originating telepathic impressions is by impressing *several persons at once*: and cases of collective percipience, which may possibly be so explicable, will be found to be among the most striking in our collection.

Meanwhile, the type where telepathic impressions seem now and again to be thrown off at haphazard, and independently of death or any other crisis, is theoretically of at least equal interest.

Our cases (about half-a-dozen in number) are not numerous enough to prove conclusively the existence of this form of telepathic transference; but the mention of them may, perhaps, serve to elicit further instances.

L.—2301.—A<sup>n</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

We received the following account from Mrs. Hawkins, of Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds.

March 25th, 1885.

I send you my cousins' accounts of my apparition. My cousins only signed with their initials, but have willingly given me leave to mention their names.

I have also sent you the account of my next appearance, which unfortunately cannot now be related by the eye-witness.

Again, a third time one of my little sisters reported that she had seen me on the stairs, when I was seven miles off—but she might so easily have been mistaken that I have never put any faith in that appearance. Then I was about 20.

For many years after that these appearances seem to have entirely ceased, but in the autumn of 1877 I was seen in this house by my eldest son, then aged 27, who may, I hope, give you his own account of it.

LUCY HAWKINS.

The event described in the enclosed accounts took place at Cherington, near Shipston-on-Stour, in Warwickshire, the residence of my uncle, Mr. William Dickins, who was for many years chairman of Quarter Sessions in the county. The ladies who saw the appearance are two of his daughters, one of them a little older than myself, the other three or four years younger. I was then just 17.

The only mistake I can discover in either of the accounts is that Mrs. Malcolm says I had been hiding with her "brother," whereas I had really been all the time with her sister, Miss Lucy Dickins, a fact of no importance except that she (Miss D.) might (if necessary) bear witness that I *had* really been with her all the time in the washhouse, and so could not have been near where I was seen.

I remember that we were all somewhat awed by what had happened, and that it broke up our game. I myself quite thought it was a warning of speedy death, but as I was not a nervous or excitable girl it did not make me anxious or unhappy, and of course, in time, the impression passed off.

LUCY HAWKINS.

Writing to Mrs. Hawkins in September, 1884, Miss Dickins said :—

Georgie is coming here on Friday, and I propose then to show her your letters, and Mr. Gurney's, and that we should each write our impressions of what we saw independently, and see how far they agree, and we will send the result to you. It is all very fresh in my memory, and I can at this moment conjure you up in my mind's eye, as you appeared under that tree and disappeared in the yard. I even recollect distinctly the dress you wore, a sort of brown and white, rather large check, such as was in fashion then, and is now ; but was in abeyance in the intermediate years.

Shortly afterwards Miss Dickins wrote :—

Cherington,

*September 29th, 1884.*

I send the two accounts which Georgie and I wrote about your apparition. We wrote them independently, and so I think they are wonderfully good evidence as they tally in almost every particular, except the little fact that I thought she joined me in searching the yard for you, and she thinks not, but that has nothing to do with the main fact of the story, our entire belief that we saw you in the body.

In the autumn of 1845 we were a large party of young ones staying in the house, and on one occasion were playing at a species of hide-and-seek, in which we were allowed to move from one hiding-place to another until caught by the opposite side. At the back of the house there was a small fold-yard opening on one side into the orchard, on the other into the stable-yard, and there were other buildings to the left. I came round the corner of these buildings, and saw my cousin standing under some trees about 20 yards from me, and I distinctly saw her face ; my sister, who at the moment appeared on the other side, also saw her and shouted to me to give chase. My cousin ran between us in the direction of the fold-yard, and when she reached the door we were both close behind her and followed instantly, but she had entirely disappeared, though scarcely a second had elapsed ; we looked at one another in amazement, and searched every corner of the yard in vain ; and when found some little time afterwards, she assured us she had never been on that side of the house at all, or anywhere near the spot, but had remained hidden in the same place until discovered by one of the enemy.

S. F. D.

I well remember the incident of your "fetch" appearing to us. I believe I wrote down the details at the time, but do not know what has become of that record, so must trust to my memory to recall the circumstances, and do not fear its being faithful though nearly 40 years have passed !!

We were playing our favourite game, at "Golowain," which consisted in dividing into sides at hide-and-seek, the party hiding having the privilege of moving on from place to place until they reached the "Home," unless meanwhile caught by the pursuing party.

As I stood towards the end of the game, as a seeker, in the orchard, I saw you, who belonged to the opposite party, stealing towards me. As your dress was the same as your sister's, and there was the possibility of my mistaking you for her, who was on my side, I shouted her name, and she

answered me from the opposite side of the wood. I then gave chase, and you turned, and looked at me laughing, and I saw your face distinctly. But at the same instant, Nina, also my friend, but your enemy, appeared round some corner, and being still nearer to you than I was, I left the glory of your capture to her. She was close upon you as you fled into a cow-yard. I was so sure your fate was sealed that I followed more slowly, and hearing the bell ring, that, according to the rules of our game, recalled us to the "Home," I went on there, to find Nina upbraiding you for having so mysteriously escaped her in this cow-yard.

In astonishment you said you never had been near the place. Of course I supported my little sister in her assertion, whilst our brother supported *you*, saying, he had been hiding with you, and that, being tired, you had both remained hidden in one place until the bell warned you that the game was over, that place being a washhouse in a distinct part of the premises from the cow or fold yard, into which we believed we had chased you.

G. M. (*née* DICKINS.)

[Neither of these percipients has ever had any other visual hallucination.]

Mrs. Hawkins continues:—

The second appearance of my "double" was in the spring (February or March) of 1847, at Leigh Rectory in Essex, my father, the Rev. Robert Eden (now Primus of Scotland), being rector of the parish.

The person who saw it was the nurserymaid. I am not quite sure of her name, but if, as I think, she was a certain "Caroline," she has been dead many years, therefore I can only give you my own very vivid recollections of her story, told with tears of agitation.

But first I should mention that I had the mumps at that time, and was going about with my head tied up, and the only other person in the house who had it was my little brother, nearly 10 years younger than myself, who could not possibly be mistaken for me.

On the first floor of Leigh Rectory there is a passage which runs the length of the house, terminated at one end by the door of a room that was then the nursery. One morning about 10.30 "Caroline" came out of the nursery, and walking along the passage had to pass a doorway opening on to the stairs which led down into the front hall. As she passed, she glanced down and saw me (conspicuous by the white handkerchief round my head, and facing her) come out of the drawing-room door and walk across the corner of the hall to the library. She proceeded along the passage, and coming to the foot of the attic stairs met our maid, who said to her, "Do you know where Miss Eden is? I want to go to her room." "Oh yes," answered "Caroline" "I just saw her go into the library." So they came together up to my room, which was one of the attics, and found me sitting there, where I had been for at least half-an-hour, writing a letter. After a moment's pause of astonishment, they fled, though I called to them to come in. When I went downstairs a few minutes afterwards and reached the passage, I saw in the nursery a group of maids, all looking so perturbed that, instead of proceeding down the front stairs, I went on to the nursery and asked what was the matter. But as no one answered, and I saw the nurserymaid was crying, I thought they had been quarrelling, and went away quite unconscious that it was on my account they were so disturbed.

LUCY HAWKINS.



The following account is from Mrs. Hawkins's son :—

June 20th, 1885.

In the autumn of 1877, I was living at my father's house, Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds.

The household consisted of my father, mother, three sisters, and three maid-servants. One moonlight night I was sleeping in my room, and had been asleep some hours when I was awakened by hearing a noise close to my head, like the chinking of money. My waking idea, therefore, was that a man was trying to take my money out of my trousers pocket, which lay on a chair close to the head of my bed. On opening my eyes, I was astonished to see a woman, and I well remember thinking with sorrow that it must be one of our servants who was trying to take my money. I mention these two thoughts to show that I was not thinking in the slightest degree of my mother. When my eyes had become more accustomed to the light, I was more than ever surprised to see that it was my mother, dressed in a peculiar silver-grey dress, which she had originally got for a fancy ball. She was standing with both hands stretched out in front of her as if feeling her way, and in that manner moved slowly away from me, passing in front of the dressing-table, which stood in front of the curtained window, through which the moon threw a certain amount of light. Of course my idea all this time was that she was walking in her sleep. On getting beyond the table she was lost to my sight in the darkness. I then sat up in bed, listening but hearing nothing, and on peering through the darkness saw that the door, which was at the foot of my bed, and to get to which she would have had to pass in front of the light, was still shut. I then jumped out of bed, struck a light, and instead of finding my mother at the far end of the room, as I expected, found the room empty. I then for the first time supposed that it was an "appearance," and greatly dreaded that it signified her death.

I might add that I had, at that time, quite forgotten that my mother had ever appeared to any one before, her last appearance having been about the year 1847, three years before I was born.

EDWARD HAWKINS.

In answer to inquiries Mr. E. Hawkins says :—I can assure you that neither before nor since that time have I ever had any experience of the sort.

L.—2302.—A<sup>n</sup> P<sup>a</sup>

The second narrative is from the Rev. T. L. Williams, Vicar of Porthleven, near Helston.

August 1st, 1884.

Some years ago (I cannot give you any date, but you may rely on the facts), on one occasion when I was absent from home, my wife awoke one morning, and to her surprise and alarm saw my *εἰδωλον* standing by the bedside looking at her. In her fright she covered her face with the bedclothes, and when she ventured to look again the appearance was gone. On another occasion, when I was not absent from home, my wife went one evening to week-day evensong, and on getting to the churchyard gate, which is about 40 yards or so from the church door, she saw me, as she supposed, coming from the church in surplice and stole. I came a little way, she says, and

turned round the corner of the building, when she lost sight of me. The idea suggested to her mind was that I was coming out of the church to meet a funeral at the gate. I was at the time in church in my place in the choir, where she was much surprised to see me when she entered the building. I have often endeavoured to shake my wife's belief in the reality of her having seen what she thinks she saw. In the former case I have told her "You were only half awake and perhaps dreaming." But she always confidently asserts that she was broad awake, and is quite certain that she saw me. In the latter case she is equally confident.

My daughter also has often told me and now repeats the story, that one day when living at home before her marriage she was passing my study door, which was ajar, and looked in to see if I was there. She saw me sitting in my chair, and as she caught sight of me I stretched out my arms, and drew my hands across my eyes, a familiar gesture of mine, it appears. I was not in the house at the time, but out in the village. This happened many years ago, but my wife remembers that my daughter mentioned the circumstance to her at the time.

Now, nothing whatever occurred at or about the times of these appearances to give any meaning to them. I was not ill, nor had anything unusual happened to me. I cannot pretend to offer any explanation, but simply state the facts as told me by persons on whose words I can depend.

There is one other thing which I may as well mention. A good many year ago there was a very devout young woman living in my parish who used to spend much of her spare time in church in meditation and prayer. She used to assert that she frequently saw me standing at the altar, when I was certainly not there in the body. At first she was alarmed, but after seeing the appearance again and again she ceased to feel anything of terror. She is now a Sister of Mercy at Honolulu.

THOMAS LOCKYER WILLIAMS.

Porthleven Vicarage, Helston.

June 20th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—As requested, I write to tell you what I saw on two occasions. I am sorry that I am unable to give you the dates, even approximately, as many years have passed since I had the experiences referred to. On one occasion my husband was absent in Somersetshire, and on waking one morning I distinctly saw him standing by my bedside. I was much alarmed, and instinctively covered my face with the bedclothes. My friends have often tried to persuade me that I was not broad awake, but I am quite certain that I was, and that I really saw my husband's appearance.

The other occasion was on a certain evening I was going to church, and on getting to the churchyard gate, which is about 20 yards from the door of the church, I saw my husband come out of the church in his surplice, walk a little way towards me, and then turn off round the church. I thought nothing of it until on entering the church I was startled at seeing him in his place in the choir, about to conduct the service. It was then broad daylight, and I am quite sure that I saw the appearance. Nothing whatever occurred after either of these appearances, and, of course, I can in no way account for them.—I remain, dear sir, yours faithfully,

EMMA WILLIAMS.

In reply to the question whether his wife or daughter had ever experienced any other hallucination of the senses, Mr. Williams replies confidently in the negative.

We have a good many cases where a hallucination, suggesting a particular person's presence, has occurred at or shortly before the time when that person was expected to appear in the flesh—*e.g.*, at about the time of his usual return home in the evening. We regard all such hallucinations as purely subjective, and caused by the percipient's attitude of expectancy. But, of course, it is a different matter when the hallucination falls at a time when the person is actually about to arrive, but his arrival is *unexpected*. We have a few visual cases of this type, and the following auditory case. The examples are not sufficiently numerous for us to be sure that we have in them a genuine type of telepathic action. In ordinary telepathic cases, the agent is doing or suffering something much more remarkable than merely returning home. But still the cases in question make a little group which is worthy of record.

The account here given is from Mr. J. Stevenson, of 28, Prospect Street, Gateshead.

L.—2303.—A<sup>n</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

*April 20th, 1885.*

During the months of May and June, 1881, my brother was staying with us. He went out one Sunday night, between 5 and 6 o'clock. He did not say what time he would return, but his time was generally about 10 p.m. About 7 o'clock, while I was reading by the window, and Mrs. S. by the fire, all being quiet, I heard a voice say, "David is coming." I instantly turned to Mrs. S., asking what she said. She said, "I have not spoken a word." I told her that I heard some one say that "David is coming." I then thought I had imagined it; but, lo and behold! in less than three minutes in he came, quite unexpected. I was surprised, but did not mention anything to him about it. The position of the house prevented us from seeing him until just about to enter the house. He was in good health, as we all were at the time. This is a candid statement of the facts. I shall be glad to give any further information if required.

JOS. STEVENSON.

P.S.—Mrs. S. tells me that I did mention it to him, but all he said was, "That's strange."

28, Prospect Street, Gateshead.

*May 29th, 1885.*

DEAR SIR,—In reference to my husband's letter of April 20th, I have pleasure in testifying to the accuracy of his account sent you on the above date, and of him drawing my attention to the fact at the time mentioned.—I remain, yours truly,

SERENA STEVENSON.

L.—2304.—A<sup>e</sup> P<sup>n</sup> and A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

The following account is from an informant who desires that her name and address may not be published, as she has a near relation who would much object to their appearance. We learn from her that she has not had any hallucinations which there is reason to regard as merely subjective.

*February 20th, 1885.*

When a resident near Portsmouth, during a visit made by my late mother to London in the summer of 1858, the year preceding her death, I distinctly saw her walking in the back garden at noon-day. I was not at the time thinking of her, but happening to look from my chamber window, I beheld this figure, which, but for my parent's absence from home, I should have supposed her veritable self. This incident led me to conjecture something was amiss, and this idea was confirmed when the next morning's post brought me information that my mother had sustained a severe fall and was so badly hurt that at first fatal results were feared, and at the moment I fancied I saw her, her thoughts were bent on telegraphing for me to go to her.

A few years prior to this, when a girl of 16, an engagement was formed between myself and a young naval officer, about to sail for the African coast. He had promised my mother and self that he would write us from "Ascension." It chanced, some time after his departure, I accompanied a friend in a long country walk, when all at once a strange feeling possessed me that this young officer was near. I seemed to feel the clasp of his hand upon my wrist, yet I saw nothing, I only *felt* a presence. My companion asked why I looked so pale. I made an evasive reply, and on returning home told my mother that "Tom was dead!" She tried to laugh away my fancy, nevertheless she noted the date of the occurrence, and when a brother of my own, then homeward bound from the coast of Africa, arrived, the first words he spoke, after an exchange of greetings, were, "Oh, that poor fellow you sent letters by for me is dead! He died three days sail from Ascension and is buried on the Island."

M. W.

I cannot, owing to the many years that have passed since the occurrences mentioned by myself, furnish any dates; my mother calculated that the singular impression I received was as near as possible to the time of our young friend's death. My brother who brought the tidings has been deceased several years.

L.—2305.—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

From Mr. Arthur Ireland, of the School House, South Witham,  
near Grantham.

*January 5th, 1884.*

About 14 years ago, about 3 o'clock one summer's afternoon I was passing in front of Trinity Church, Upper King Street, Leicester when I saw on the opposite side of the street a very old playmate, who, having left the town to learn some business, I had for some time lost sight of. I thought it odd he took no notice of me, and while following him with my eyes deliberated whether I should accost him or not. I called after him by name, and was somewhat surprised at not being able to follow him any further, or

to say into which house he had gone, for I felt persuaded he had gone into one. The next week I was informed of his somewhat sudden death at Burton-on-Trent, at about the time I had felt certain he was passing in front of me. What struck me most at the time was that he should take no notice of me, and that he should go along so noiselessly and disappear so suddenly, but that it was E.P. I had seen I never for one moment doubted. I have always looked upon this as a hallucination, but why it should have occurred at that particular time, and to me, I could never make out.

ARTHUR IRELAND.

To inquiries, Mr. Ireland replies :—

(1) To the present time the instance related is the only one of the kind that has occurred to me.

(2) I mentioned the incident of having met E. P. to my mother, and remarked on the seeming slight of his not acknowledging me. Of course, when the news of his death came, mother remarked that I was mistaken, and although not feeling convinced, I had to assent to such a seemingly apparent truism. My mother has since died, or we might have had this added testimony.

(3) I am thankful to say that my eyesight is good, and I remember no instance of mistaking one person for another. Of course, I could not swear that there was no mistake, but I do assert that I, without knowing he had left the town, and with nothing to make me think of him, was suddenly certain that E. P. was coming towards me on the opposite side of the street; that I watched him attentively for any sign of recognition; that I called after him, and could never explain his disappearance, or account for the unnatural noiselessness of his movements or the suddenness of his appearance.

I conclude by assuring you that so far I have been of a very realistic turn of mind, and am not aware that I am in the least superstitious or even imaginative. That which I have written is the truth, according to my experience, placed at your disposal to help, if of any service, in the unravelling of that for which at present there seems no adequate explanation.

ARTHUR IRELAND.

Mr. Ireland adds that the date of the death was October 1st, 1868.

---

L.—2306.—A<sup>d</sup> P<sub>n</sub>—(Borderland.)

Mrs. Scott Moncrieff gives us the following account of the apparition of a dying sister-in-law to her husband, now dead.

May 20th, 1885.

The circumstances of the dream or vision, as far as I can remember at this distance of time, were these. A. awoke me one night, and said, "I have had a strange dream about S., and I fancied I saw her standing at the foot of the bed; indeed, I had to rub my eyes to convince myself that she was not really there." He fell asleep, and again dreamt the same, and this made a powerful impression upon his mind, with almost a depressing effect. He was in perfect health at the time, and of a thoroughly practical nature; not at all given to sentimentality. He had also no reason to believe that S. was in frail health. Some weeks after, the news came of her death, and by comparing dates, and allowing for the difference of time between

India and Scotland, the event must have taken place during the period of these dreams; but whether at the time of the first or the second, I cannot remember. This happened on the 7th September, 1852.

ELIZABETH H. S. MONCRIEFF.

I very well remember my brother, the late Major A. P. Scott Moncrieff (whose widow has written the preceding narrative) telling me of this apparition, as he believed it to have been, of our sister Susan, after the news reached us of her death in Edinburgh, on September 7th, 1852. I was living in Calcutta at that date; my brother was with his regiment at Dinapore. In the month of November, I was on a visit to his house in Hazareebagh, where he was then living with his wife; and it was then that he told me of the apparition. As he was a man of a very unromantic, practical character, always ready to ridicule a ghost story, I was the more struck with the depth of the impression left on his mind by the vividness of the apparition, as he believed it to have been, which had led to his taking a note of the date in writing.

He told me that after having been asleep for a time, during the night of that date (which must have been the 7th September), he awoke, feeling the heat rather trying; that he saw, by a light burning in the room, the punkah swinging above the bed, and then saw our sister Susan standing at the foot of the bed, gazing at him very earnestly. That he was so surprised, he sat up, rubbed his eyes, and looked again, seeing her still there. That he exclaimed, "O, Susan!" (I think he added, "what are you doing here?" but I am not certain that these were his words; though I am certain that he did utter some such words after saying, "O, Susan!") That his wife awoke on hearing him speak, and said, "What is it, Alick?" (or words of similar import) but that he, fearing lest in the state of health she was then in, it might prove injurious to her to be told what he believed he had seen, said he had awakened from a dream, but did not tell her how fully he was convinced he had been awake when he saw the apparition of his sister, which had disappeared before his wife had spoken to him.

R. SCOTT MONCRIEFF.

Miss Scott Moncrieff, of 44, Shooter's Hill Road, S.E., corroborates as follows:—

I heard the same account from my brother, Major Scott Moncrieff, on his return from India.

MARY ANNE SCOTT MONCRIEFF.

L.—2308.—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

Mrs. Passingham, of Milton, Cambridge, sends the following account from the nurse who had been attending her daughter, Mrs. Gillig. Mrs. Passingham says:—

The fact of her having quarrelled with her favourite sister, and her dying without a reconciliation affects her deeply, and she had tears in her eyes as she told me the story. She declares she was *not* asleep, and it was *not* a dream, she had only just put out the light and had not got into bed.

From Mrs. Walsh, 107, Queen's Crescent, Haverstock Hill.

*May 6th, 1884.*

On October 24th, 1877, I was in London, and after preparing to go to bed, I had just extinguished the light when I heard the voice of my sister, who was then in Wolverhampton, call me by my name, "Joanna." I instantly answered, "Yes, Polly." The voice was low, almost a whisper, but perfectly clear, and I was so sure that she spoke that I turned to the part of the room from which the voice came. Again I heard the voice, and after that, once more, making three times in all.

When I realised that it could not possibly be my sister I felt—not exactly frightened—but awed, and I could not sleep till near morning for thinking of it. The next day I heard from my family that they had had a telegram to say that she was dangerously ill, and some one was to go to her. Another sister went and found her dead, and the time of her death agreed exactly with the time when I heard the voice. She died very suddenly of mortification, and I had not the least idea she was ill; also, we had become estranged from each other, although we were exceedingly fond of each other, and I think that is the reason she spoke to me.

JOANNA WALSH.

*May 12th.*

In answer to your first question I must tell you that at the time of my sister's death I was with almost entire strangers and therefore do not think I mentioned what I had heard to anyone until after I had a letter saying she was ill, and almost directly afterwards a telegram saying she was dead.

To explain clearly, when I had the letter saying she was ill, I mentioned it to my sister who brought the letter; then when I had the telegram to say she was dead I found that the time corresponded exactly with the time I heard her voice.

This is the only experience of the kind that I ever had.

[This is in answer to the question whether she had ever had any other hallucination of the senses.]

I didn't for one moment doubt whose voice it was as I immediately answered by name.

J. WALSH.

L.—2309.—A<sup>d</sup> Pn

From Mrs. Stent, living at 14, Singapore Road, Ealing Dean—a former valued servant of Miss Craigie, of 8, McGill College Avenue, Montreal, to whom she gave a completely concordant account, which we have seen.

*June 1st, 1885.*

Miss Craigie has written to me to ask me to send you the account of Elizabeth calling for Mr. Reggy and me. She called him and me. I was not dreaming, for she called "Reggy" and "Cook" so plainly I could not rest in bed; and I told the housemaid, E. Morris, and we wondered what it meant. I could not go that day, but I went the next, and the porter told me she died the morning before at 20 minutes to 4. I went to the Infirmary the day she was buried, and the old dame in the bed next to hers told me she called for Reggy and Cook with her last

breath. It troubled me much, for we had been friends for years, and I went to see her as often as I could. I never had anything of the kind happen to me before, and she called us so plain. I have often wondered what it could mean, and I shall never forget it.

E. STENT.

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Stent says :—

*June 7th, 1885.*

I send you the name of my dear friend ; it was Elizabeth Membrey. The day she died was October 18th, at Chelsea Infirmary, near the Consumption Hospital at South Kensington ; but I am sorry I can tell you nothing about Elizabeth Morris, having lost sight of her. Elizabeth has been dead four years this October. She was my dearest friend, and was more to me than a sister, but was no relation to me—only my dear friend. I think the bond of sympathy was very strong between us ; only death could break it. We told our troubles to one another ; for years past we did not do anything without talking about it first. Mr. Reggy was the son of the lady where we lived in service together, and she was very fond of him ; and he went to the Infirmary to see her as often as he could find time.

L.—2310.—Ad Pn

From Mrs. Wyld, of The Willows, Ellesmere, Salop.

*May 10th.*

I would very gladly write the short statement you ask for, but though to my own mind it is pretty conclusive, still I feel that to outsiders it is wanting in two important details. (1) I mentioned the fact of hearing the voice to no one at the time, and (2) I could not tell whose voice it was.

It was on Thursday evening, January 10th, 1884, that I was sitting alone in the house reading, and it seemed strange, and still not strange, to hear my name called with a sort of eager entreaty.

Shortly after the others came in. I was leaving for Ellesmere next day, and in the bustle of departure I thought no more of the circumstance. It was only when coming down to breakfast on the Saturday morning and finding the letter telling of E.'s death that I instantly recalled the circumstances, and saw that the *time* and *day* corresponded with when they knew she must have slipped out and down to the river.

I wonder I did not associate it with her, for she had written me some very pitiable letters beforehand.

MARY WYLD.

For the sake of my dead friend's relations, I should hardly like to give very identifying details (if for publication), as her death was a particularly sad one.

We were school-fellows together for nearly three years and great friends ; and she had written to me previous to her death in a terribly depressed state, but I had not the least idea her mind was affected. I never have had a hallucination of the senses at any other time. It was about 8 o'clock in the evening, I fancy, when I heard the voice. She was not found till 2 o'clock the next morning when the tide turned on the river ; she then had been dead several hours, having slipped out, I fancy, between 7 and 9 the previous evening.

MARY WYLD.



L.—2311.—Ad Pa

Mr. W. Colman, of 44, Finsbury Circus, E.C., writing to us on May 10th, 1885, enclosed the following account. He had heard the particulars about a fortnight before, when staying in apartments which Mrs. Longley lets.

Mrs. Longley, of 4, Liverpool Lawn, Ramsgate, a respectable married woman, wife of a small tradesman, both resident upwards of 35 years in the town, states:—

My eldest son, Pilcher, in February, 1884, was one of the crew of the "Young Eliza," cutter, of Grimsby, employed in collecting fish from the fishing fleet, and was then 28 years old.

On the 10th of that month, at 3.10 a.m., he was washed overboard in a storm, and drowned.

On that morning I was restless, and being unable to sleep, determined to watch how long the moon would take to cross a certain pane of glass in the window, and while so doing heard a voice three times distinctly call "Mother."

Supposing my son George was at the door, I called out several times, "Is that you, George? What do you want?" waking my husband, to whom I told what had occurred.

Having no reply, I got up, lit a candle, and went upstairs to George's bedroom, and found him sleeping soundly, without any signs of having recently been awake or moving.

Looking at the clock on the stairs I noticed it was 3.15 a.m.

Nine days after a telegram arrived, stating my eldest son had been drowned on the morning referred to.

My husband went to Grimsby, saw the captain of the vessel, and ascertained that Pilcher was washed overboard *at the time stated*, on a moonlight night, and that his first cry was, "Mother! mother! mother! save me for my mother's sake!"

He swam for 15 minutes, calling out occasionally, much as at first, but rescue was impossible.

The distance from Ramsgate to where he was drowned was over 200 miles.

He was a most affectionate son, and before going this voyage, had promised me it should be his last.

[Mrs. Longley signs this account as correct.]

SARAH LONGLEY.

her X mark.

11th June, 1885.

Witness, CHARLES E. TROUGHTON.

At my request Mr. G. A. Smith wrote to his friend Mr. C. E. Troughton, second clerk in Cobb's Bank, Margate, asking him to interview Mrs. Longley, and put some questions to her. Mr. Troughton writes:—

46, Addington Street, Margate,

June 14th, 1885.

In reply to the inquiry "did she tell any one of the voice *before* she heard of his death," she informed me that she mentioned the matter the following morning to her husband and sons, at the same time attaching no

particular importance to the voice she heard during the night, being still under the impression it was her son George who had called her, whom she thought was unwell. She also mentioned the matter to whoever "dropped in" during the next few days, remarking at the same time she felt sure something was "about to happen," and then the affair was forgotten till a telegram was received 9 days afterwards stating her son was drowned, which led eventually to her ascertaining by letter that her son met his death on the same night, and about the same hour that she heard the voice. She stated the voice seemed to proceed from some one *outside* the door, and most certainly addressed to her as if in supplication. She most distinctly asserts the voice was not an impression proceeding from her own mind, but seemed to proceed from some person *outside* her bedroom door. Unfortunately her husband and son were both away from home when I called, but she assured me it would be useless for me to attempt to induce them to corroborate her statement by signing the "document," as her husband in particular had an aversion to putting his name to anything of the kind. She did not associate the voice she heard with that of her son's at sea (nor did she connect the dream with him in any way), fully believing it to proceed from her son George. I asked was there any similarity between the voices of her two sons, and why she fixed upon George when he was sleeping beside her son Albert. She replied she knew it was not Albert who spoke because he has a slight impediment in his speech, and as to its being "Pilcher's," she was not thinking about him. I asked her if anything had transpired during the day or days previous to remind her of her son at sea, to which she replied in the negative.

C. E. TROUGHTON.

[It appears that this hallucination was unique in Mrs. Longley's experience.]

L.—2312.—Ad P<sup>s</sup>

From Mr. A. Jaffé, of 4, The Exchange, Balham, S.W.

May 28th, 1885.

After mentioning that he married while abroad, and was staying with his wife at Berlin, Mr. Jaffé continues: As soon as my parents had learned of my arrival at Berlin, where I had engaged furnished apartments, my mother immediately came to see me and my foreign wife. She remained with us for three days, and two days after her departure my father and sister came to see us, staying also three days, and then returned home. My wife and I, both young, in good health, and happy, were thoroughly enjoying ourselves, and were free from all serious thought. About a week after my father's departure, we (my wife and I), having been to a concert, arrived at our rooms about 11 o'clock at night, and went to bed at once, being tired. My wife fell asleep almost immediately, and after a little while I also was in the arms of Morpheus. Soon after, however, I awoke suddenly, with all my senses alive, as if I had slept for hours instead of only about 20 minutes, and heard what is commonly called the death-watch ticking. I knew that it could not be my gold repeater, for its spring was broken, and it did not go therefore. I was well aware then that such ticking was caused by some insects in the woodwork, and was not alarmed in the ver least degree.

The noise continuing, however, for a long time, curiosity got the better of me, and I lit the candle, got softly out of bed, and tried to find out in what part of the room the ticking was. But the noise was like a will-o'-the-wisp; when I went to one part of the room, it went to another. I got at last tired of the hunt, and crept softly into bed. Nevertheless, I must have disturbed my wife, for she said to me, in a half-conscious state, "Alfy, your watch is going!" I did not answer her, for I saw she was asleep again as soon as the words were spoken and I also slept soundly till the morning. At breakfast my wife said, "Alfy, I had such a funny dream. I saw your mother with a handkerchief tied under the chin, making such faces to me, and moving her jaws in a most extraordinary manner." We both laughed, and went to dress for a drive to Charlottenburg. I was the first dressed, and went into the sitting-room, waiting for my wife. A knock at the door. It is the servant, handing me a telegram. It was from my father and ran:

"Mother died last night. Letter to follow."

In the evening I received the letter, which stated among others:—

"Mother was paralysed, and had lost, for 6 hours before death, though no consciousness, but the power of speech. All this time she struggled fearfully to articulate, and the doctor tied, at last, her jaw with a cloth, to prevent her opening it. She died at 4 o'clock this morning."

ALFRED JAFFÉ.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Jaffé says:—

My first wife (here in question) is dead. She could not have stated, if now alive, anything else than what I communicated to you. We both were like one heart and soul, we could read each other's thoughts, and it is, therefore, that I hold my evidence as if it were hers.

About her dream, I am sure she told me then all she knew, and I, in my letter to you, have added nought nor omitted. No severest cross-examination could have disveiled anything more about it from her.

On the whole, my wife dreamt little, and when so, her dreams were always "nonsense."

He adds:—

It was and is *most decidedly* a fact, clear of all hallucination, from which she was free at all times.

The ticking which I heard, and my wife's dream, happened during the hours of my mother's death-struggle. Letter and telegram I received on the day after the nocturnal occurrence.

I do not remember the exact date; but it was in the last week of August, 1867.

If we accept the *dream* in the above case as telepathic, there would be some ground for regarding the *sounds* as possibly a telepathic hallucination of the rudimentary type. But they may, of course, have been due to some undiscovered objective cause, and the coincidence, as far as they are concerned, may have been accidental.

L.—2313.

From the Rev. W. D. Wood Rees, of Holme Villa, Market Weighton.

May, 1885.

In 1874, when reading for college, I frequently visited a man named William Edwards (of Llanrhidian, near Swansea), who was then seriously ill; he often professed pleasure at, and benefit from, my ministrations. He at length recovered so far as to resume work. I left the neighbourhood, and amid new scenes and hard work, I cannot say that I ever thought of him.

I had been at college some 12 months, when one night, or rather early morning, between 12 at midnight and 3 in the morning, I had a most vivid dream. I seemed to hear the voice of the above-named William Edwards calling me in earnest tones. In my dream I seemed to go to him and saw him quite distinctly. I prayed with him and saw him die. When I awoke the dream seemed intensely real, so much that I remarked the time, 3 a.m. in the morning. I could not forget it and told some college friends all particulars. The next day I received a letter from my mother, with this P.S. : "The bell is tolling; I fear poor William Edwards is dead." On inquiry I found that he did die between 12 and 3; that he frequently expressed the wish that I were with him. I had no idea that he was ill.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Rees says :—

My dream took place between midnight and 3 in the morning. William Edwards died *within that time*. My mother wrote her letter just after breakfast, when the death-bell was tolling for him. Just at the time I mentioned my dream to some friends. I received the letter either the next night or the morning after. It was generally a two-days' post. I was particular to inquire if the death took place the *night of my dream*; it did. I have not the date of the occurrence, but can get it, no doubt, from inquiring the date of the man's death. I had no object in making any note of it then. The friends, I believe, were Rev. G. L. Rees, Howden, Rev. J. W. Roberts (dead), and, I think, the Rev. T. S. Cunningham; I will ask him. I have on other occasions dreamt of deaths, but have not taken any trouble to investigate them. I have sometimes dreamt I saw a person dying, and then heard they were ill. The vividness and reality of the case I mention caused me to take such notice of it.

The Rev. G. L. M. Rees corroborates as follows :—

Howden, East Yorkshire.

June 11th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—The statement made by my brother, the Rev. W. D. W. Rees, relative to the death of William Edwards, is quite correct. I perfectly remember his relating to me a dream respecting his death, previous to the intelligence reaching us at college.

I am, yours faithfully,

G. L. M. REES.

L.—2314.—(possibly a clairvoyant dream.)

From Mr. Evans, Penalltan House, Richmond Road, Cardiff. The case

was procured for us by Miss A. G. M. Richards, of 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff, who writes :—

May 7th, 1885.

Mr. Evans is a man of undoubted veracity, and is known to a large circle of friends, most of whom have heard of his remarkable experience, both from himself and from his wife when living.

29th April, 1885.

The following is an account of a dream which was dreamt by the undersigned.

R. EVANS.

On Palm Sunday morning, 15 years ago, I awoke with a start about 4 o'clock, having dreamed that some one had been on the lawn in front of my house and taken away about 50 roots of wallflowers which I had in bloom, and that the only thing left was a portion of blossom which had dropped near the entrance gate.

I at once related my dream to my wife, and afterwards slept until about 8 o'clock in the morning, when I awoke through the servant girl rapping at my bedroom-door and shouting in an excited state, "A donkey has been on the lawn and eaten up all the flowers."

I immediately got out of bed and looked out of the window, and the first object I saw was the bit of blossom by the gate where I had previously seen it in my dream, and I found the border relieved of every root as I had dreamed.

I have, ever since, felt satisfied that if I had got out of bed and looked out of the window at the time I first awoke, I would have found the thief in the act of taking away the flowers.

I should say that the gate was locked, so that it was impossible for any animal to have done the mischief.

Mrs. Dyer, of 8, Pembroke Terrace, Cardiff, says :—

I have much pleasure in stating that Mrs. Evans frequently spoke to me of her husband's remarkable dream, adding that she had had it related to her before its verification.

[Mr. Evans may have been anxious about his flowers, and the chief point, evidentially, is the dropped "portion of blossom," which may, however, have got read back into the dream after it was actually seen.]

---

L.—2315.

Headington Hill, Oxford.

May, 1885.

On Saturday, May 5th, 1884, I drove into Oxford in an open landau with my little boy and his nurse. On reaching the covered Market I got out, leaving the nurse and child in the carriage, which remained in the High Street.

It was my intention to go to a shop in the middle of the market, but before I reached it I became suddenly convinced that something had

happened to the child, and that the carriage was being closed. The feeling was so strong that I stopped walking, and was about to turn round to go and see what had happened, when I felt I was foolishly fanciful, and for discipline's sake I decided to walk through the Market down a short street to Exeter College, where I had to leave a note, instead of driving there after my visit to the Market, as I had previously intended to do. I did this, and then called at the shop, walking very fast all the time. I was nervously anxious to see the carriage again.

When I reached the High Street I saw a crowd looking at the carriage, which was closed, and on reaching it found that my little boy had fallen out of it, on to the street, about 2 minutes after I had left him. The child had been much frightened, and a crowd having assembled the coachman closed the carriage.

HENRIETTA WILLEBT.

June 3rd.

As regards my own experience, I can honestly say I never had before or since such a strong feeling that something *was* happening as that which came upon me just after I left the carriage. I have had a presentiment that a thing would happen (not always realised), but never that it was happening.

H. W.

---

L.-777.—A<sup>n</sup> P<sub>n</sub>

From the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, 19, Heywood Street, Cheetham, Manchester

When I was in Liverpool, in 1872, I heard from my friend, the late Rev. W. W. Stamp, D.D., a remarkable story of the faculty of second sight possessed by the Rev. John Drake, of Arbroath, in Scotland. I visited Arbroath in 1874, and recounted to Mr. Drake the story of Dr. Stamp, which Mr. Drake assented to as correct, and he called his faculty "clairvoyance." Subsequently, in 1881, I had the facts particularly verified by Mrs. Hutcheon, who was herself the subject of this clairvoyance of Mr. Drake.

When the Rev. John Drake was minister of the Wesleyan Church at Aberdeen, Miss Jessie Wilson, the daughter of one of the principal lay office bearers in that church, sailed for India, to join the Rev. John Hutcheon, M.A., then stationed as a missionary at Bangalore, to whom she was under engagement to be married. Mr. Drake, one morning, came down to Mr. Wilson's place of business and said, "Mr. Wilson, I am happy to be able to inform you that Jessie has had a pleasant voyage, and is now safely arrived in India." Mr. Wilson said, "How do you know that, Mr. Drake?" to which Mr. Drake replied, "I saw it." "But," said Mr. Wilson, "it cannot be, for it is a fortnight too soon. The vessel has never made the voyage within a fortnight of the time it is now since Jessie sailed." To this Mr. Drake replied: "Now you jct it down in your book that John Drake called this morning and told you that Jessie has arrived in India this morning after a pleasant voyage." Mr. Wilson accordingly made the entry, which Mrs. Hutcheon assured me she saw, when she returned home, and that it ran thus: "Mr. Drake. Jessie arrived India morning of June 5th, 1860."

This turned out to have been literally the case. The ship had fair winds all the way, and made a quicker passage by a fortnight than ever she had made before.

The above account was sent by Mr. Macdonald to Mr. Drake for verification, and the following reply received from the Rev. Crawshaw Hargreaves :—

Wesleyan Manse, Arbroath.

*April 29th, 1885.*

MY DEAR SIR,—Mr. Drake is sorry your communication of the 2nd inst. has been so long unanswered ; but two days after receiving it he had a paralytic seizure, which has not only confined him to bed, but taken from him the use of one side.

He now desires me to answer your inquiries, and to say that the account, which you enclosed and which he now returns to you, is correct, except that he has no recollection of ever calling it “clairvoyance.” It was neither a “dream” nor a “vision,” but an impression that he received between the hours of 8 and 10 in the morning, when his mind was as clear as ever it was, an impression which he believes was given him by God for the comfort of the family. Moreover this impression was so clear and satisfactory to himself that when Mr. Wilson said “It cannot be,” Mr. Drake replied, “You jot it down,” as warnly as if his statement of any ordinary circumstance had been doubted by a friend.

Mr. Drake hopes these particulars will be enough for your purpose.— Believe me, dear sir, yours very truly,

C. HARGREAVES.

The following is Mrs. Hutcheon’s account of the incident, received quite independently :—

Weston-super-Mare.

*February 20th, 1885.*

The facts are simply these. I sailed for India on March 3rd, 1860, in the “Earl of Hardwicke,” a good, but slow, sailing-vessel. About 16 weeks were usually allowed for the voyage, so that we were not due in Madras till about the middle of June. Our voyage, however, being an uncommonly rapid one, we cast anchor in the roads of Madras on the morning of June 5th, taking our friends there quite by surprise.

On this same morning, my former pastor, an able and much esteemed Wesleyan minister, called on my father at an unusually early hour, when the following conversation passed :—

“Why, Mr. D., what takes you abroad at this early hour?”

“I have come to bring you good news, Mr. W. Your daughter, Jessie, has reached India this morning, safe and well.”

“That would indeed be good news, if we could believe it; but you forget that the ship is not due at Madras before the middle of June. Besides, how could you get to know that?”

“Such, however, is the fact,” replied Mr. D., and, seeing my father’s incredulous look, he added : “You do not believe what I say, Mr. W., but just take a note of this date.”

To satisfy him, my father wrote in his memo. book: "Rev. J. D. and Jessie. Tuesday, 5th June, 1860."

In due time, tidings confirming Mr. D.'s statement arrived, greatly to the astonishment of my friends. He, however, manifested no surprise, but simply remarked, "Had I not not known it for a fact, I certainly should not have told you of it."

These particulars I received by letter at the time, and on our return home, 7 years later, we heard it from my father's own lips. He is no longer with us, but the above are the plain facts as he gave them, and the little memo. in his handwriting, which he gave me as a curiosity, lies before me now.

J. H.

In answer to inquiries Mrs. Hutcheon adds:—

*March 23rd.*

I felt inclined to smile at the idea that I could possibly be mistaken as to a date so memorable in my life's history, and immediately preceding my marriage. However, to render assurance doubly sure, I have referred to both my husband's diary and my own, in each of which my landing in India on the 5th of June has an important place.

The entry made by my husband is as follows: "N.B.—5th June, 1860; a memorable day! The 'Hardwicke' has arrived. What a quick voyage! Miss Wilson and mission party well."

JESSIE HUTCHRON.

Mr. Macdonald tells us that he believes Mr. Drake had many such experiences, but that he found him so reticent that he despaired of getting an account of them from him.

Inquiries on this point elicited, we regret to say, the following reply from Mr. Hargreaves:—

*May 29th, 1885.*

Mr. Drake, of whom you inquire in your letter of the 22nd, died on the 18th inst. I have made inquiries but do not hear of any other circumstances that can be reported to your Society. If he had been spared I am sure Mr. Drake would have given all the help in his power to such a society, but he has gone from us.