

JOURNAL

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
New Members and Associates	153
Meeting of Council	153
General Meeting	164
Announcement of Meetings	158
Hallucination, Memory, and the Unconscious Self, by Hon. Boden Noel.	158
Cases received by the Literary Committee	171
CORRESPONDENCE:—Experiments in Thought-transference made November 23th, 1885.	183
Supplementary Library Catalogue	184

NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

CORRESPONDING MEMBER.

KANE, MAHADEVA VISHNU, B.A., Government High School, Dharwar, Bombay.

MEMBER.

EVETTS, BASIL T. A., 130, Gower Street, London, W.C.

ASSOCIATES.

ELLIS, JOHN EDWARD, M.P., Nottingham.

HARRISON, MRS. W., Clovelly Rectory, Bideford.

HOPPS, REV. J. PAGE, Lea Hurst, Leicester.

LEWIS, C. W. MANSEL, Stradey Castle, Llanelly, Carmarthenshire.

PRIBYTKOFF, V. I., 27, Troitzky péréoulouk, St. Petersburg.

RIGG, THOMAS S. G., B.A. (Syd. Univ.), General Post Office, Sydney.

SIBLY, F. A., B.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.

TURNBULL, MRS. PEVERIL A., Sandybrook Hall, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.

WALTER, REV. HENRY M., M.A., 2, Mandeville Place, Manchester Square, London, W.

WOODWARD, LIONEL M., Tintern House, Great Malvern.

MEETING OF COUNCIL.

A Council Meeting was held on the 2nd inst., the President in the chair, when Professor H. Sidgwick and Messrs. Alexander Calder, Walter H. Coffin, Edmund Gurney, Richard Hodgson, F. W. H. Myers, Frank Podmore, Henry A. Smith, and J. Herbert Stack were present.

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

On the proposition of the President, Mahádeva Vishnu Káné, B.A., Head Master of the Government High School, Dharwar, Bombay, was elected a Corresponding Member of the Society.

One new Member and ten new Associates, whose names and addresses appear on the preceding page, were also elected.

Several resignations of Members and Associates who from various reasons desired at the close of the year to withdraw from the Society, were accepted.

It was announced that Mr. Edward R. Pease desired to resign his position as a Member of the Council at the close of the year.

The usual cash account for the past month was presented, and the necessary accounts passed for payment.

A donation of £1 from Miss Curtis, an Honorary Associate, was reported, and directed to be acknowledged with thanks.

A Statement of the Receipts and Expenditure for the year ending the 31st of December was also presented to the Council, which showed that while there had been again a large increase in the income of the Society from subscriptions and the sale of publications, it had still been inadequate to meet the needful expenditure. The receipts from these sources had been supplemented by some small donations, but mainly by the continued liberality of the late President, Professor H. Sidgwick. The whole question of the finances, with special reference to certain items, was referred to the Finance Committee, with the request that it would draw up a scheme of expenditure for the coming year, and submit it to the Council.

The Annual Business Meeting of the Members of the Society, at which the usual audited Financial Statement will be presented, will be held, as arranged, at the Society's Rooms, 14, Dean's Yard, S.W., on Friday, the 29th inst., at 4 p.m. The Council will meet previously on the same afternoon.

GENERAL MEETING.

A General Meeting of the Society was held at the rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, S.W., on the evening of the 2nd inst. The President occupied the chair.

Mr. Edmund Gurney read a paper on "Collective Hallucinations." He pointed out that, though these phenomena had not been recognised by psychologists, there was a large amount of evidence for their occurrence; and they might be explained as instances of thought-transference. It was conceivable that even a purely subjective hallucination might spread in this way by infection; though no doubt most of the cases where this explanation had been put forward were cases merely of collective *illusion*, where a real object had been misinterpreted in the same sense by several spectators, generally owing to some verbal suggestion. In most, however, of the examples which the Literary Committee had collected, the original hallucination seemed

to be probably *telepathic*, and due to the contemporaneous crisis of some absent person; and in such cases it was sometimes conceivable that the absent person had influenced two (or more) percipient *directly*; while sometimes it seemed more natural to suppose that the impression had been propagated from one of these percipients to another. According to this theory if the reality of impressions from *deceased* persons were ever solidly established, sensory hallucinations so caused might be communicable from one person to another in just the same way.

The President said that he had listened with pleasure to the able and interesting paper by Mr. Gurney. Before going further he should like to refer for a few moments to the progress that had been made by the Society during the year that had just closed. He had been gratified at finding that it now numbered 643 members, being an increase of over 120 since this time last year. He thought that the success of the Society had been in great measure due to the fact that, in his opinion, the relation between Science and Philosophy had in its researches been just as it should be. It was his conviction that their continued prosperity depended on the legitimate claims of both being duly recognised, and he thought this was being done by Mr. Myers and Mr. Gurney in the special work in which they were engaged. The fact of Telepathy having been established beyond doubt, it was being investigated in many different directions. Mr. Gurney's analysis of a number of cases of collective hallucination might play an important part in this investigation.

Some persons, the President continued, would like to go on a little faster than the Society seemed to be moving. His own wonder was that so much had been done. Ordinary science did not make rapid progress. The work of the chemist, for instance, was exceedingly slow. Men of science have, however, been too ready to build dead walls. It has been suggested that this Society had been doing something of the same kind itself. But he felt quite certain that no such stigma would attach to it. The Society had been loyal to the truth in its youth, and he believed it would remain so as it grew older. He did not believe in any such thing as a dead wall in science. The intellectual landscape was in that respect as boundless as the physical. But the work must be carried on laboriously. There is no royal road to any kind of knowledge. The links of connection must be maintained in every step taken. It will be found to have been a great advantage that telepathy should be worked up in every possible way, ever bearing in mind that there is no such thing as a dead wall. In concluding his remarks, the President said that he considered that the Society had made as great progress as could possibly have been expected. He now invited remarks from anyone in the meeting.

Mr. F. W. H. Myers said that although he usually found himself in accordance with Mr. Gurney on points of this kind, he saw great difficulties in the theory which had just been broached,—explaining collective hallucinations, of telepathic origin, by a communication of the telepathic impact to some one primary percipient, and then the infection of other persons in his neighbourhood with the hallucination which that primary percipient's mind had developed. We had thus to assume not only that the death of one man could generate a hallucinatory percept in another,—which the evidence sufficiently proved,—but also that this hallucinatory percept itself possessed a power of infecting other minds without verbal suggestion. This infectiousness seemed to need corroboration from non-telepathic cases, before we could assume it as operative in telepathic cases. But there was no evidence that the hallucinations of the insane were ever communicated either amongst themselves or to sane persons by infection without verbal suggestion, although insane delusions were often communicated to others by verbal suggestion. Mr. Gurney's cases of the supposed spreading of a hallucinatory image—not of telepathic origin—from one sane person to another seemed of a very dubious character. Most of them were cases of what was taken at the time to be the voice of a dead person. But he (the speaker) considered that the possibility or otherwise of communications with the so-called dead was an entirely open question, and that until the evidence had been thoroughly sifted we were bound to preserve a *bonâ fide* neutrality, and not to treat such narratives as though the interpretation which the narrators placed upon them were out of the question. He felt strongly the danger of which the President had spoken,—the danger that those who believed themselves to have attained to some truth new to science—such as telepathy—should build a wall round this new extension of territory, and refuse to look beyond it, in the same way as other men often refused to look beyond the limit to which the accredited sciences had already attained. For his own part, he preferred to seek the explanation of these collective veridical hallucinations in the direction of *clairvoyance*. In the simplest telepathic experiment—the transference of a word or number from one mind to another—the *percipient's* mind was probably in reality more active than the so-called *agent's*, for it was, of course, easy to think of the word, but to most people impossible to divine it. And throughout the series of spontaneous telepathic cases we might trace instances of this *activity of percipience*—as when a man, either in dream or waking life, seemed to himself to be transported into a distant scene and witnessing it from a particular standpoint. Now we certainly need not suppose that he was in this distant scene in any material fashion, that there was anything transported thither which could reflect light or

act on the ponderable world. But it was conceivable that a centre of psychical energy might be thus translated, and might form a *phantasmogenetic radiant-point*—a point in apparent space, that is to say, from whence hallucinations might be generated, which should thus directly reach all or some of the persons present. Support seemed to be given to this view by *reciprocal* cases; cases, that is to say, where something was perceived at each end of the telepathic line, where A felt himself to be in B's home, and saw what B was doing, while B on his side perceived A's phantom in the very place where A felt himself to be. Apologising for the obscurity of this theory and for the trivial character of an illustrative example given, Mr. Myers concluded by saying that so long as we were content to think vaguely of the great primary conceptions with which these discussions were bringing us into somewhat closer contact, they appeared simple and sublime; while rudimentary attempts to give precision and actuality to our thought were likely to seem grotesque, trivial, and obscure. Yet, in other regions of inquiry men had found that, after passing through a period of similarly tentative groping among "beggarly elements," they had been able to reconstitute great conceptions in a simplicity and sublimity founded more firmly than before on observation and fact.

Mr. R. Pearsall Smith (of Philadelphia), a Member of the Council of the American Society for Psychical Research, congratulated the Association on its marked success in gathering together so many men of high scientific reputation; on the careful and yet courageous investigations, and on the marked talent shown in its papers. He specially spoke of the number of intellectual young men who had been recently saved by its thorough investigations and masterly Report from the influence of a fascinating imposture, a work which could not have been accomplished save by an organised society. The affiliated Association in America is composed of the best representative men of science, whose work will in due time tell upon parallel lines in the development of psychic research. He believed that the Society was building "better than it knew," and that the influence of its work was spreading throughout the whole Anglo-Saxon world and beyond, opening up, in its final results, great "truths deep seated in our mystic frame," which bear vitally on human welfare and happiness. He could not see how any delusive phenomena could long survive the calcium light of such accurate, systematic, continuous observation and record, or how what truths were behind real phenomena could escape being brought out into the light.

Mr. Douglas B. W. Sladen asked permission to mention an occurrence which had happened to himself. Some years ago, when in Australia, he dreamed one night that his father's house in England was on fire. The dream woke him up. He observed the time, about 1.30 a.m., roused his wife and told her of his dream, and also, there and then,

made an entry in his diary. Six weeks afterwards he learned by letter from England that a fire had occurred exactly as he had dreamed. But there was this curious circumstance. After allowing for difference of longitude, about $9\frac{1}{2}$ hours, it still seemed as if his dream was several hours subsequent to the time of the actual occurrence. It had struck him whether the time of his dream corresponded with the hour at which his father might have been writing to him the next day, when his father's thoughts were centred both on the fire and on himself. But this he had not ascertained. However, the fact remained that the circumstances of the fire were transmitted to him visibly at a distance of 11,000 miles.*

The meeting then assumed a conversational character.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS.

The Annual Business Meeting of the Members of the Society will be held at the Society's Rooms, 14, Dean's Yard, S.W., on Friday, the 29th of January, at 4 p.m. The next General Meeting of the Society will be held on Saturday, the 6th of March.

HALLUCINATION, MEMORY, AND THE UNCONSCIOUS SELF.

BY HON. RODEN NOEL.

As my strictures on Messrs. Von Hartmann, Gurney, and Myers were published in *Light*, and as it must be a little difficult for our readers to judge of them from the extracts which my friend Mr. Myers has made in the course of his reply (*Journal*, December), it seems well, by permission of the editor, to say a few words here. I hardly think Mr. Myers has attempted to meet my objections; he would rather seem to have made, as it were, casual darts at my papers here and there, and fished out extracts almost at random from them, somewhat as a boy makes darts at a dish of snapdragon. I fear, however, he has not approved of my plums, and I hope he has not burnt his fingers! But this method is perhaps a little bit hard on one's objections,—though I am glad he gives me credit for "earnestness," if for no other good quality. And while I am not disposed to begrudge him his claim to greater knowledge of physiology than I can pretend to, I am sure he will pardon me for

* On further inquiry we learn from Mr. Sladen that there was a discrepancy of a few days between the time of the fire and his dream experience. He writes that "the day on which his father wrote to him was the 22nd of December, 1881, and the date of entry in the diary was 1 a.m. of December 23rd, though entered not unnaturally at the foot of December 22nd, after all the events of that day." And "as 1 a.m. in Victoria on December 23rd corresponds with 3.30 p.m. on December 22nd in England, and as the Australian mail closes in branch offices at 5 p.m., nothing is more likely than that his father should have been writing to him just an hour or so before the mail closed."

retorting that I in my turn could wish my esteemed opponent just a trifle more fully equipped in metaphysics and psychology for his arduous undertaking.

Because I myself believe that philosophy (in this sense) can alone furnish the clue we need to guide us through this labyrinth of occult and unfamiliar facts, which the admirably patient and difficult investigations of Mr. Myers himself and his working colleagues of our Society (in collaboration with French and other "researchers") are gradually revealing, or, at any rate, reviving. And yet I own that I deem it a somewhat serious charge which he has brought against me—this of ignorance of the most elementary laws of physiology—and that partly because no man can afford to be ignorant of the results of the best thought of his time, even with respect to matters only remotely related to the topic under discussion—partly also because I have in *Light* actually entered, though only a little way, upon that physiological line of argument, on which the peculiar theories of the writers under consideration necessarily invited me to enter. And though I cannot, and do not, as Mr. Myers rightly surmises, pretend to be a physiological expert of the same calibre as my friends the English authors of these very ingenious and intricate psycho-physiological hypotheses, which are, from their (somewhat startling) originality, even compelling their authors to favour us with quite a new language of their own, yet I do claim a little of that *elementary* knowledge which nearly every educated man now possesses; indeed, I have formerly been much interested in this particular science of physiology, and have read several standard treatises upon it. Moreover, though I have, as I say, partly through inability, and partly through failure to understand that physiology has more than a remote connection with the topics under discussion, entered only a little way into this question, yet I fail to see that Mr. Myers in his answer (if, indeed, he intended his remarks for answer) has convicted me of such entire ignorance of the rudiments of the science as he apparently imputes to me in the course of his remarks.

As instances of "misapprehensions of a somewhat rudimentary kind" (misapprehensions, as it appears from the context, of *physiological* discoveries), I am surprised to find that Mr. Myers cites my suggestion that in madness the patient may be really conversing with some alien intelligences out of the flesh, as he supposes himself to be doing, and that in dreams we may sometimes be really conversing with those persons we imagine ourselves to meet. But if Mr. Myers had done me the honour to read me attentively he would have seen that I acknowledge the difficulty of supposing that we do so when they are, so far as they can remember, not thinking or dreaming of us, or do not conceive themselves to be in the situations belonging to our dream (thus Mr. Myers'

fun about Bradlaugh and the woolsack does not touch me)! But as Mr. Myers is himself, unless I err, partly responsible for the statement, founded on testimony received by our own Society, that a dreamer is peculiarly open to "telepathic" impressions from other spirits far away from him in the flesh, I scarcely see the force of his caveat that my suggestion about dreams and madmen shows the danger of not knowing more about physiology, and is a reversion to the "crude explanations of a pre-scientific age." For if many dreams are admitted by Mr. Myers and his friends to be due to the telepathic influence of spirits (I thank our researchers for that valuable discovery of the fact "telepathy," and for the convenient word), and if their great knowledge of physiology has nothing to say against that admission, I fail to see why it should have so much more to say against a suggestion that *all* dreams may possibly be due to a similar cause. The fundamental mystery, which is yet a fact, is the transmission of impressions, or ideas, from mind to mind. The study of occasions or attendant circumstances, though interesting, helps us not at all to explain the fact, nor perception. My argument as regards dreams and hallucinations (more fully given in *Light*) is briefly, that they are for the most part as vivid and apparently sensible as our normal waking perceptions, that they are felt and believed by us at the time to be as objective and external to ourselves as the bodies and objects we perceive when wide awake; the only difference being that our perception in the former case is unshared by persons in the normal waking condition. Upon that I remark that if they were in *our* condition, or sphere, we should probably perceive the same, or similar, objects, but as we are not in their sphere or condition, we also fail to perceive and confirm the reality of *their* objects. Does Mr. Myers think, then, that his, or any one's knowledge of physiology *explains* normal perception? I can only say that Professor Huxley, for one, does not agree with him, and that perhaps no physiologist, who is also a metaphysician, agrees with him. Mr. Gurney, I think, does not. But if physiology cannot explain normal perception, I do not understand why it should be more successful with hallucinations or dreams. Here you have a wave of a certain length in a supposed ether (the whole being confessed to be only a good working hypothesis), impinging on certain nerves, whose vibrations, or changes of some sort, nobody knows exactly what, are communicated to certain nervous centres—does Mr. Myers think that throws any real light on the very simplest sensation of green or blue, let alone the perception of an ordered landscape? If he does, I do not know of any *philosophical* physiologist who agrees with him. Nor again does the other fact (which I am as far from denying as I am of denying that this correlation in normal perception is a fact) that when I see a landscape or person in my sleep, and talk with that person—these being experiences

fully as vivid, and seemingly real, as the former, or when a madman is hallucinated with the same vivid impression of reality, there is probably a nervous change passing downward from the ideational centres to special sense-centres—nor again, I say, does this other probable fact throw any more light upon the dream, or hallucination-experience than the former correlated physiological fact threw upon normal sensation or perception. And let Mr. Myers be able to pass ever so stiff an examination in physiology, biology, anatomy, entomology, botany, or astronomy (all sciences of extreme interest to myself, as well as to him), I do not think he will ever find that either of them throw any real light upon psychology and metaphysics—[except, indeed, *indirectly*, for all is in correlation, nothing isolated.]. But what makes us admit the existence of a world external to ourselves? Why, only common-sense, instinct, that very “intuition” about which Mr. Myers expresses himself so contemptuously. Now I argue that the same common-sense, intuition, or instinct, assures the dreamer, or the madman, that he also is in presence of a world external to himself. And I do not quite see how a rudimentary, or even a perfected, acquaintance with Mr. Myers’ pet science is going to dispose of his intuition, unless it is also going to dispose of the waking man’s perception—especially since, as I have argued in *Light*, the sense-centres are admitted by physiologists to be affected in these other cases also, though it be from the cortical centres outward. If it is replied that others do not share the same experience, and so confirm it, my rejoinder is that the dreamer does not share *our* (waking) experience any more than we share *his*. Each is surrounded by his own external world according to his condition, and others in the same condition are likely to share the same, or at least a similar experience. I know enough to know that physiologists do not profess to be able always to discover a chemical, or other peculiarity of brain-structure in cases of madness; but if they were able, I should still maintain that, since their science cannot explain *normal* perception, neither can it any better explain *abnormal*. But I am, to use Mr. Myers’ expression, “in earnest” with my idealism; and I am not at all sure that Mr. Myers, though he explains that he also is an idealist, is as much in earnest with that as he is with his physiology. For he says that “neither Mr. Noel nor I am likely to prove this interesting thesis.” But I do not hold my idealism on these easy terms. I consider it quite as certain and “provable” as physiology.

Even an elementary course of physiology should have shown Mr. Myers that our sensations are subjective, that colour is not in a dead material object, because it is a feeling; and then a little elementary philosophy will show him that when felt as a colour—as blue or green—it needs to be discriminated, identified, distinguished, compared by our implicitly self-identifying Ego. And that is still more true of a

perception. In order to form part of a system, or order of experience, it needs comparison with other percepts present, or remembered, and united in one self-identified succession, or system of experience, only constituted such according to certain permanent moulds or forms of sense, and thought, space and time, and other categories. This is no speculative theory—(Mr. Myers, curiously enough, seems to object to speculative theories, though his own are so ingenious)—but it is the most rudimentary mental philosophy. Surely, since Berkeley, Hume, and Kant, it is impossible to ignore, or affect to treat it as doubtful, if one has at all understood the problem, and the solution offered by philosophy? Now, as I believe that we, by our mental constitution, give “laws” to nature, and can only comprehend her according to the laws of our own knowing faculty, why Mr. Myers attributes to me the odd notion that “phenomena” are “real,” but not “laws,” I cannot even remotely guess! “Phenomena” are only possible and conceivable *by and through* “laws,” or uniformity of operation. But what I maintain is that the ideal *is* the real, and the real *is* the ideal. From what I have said it must be obvious that there can be no real out of the ideal; out of minds, therefore, for only in and by minds can the ideal process of experience, which alone makes phenomena possible, take place at all. Percepts, or objects can only be in and through some consciously arranged, and implicitly self-identified order, or system of experience, which involves *one* Ego at least. If common-sense, or intuition insists that it is also *outside* this Ego, say myself, then assuredly I have here shown that it must be in another, or many other similar conscious Egos. How “physiology” is going to affect this conclusion I cannot at all imagine.

Then again as to memory. Mr. Myers also classes my theory of memory as another “misapprehension of a somewhat rudimentary kind,” and the context shows he means a *physiological* misapprehension! From this I suppose Mr. Myers really thinks that what physiological psychology tells us about nervous changes, or motions in the ready-made channels of least resistance explains memory. I am quite aware of what this school has said, but it never struck me as explaining memory at all, whether my own theory be right or wrong. That seems to me to explain it, not of course fully, but a little better than other theories. Does not Mr. Myers see that you might have the same, or similar neural changes for ever, and even if you got their psychical correlates (but Mr. Myers does not know *how* you get these, or why there should be such a correlation, for, as I said in *Light*, the dance of molecules in the nervous systems of Goethe and Homer does not explain the “Iliad” or “Faust,” any more than Mr. Myers’ own algebraical formula for revelations— $XX' + HH'$ —explains the Bible), even, I say, if you got their psychical correlates, you would not be a bit nearer

to memory? For memory does not consist in *the identity* of nervous changes, or even of their corresponding concepts, but in *our recognition of them* as the same. These nervous changes themselves, or even their psychological correlates, being isolated and successive, *cannot identify themselves, compare themselves with their own past.* That needs a one and self-identical Mr. Myers, an Ego, a person. Each nervous change itself, as we conceive it, and each psychological correlate, absolutely needs and implies that. Memory, though so commonplace and constant a phenomenon, is about the most mystical and difficult of all phenomena to understand. You try and remember what is not in consciousness, and yet directly that flashes into it you recognise it for what you were seeking, and for the same image or notion as has been in your mind before. That involves a self-identifying Ego, the same through all changes of experience, and implicitly knowing itself to be the same, comparing the present with the past experience, and pronouncing it either identical or different. But if you want to know what memory is, you must carefully examine and reflect on your conscious experience; you may, of course, also dissect, or vivisect somebody's brain if you like; only the brain seems to be one thing, and my remembrance of a past fact quite another. Now, I argue that if there was an external object, person, or thing affecting your first perception, and if your memory assures you that you are now conscious of the same thing or person, that thing or person must be now again affecting you. But you are also aware that it is the *past* of that person or thing which you now remember; the past is restored, therefore, and become present, but this (which seems to me like a miracle) is only possible, I suppose, if the past has not perished; yet in time it has perished; hence it must be out of its *transcendent* being, above and beyond time, that it now affects you. That argument may be unsound, but I do not see how it argues insufficient knowledge of *physiology* to maintain it, nor do I think the instance of the squib a *reductio ad absurdum* of it, since I regard all phenomena as in their essential being transcendent, squibs included! But then I am "in earnest."

With regard to the "more complicated confusion" attributed to me on p. 124, I am at a loss to conceive on what kind of misunderstanding the charge may be founded. On p. 516 of *Light* what I am referring to is not sensations, but thoughts, and these are usually located, even by advanced physiologists, I have understood, in the cortical centres, and not in the muscles. But really Mr. Myers must have a portentous idea of my ignorance if he supposes me unaware of the fact he mentions of the girl remembering a tune, so to speak, with her fingers!

But this leads me to remark that Mr. Myers has apparently darted at the side issues raised in my papers, and, seemingly, has wished rather in his turn to pillory my theories than to answer my objections.

What I expressly urged against him in *Light* (though Mr. Myers is curiously wrong in his allegation that the greater part of my essay was directed against him! whereas it was chiefly a reply to Von Hartmann, and in part to Mr. Gurney) was that the instances of this habit-organised, or secondary reflex action, and those of our behaviour when absent-minded, or attending to something else, which he brings to support his theory of an unconscious secondary self, as explaining a great proportion of the phenomena of Spiritism, attributed by Spiritists to intelligences out of the body, other than those of the medium and circle, or the psychographic writer, are really not to the point.

Because (1) here there is nothing organised for reflex action by inheritance, or by habit and long practice; (2) in psychography, or in watching slate writing through Eglinton, or at a Spiritist séance, the persons concerned are not commonly attending strenuously to something else, or absolutely given over to a day dream. They are, on the contrary, either watching keenly (perhaps suspiciously) the present proceedings, or at all events in a frame of more or less blank, and expectant attention to the matter in hand.

And yet under these circumstances occur the extraordinary phenomena of slate writing, or those other extraordinary phenomena happening at Spiritist séances—I mean, of course, granting them genuine). The special instance I brought forward as inconsistent with Mr. Myers' hypothesis was that of Mr. and Mrs. Newnham, detailed in our "Proceedings," and commented on as a proof of his theory by Mr. Myers (I also brought forward the Clelia anagrams); and I may observe here that Mr. Myers is mistaken in supposing that my comments upon the very interesting experiments in mesmerism detailed by him in the *Fortnightly* were intended for an interpretation of his opinions (I know how totally our opinions differ); they were my own interpretation of his facts. But though Mr. Myers tells us he believes in a transcendent self, I do not quite know what use he makes of it, if not to afford a refuge, so to speak, for the incubating ideas which are to enter, but have not yet entered the conscious current of a particular personal experience: that is one great use of it for me, though I assert that these cannot enter in two full, parallel, uncommunicating, simultaneous conscious currents. The transcendent Ego has itself blocked the way for one by providing another at a given moment. If we ever attend strenuously to more than one thing at a time, we are aware of it then, and remember it afterwards. I criticised particularly the "sub-conscious" department of this perhaps somewhat many-chambered, and elastic theory, in reference to the Newnham case. For the writers seem now to maintain absolute, and now only relative unconsciousness in their secondary self, as if they didn't quite know on which leg to stand. I rather wish they would finally decide on one alternative or

the other. Thus too Hartmann seems to oscillate between absolute unconsciousness, and *an even fuller* "masked somnambule," or clairvoyant consciousness in this secondary self (in the latter sense Mr. Massey interprets him, at least). But I shall here confine myself chiefly to Mr. Myers and Mr. Gurney (in this last December paper Mr. Myers appears to prefer Mr. Gurney's "sub-conscious" view). Now that, I think, is quite inapplicable to this case. Because, as I have said, it is impossible that Mrs. Newnham herself can have been only sub-conscious of the written questions of her husband, and of the relevant answers that were written to them through planchette, while yet her mind was not strenuously occupied with *some other subject*, or abandoned to aimless reverie, but, so far as appears from the printed account, was blankly and expectantly attentive. If such a process had taken place in her mind at all, reading and comprehending questions put by another, and intelligently replying to them, though in a peculiar fashion quite uncharacteristic of herself (her attention not being occupied otherwise), she could not have been sub-conscious, only semi-conscious of it; the work would not have been done, moreover, unless she was fully conscious; and if she *was fully* conscious of it, and yet *not* conscious of it *at the same time*, that is the self-contradictory hypothesis which I am sure no knowledge of "physiology," however advanced, could ever make me, for one, content to swallow.

I tried to show, moreover, that *absolutely* unconscious intelligence is an absurd and self-contradictory idea—also that a *transcendent* consciousness did not seem applicable to such a case—but now I will confine myself to a little further brief comment on this sub-conscious self theory, which, I gather from his present paper, Mr. Myers now wishes to put forward as his own finally authorised version of his hypothesis of an unconscious secondary self. But unless we are going to use the words, "conscious" and "unconscious" self, in some peculiar sense of our own, I really do not think there is much need to define them, since they connote ideas so fundamental, universal, and primary. I complained in *Light*, however, that the writers criticised did not seem to have realised clearly what a self (as universally and by common-sense understood) actually does imply, for else they could hardly have invented these hypotheses. *Definitions* of the most primary and universally understood fact of experience *consciousness* are perhaps a little dangerous, as they may possibly tend to *limit* the meaning too much. *Unconscious*, of course, unless specially defined, is just the negation, excluding opposite of conscious. But Mr. Myers says, "by an experiment in definition" *he* will mean by "conscious" "memorable," that may be remembered. Yet, though sensation is certainly conscious, it is not always rememberable—at least at once—though, ultimately, I believe it is. The faintest sensation, if a "sensation," or feeling at all,

must be, as I have said, *implicitly discriminated*, and therefore implies a one implicitly self-identifying Ego behind it. However, if Mr. Myers means by "unconscious" faint, and practically unrememberable sensations, then I say that these would clearly be incompetent to perform the work attributed to the intelligence who wrote automatically through Mrs. Newnham; for that comprehended and appraised the questions of her husband, carefully and deliberately adapting answers to them through the muscles of Mrs. Newnham. That was the work of a complex, *remembering*, matured self-conscious thought, not of vague, unrememberable sensations.

Yet Mrs. Newnham had her train of thought and observation too, going on *at the same time*, and she assures us that of this other train of thought she knew nothing, till she saw it written down. That, Mr. Myers thinks, belonged, however, as he now says, to a "second focus of consciousness in the one mind" of Mrs. Newnham. And he adds that his position is this: "One such focus of potential (not necessarily of actual) consciousness may acquire knowledge, or perform operations not acquired or performed by another focus, and communicate such knowledge, &c., to the other in various ways." Now, I must repeat that this is distinctly a description of two selves, not of one. You may call two selves two foci, and say they belong to one mind, but that does not make the *fact* otherwise. Mr. Myers says that I use words as "metaphysical counters." On the contrary, I claim that in my use of the words "self" and "conscious" I simply follow the meaning assigned to them by universal consent, and common usage. That is true when I say the conscious can never identify itself with the unconscious; they being states absolutely exclusive of one another—by that I mean, in their commonly understood sense. But when you come to give a peculiar meaning of your own to the term "unconscious," and make it mean "faintly conscious," then I would no longer assert this—*far from it*—though Mr. Myers indeed asserts it when he says that the very faintly conscious cannot be remembered. That I shall totally deny, if he means never. I contend that feeling, if it be feeling at all, must have some character (however vaguely) attributed to it at the moment, and that this implies *some* attention—when the neural process has been long enough to accompany (not, observe, to cause) *any* rise above the threshold of consciousness, expressing myself in the terms of that particular psychological school; and if there has been any attention, the feeling may always be remembered on the fit occasion. But Mr. Myers must be talking of vague percepts, or notions; else his remarks would be totally irrelevant to the discussion. Now these imply indisputably some attention, or they could never have been formed and distinguished at all, and so they certainly are "memorable." However, my present point is that these faint experiences gather round *no* "focus of

mentation" whatsoever, unless it be the one focus of the implicitly self-identifying Ego, or self. I know that they do so, whether "memorable" at a given moment or not—for else they could never have been conscious at all, never have risen above the threshold of consciousness, that is, of ours. What other "second focus of mentation" does Mr. Myers think they gather around? If we must put—and we must in these discussions—the intuition of common-sense into philosophical language, then certainly what everybody who has not a theory to defend means by a "self" is a given order of experience that is capable of subjective or inward identification as belonging to *one and the same* focus of consciousness, however various the successive details of which it is composed. That one focus is you, or I. But if there are *simultaneous* details of experience *not so identifiable at the time by me, or you, as yours or mine*, then common-sense, as I believe, refuses to call these mine or yours. True, if they are very faintly realised, they may be only implicitly, not self-consciously, so identified, and they may hardly be "memorable," in Mr. Myers' sense, *at any given moment*, therefore are apparently lost for a time, out of the same identical consciousness of you or me. Yet the very class of recent experiments with which Mr. Myers is familiar, in hypnotic and other cognate conditions, should have made him particularly shy of deciding that, because a detail does not recur to memory now, therefore it was never in a given conscious experience at all—for he knows repeated instances in which it does recur upon special conditions being fulfilled. There may be alternating personalities gathered up into a fuller and more transcendent Ego. And the very differentia of these apparently *unattached* details is that they gather round no focus at all, except in so far as they gather round the one ordinary focus (or lapse into the transcendent). But round what other simultaneous focus are they held to gather? If they do gather round such a second focus, then I contend that they never could have been mine, or yours, at all; they did, in fact, gather round mine or yours, and, therefore, did not round any other. If I had no experience of them, then they were never mine, but belonged from the very first to someone else. They were, in fact, so vaguely and faintly and implicitly gathered round the one focus, which is the one self of you, or me, that Mr. Myers can fancy they were gathered round a *second* focus of experience—only, he adds, belonging to the *same* self, you or me. Not, I reply, if it was conscious and simultaneous, because a second focus of conscious experience *means* (according to common-sense and common parlance) a different self or person, and not the same.

But, further, such unmemorable, and isolated vague experiences could never have done the work actually performed by the Newnham intelligence, a work of mature thought, reacting upon other mature thoughts presented to it. Yet directly these faint, isolated, what Mr.

Myers calls "unconscious" feelings rose sufficiently above the threshold of consciousness in Mrs. Newnham's mind *as to be capable of doing what was done*, they could no longer, even according to Mr. Myers' own showing, have gathered round the second focus, around which he thinks faint, unmemorable, in his sense unconscious, feelings do gather (though, in fact, in so far as such vague, isolated, because unorganised, unsystematised feelings do not gather round *one* focus of experience they clearly do not gather about any), but they would then of necessity gather around the first, *i.e.*, Mrs. Newnham's ordinary, fully matured self-conscious focus of experience—which is precisely what she assures us they did not. And, therefore, I conclude that this intelligence was not then, never was before, and never will be afterwards, *her* intelligence, but was, is, and always will be someone else's, *i.e.*, that of some third intelligence, using her brain and body to communicate with her and her husband—which is the conclusion of Spiritism. Mr. Myers will have to prove not only that faint unmemorable feelings may gather round a second focus of mentation, and yet belong to the same person, though he knows nothing of it, but also that a full-blown, mature, self-identifying, self-remembering system of consciousness may do so; and yet that is precisely what he now disclaims being supposed to mean! He talks, indeed, of "a second potentially (not necessarily actually) conscious focus of mentation." What does he mean? A "potentially" conscious intelligence could certainly not have done the work attributed to it. He must mean either *semi-conscious*, or unconscious. Both alternatives are inadmissible, as I have shown. He talks also of "ideas which have already attained an unusual degree of force and elaboration," being "transferred from the unconscious to the conscious mind." What are unconscious ideas, and whose? Only Von Hartmann, and Mr. Myers know! If he means *semi-conscious*, then these cannot have obtained much "force or elaboration," else they would have become *fully* conscious before, that being just what is meant by fully conscious. And then they were either in Mrs. Newnham, or in someone else—not in her, out of her, and in her at the same moment. This is what I mean by "both confounding the persons, and dividing the substance." For this intelligence must have had all our categories, or fixed formal modes of thought behind it, by help of its own past remembered experience, understanding, remembering, putting together, Mr. Newnham's questions, besides seeing them written, and then, by help of the same remembered and compared experience, putting relevant answers together, and writing them down. Whose was it? Now, really, physiological knowledge, however advanced, cannot help us to prove that two and two do *not* make four, that two straight lines *can* enclose a space, that every effect need not have an adequate cause to produce it, or that it is extremely possible for the same thing to be and not to be at the

same moment. These I have always supposed hitherto, and others like unto them, are not physiological, but mathematical, and metaphysical questions—however unfashionable the philosophy of first principles or metaphysics, and psychology, properly so-called, the philosophy of our subjective experience, may have become since a dark and “pre-scientific age.”

Again, to assert this developed and capable intelligence *absolutely* unconscious is, to my mind, equally absurd and self-contradictory, and you would then have positively no evidence whatsoever for any other consciousness than your own. Mr. Myers then might be an unconscious cerebrator only for me, and I the same for him. There remains Mr. Massey's hypothesis, which seems to me the only philosophical one, other than that of Spiritism; yet even this, I think, though so largely agreeing with him in many respects, will not hold water in the present instance. That is, briefly, the hypothesis of a *transcendent Ego*, including the normal and contemporary experience of Mrs. Newham, but this latter not including it. Now I hold to this transcendent eternal Ego myself as necessary to account for, and give a basis to, our changing and transitory experience. But in proportion as it is eternal and transcendent we can, *ex hypothesi*, only know it as *it manifests itself to us from moment to moment, successively in time*. And so, various as it may be, and infinitely different at different periods, we still know it to be *ours*—for this it is transcendently, *in our real essential being*. But once let a mature experience, temporary, phenomenal, come into consciousness *simultaneously* with another, and yet fail to be identified by us as ours, I hold that common-sense must declare it to belong to *another* person, or system of experience, that is, to *another transcendent* self, and not to ours. Here, however, the radical difference between us is that Mr. Massey admits of no absolute or transcendent individualities at all—he is a Vedantist *pur sang*.

But if you go in for literally unconscious cerebration, then, being “in earnest” with my idealism, I must own that I can only regard brain and organism as conceptions in a mind, or in many; when, and so far as not in ours, then in and through the minds of other personal intelligences. The momentous fact of the correlation of nervous with psychical process, and the nourishment of the former by the great world without, can to my idealism only mean the correlation of our psychical life with, and its nourishment by, the world of intelligences external to our own. Depend upon it spirit-consciousness is the reality, and the brain only phenomenon, solid-seeming though it be. If “the unconscious brain” is able, in the inspirations of genius, “to pour,” as Mr. Myers thinks, “a stream more than usually nutritious into the conscious channel,” to me that can only mean a conscious

stream of this character from surrounding intelligences, and from the transcendent Ego, which is one with the Divine, creative, universal ideas. An "unconscious brain" can pour nothing into a conscious mind! And to speak of a "morbid excitement in part of a madman's brain" making him fancy he sees and hears devils, is to pay oneself with words. The "morbid excitement," like alcoholic blood-poisoning, may enable him to see and hear them—that is all it can do.

As to what Mr. Myers says of cruder conceptions belonging to a pre-scientific age, I confess I have always felt it extremely improbable that men everywhere, and from the beginning of time, should have been all wrong, and that only a few years ago they should first have begun to be all right. Worse than foolish, indeed, must he be who would depreciate the results of scientific discovery, deeply interesting and momentous as they are. I only object when Science affects either to deny, or to explain away things out of her own province, or distasteful to her own prophets, because disturbing crude inductions made upon insufficient data. I hold that a way ought to be found of conciliating the new facts with the old theories, modified. It was right the age should direct so much attention to physical phenomena. But let us not lose our spiritual organs, as the Proteus of Adelsberg lost his organs of vision in the Cimmerian darkness of his subterranean lake. And moreover, let us remember that our psychical researchers have already committed ourselves to conclusions, as inferences from experiment, which are almost, if not quite, as heretical and ridiculous in the opinion of some scientific men as that old ghost-theory, upon the margin of which my cautious friends stand so timorously shivering. Why, we are all head over ears in scientific heresies already! Take the leap, friends, and fear not! There are good swimming masters in there, and their names are Wallace, Zöllner, Crookes, Barrett, Varley, Butleroff, Fechner, and a host beside! The other men of science do not, I fancy, even now see much difference between

You and me,

Tweedledum, and Tweedledee.

So in all good humour I conclude. If certain theories commend themselves to certain minds, well and good; let me seek no longer to deprive them of congenial food. For in theories, as in graver matters, "the readiness is all."

P.S.—The writers admit that in what they term "veridical hallucinations" a real external object is presented in a visionary manner to the mind, presumably through the higher centres; though perhaps it may be through that inner psychical body, which Occultists, and our President alike believe in. Certainly the object is not presented through the ordinary channels of sense-perception. I only suggest an extension of this admission to cases of so-called hallucination, when the object is not

to us perceptible ; and I would rather call such vivid abnormal perceptions *vision* than *hallucination*. It is, at any rate, no disproof of their objective character that Mr. Myers can show us local nervous centres, which may possibly be instrumental in their production, and that is why I can see but small use in his algebraic "formula for revelations." I ventured to call it a "belittling of the sublime," and to quote Hinton's similar, but satirical formula for a quartet of Beethoven, viz., "a scraping of horsetails on the intestines of cats."

Similarly, I only propose an extension of the principle, confirmed by our Society in hypnotic cases—(that a dominant suggestion, which the entranced person when awake cannot resist, though unaware of the source whence it emanated, viz., the will of the mesmeriser)—to cases of "uncontrollable" impulse in madness, the hidden will and suggestion then being from some unseen order of intelligence. I am, however, quite aware that all such hypotheses are only tentative—if you like, *speculative*. But the probability of the spirit theory has to be balanced against that of a rather self-contradictory theory, such as "unconscious secondary selves" (indeed, Mr. Myers threatens us in his last paper with more than two, with an indefinite number, all unaware of each other!). It is possibly wiser to say, with Newton, "*hypotheses non fingo*." Yet the advance of knowledge has always been assisted by happy guesses of the imagination. And I rather think that, while Physiology can give no explanation at all of our psychical phenomena, new or old, we may be in some danger of mental indigestion from a plethora of mere crude, not understood phenomena. But I must say that an accusation of *too much* theory does not come with good grace from the Spiritist camp, and where the Spiritist hypothesis has been, so to speak, *bolled*, and that of vulgar fraud far too confidently ruled out of court.

CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

(Continued.)

G.—120

From Rev. Wm. S. Grignon, The Grove, Pluckley, Kent.

September 6th, 1884.

I do not know where my former pupil, the seer of the apparition, now is, so that I cannot now ask him the question suggested, but being fully aware of the importance in such cases of ascertaining the percipient's mental and moral antecedents, I did at the time ask him if he had ever before had any perception of the kind, and I can say positively that he did not remember, on any previous occasion, either seeing, hearing, or feeling anything abnormal. He had, however (as I wrote before), on two occasions dreamed

of scenes which corresponded with real events unknown to him at the time of the dream. I endeavoured to get the narrative of these dreams from him, under his own signature, in order to send to you, but either from unwillingness or neglect he has failed to supply them as he promised. Evidently he was of a sensitive "mediumistic" temperament, but you may take it as certain that he never before had had any abnormal perception in his waking moments.

(Signed) WM. S. GRIGNON.

The apparition was, apparently, connected with a promise made at a séance.

On the 21st December, 1882, about 5.30 p.m., I was on my way back from the town of X— to the village of H—. My way from the nearest railway station was by a footpath which crosses a park, shortly before quitting which it enters a belt of trees, continues through them for about 100 yards, and quits them and the park together at a lodge-gate for a public road. This road at once crosses a river of no great size by a stone bridge, and then mounts a hill among some scattered houses. Just as I was entering the belt of trees above mentioned I saw in the dim light a village lad, as I thought, coming towards me along the path, and, as he came close, I said "Good night" to him. As he passed he turned his face towards me, and I then noticed that his dress was that of a gentleman, that he wore a college cap such as are in use at P— College, and that the features were unmistakably those of a former school-fellow who had died at the age, I think, of 13 or 14, while I was at P— College. Almost instantly after the figure passed me, before any one could have gone more than 4 or 5 yards, I looked round. There was no one to be seen. It was just possible that the person might have suddenly darted under cover of the trees, but there was no apparent reason for his doing so. I did not feel startled at that time, and as I passed on through the belt of trees, it occurred to me that I must have fancied the likeness. But when I was crossing the bridge, there, seated on the parapet, was the very same figure I had seen before, in the same dress, and with the face turned full towards me. The features were beyond all doubt those of my deceased school-fellow, but with something fixed and waxy in the look of them. The only path to the bridge from the spot at which the figure first appeared was the one I had followed. I am quite certain that no person passed me from behind between the times of the first and second appearances. This time I did feel a certain amount of disturbance of mind, and seemed hardly able to mount the hill, the foot of which I had reached. I saw nothing further; but while crossing, some minutes later, a field belonging to the house in H— where I was then staying, I heard what seemed the sound of footsteps on the road close behind me, but when I looked round saw no one.

It may be as well to add that my acquaintance with the deceased had been very slight. He was not in the same house or the same form with me at P— College, and, so far as I can recollect, I had never spoken to him, or had, at most, exchanged a few words with him once or twice.

It ought further to be stated that at a table-turning séance a day or two before a spirit professing to be that of the boy in question had promised that on the 21st he would show "something visible" to one or perhaps two of the persons then present. I was not, however, at the time of the

apparition thinking at all about this announcement. On the contrary, while I was crossing the park and up to the moment of the apparition my mind was turned to matters totally different.

M. C.

The Grove, Pluckley, Kent.

July 12th, 1883.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have endeavoured in vain to induce M. C., the author of the annexed narrative, to allow his name and those of the places mentioned to appear in full. I can testify that the statement now initialled by him coincides exactly with what he related to me and to others in my house within an hour after the occurrence. From a very intimate knowledge of M. C., and of all the circumstances of the case, I am convinced that he reported only what he believed he saw, and that he is not by any means a person of predominant and constructive imagination. Twice, I think, within three days after the 21st he passed at nightfall over the scene of the apparition, and then with an impression and almost hope that his vision would be renewed; but nothing occurred.

The Grove, Pluckley, Kent.

July 19th, 1883.

The school at which M. C. and the boy had met was not *Clifton*, but *Cheltenham* College, and I have no reason whatever for supposing that the boy had any connection with the locality of the apparition. The extreme slightness of the previous acquaintance is a curious fact in the case. M. C. probably knew 200 or 300 boys at least at Cheltenham as well or better than he knew the deceased. When at a "séance" the name was given, he merely remembered the fact that a boy of that surname had died—the Christian name he had never known—and that his death had taken place at home—where he did not know—from illness begun at school. A death at school sometimes makes a strong impression on boys' minds, and might serve as a spiritual connecting link, but a death at home is much less impressive, and would have made very little impression on M. C., to judge from my pretty intimate knowledge of him. I feel sure that I have now given correctly the effect of his statement made at the time. He certainly said nothing then about any vanishing of the apparition from under his eyes. The impression left on my mind was that he looked away from the figure, and hurried on without again turning his eyes towards it. Three of the pupils now with me were then at Hanbrook, and heard the whole story from M. C. just after I did, and their impression agrees with mine exactly. So does that of my daughter, who heard the story with me from M. C. as he told it for the first time, immediately after the occurrence. I think this combination of evidence more satisfactory than any statement of the boy's own could be after an interval of six months and more. I believe you will be safe in taking it that the apparition did not vanish under his eyes.

WM. S. GRIGNON.

G.—472.

From Mrs. Codd, Belmont Lodge, Eltham, Kent.

(The name of the house was given.)

September, 1884.

In 1872, my father hired a house on Hampstead Heath for six weeks. Our party consisted of my father, mother, three brothers, and myself. We took

two of our own servants, but there was a third, who was the cook of the gentleman who let us the house. His name was F. He wished one of his own servants to be in the house during his absence, and so for the time she became ours. From the first day of our going there I felt most uncomfortable, by reason of an indescribable sensation of fear, hitherto unknown to me. I could not bear to be alone for a moment, feeling that another presence was in the room. I was also troubled by many unaccountable noises, one of which exactly resembled the rustling of a stiff silk gown. Sometimes it appeared to be quite near me, as though it might be touching me; sometimes I heard it passing up or down stairs. I often heard a sigh, but I never saw even the faintest vapour of an appearance. I was more or less disturbed in all parts of the house, but the room where all these sensations were strongest, and where I felt most awe-stricken, was the dining-room. Neither my father nor mother were conscious of anything, and were vexed with what they considered my foolishness. On two occasions I heard my two youngest brothers, children of five and six years, having an altercation with their nurse because they declared she came into their bedroom and made such a rustling that she awoke them. She assured them she had not been in their room after they were in bed. They said they even saw her, or some woman who must have been she. But, of course, it was almost totally dark.

One Friday, after we had been a month in the house, my aunt, Miss Walton, come to stay with us until the following Monday. On the Sunday afternoon, my father, brothers and I went for a walk. Our own two servants were out, and my mother, who was not strong, was lying down in her bedroom upstairs. My aunt, Dorothy Walton, and Mr. F.'s cook, and my mother were the only occupants of the house.

I became tired after I had been out some time, and returned home by myself, leaving my father and brothers to continue their walk. I found my aunt reading the Collect and Psalms for the day, and sitting in a tiny sort of balcony, which was at the top of the first flight of stairs, her back to the front door. I walked upstairs, when she turned round to me, and said, "I have seen a spirit while you have been out." I asked her some questions, the answers to which amounted to as follows:—

She felt impelled to turn round and looked towards the front door, when she saw a pretty-looking woman, of about 30 years of age, come in at the front door (which was always open during the day, there being a garden), and turn into the dining-room. For a moment she thought it must be some neighbour. But the dress was old-fashioned, being made in the style of 100 years ago. It was a silk gown of a kind known now as *chêne*, and drab in colour. The lady's hair was thick and black, and plain-braided. My aunt felt rooted to the spot. She could not move for some time, but even then she did not descend into the dining-room, but just turned round to continue her reading, when I came in.

I had not mentioned to her what my feelings in the house had been, and I only said, "Come downstairs into the kitchen with me to Ann." Ann was the aforementioned cook, to whom I had several times spoken about the noises and sensations which worried me. She had always repudiated any idea of the house being haunted, and used to say that her master would be extremely vexed if I spread such a report.

My aunt and I went below, where we found Ann, to whom I said, "Now, Ann, I have discovered that this house is haunted, and if you do not answer some questions I will put to you, I shall make inquiries in Hampstead on the matter." She turned very pale. I said, "Who haunts this house?" She: "A lady."

I: "What is she like?" She: "Youngish, good-looking, with black hair and fresh complexion."

I: "How dressed?" She: "In a thick light-coloured silk dress."

Then, having broken the ice, she went on to say that this appearance haunted the whole house, but chiefly the dining-room and the bedroom where my two youngest brothers slept; that she (Ann) had seen her countless times, and had heard the rustling of her dress still oftener; that her late mistress, Mrs. F., had been much disturbed by the ghost during her last illness; that she (Ann) was too nervous ever to stay in the house by herself, in consequence of what she saw, and when Mr. F. went away and did not let the house, she always had a friend to stay with her. She frequently saw the figure seated in the dining-room, when she went to open the shutters in the morning.

Soon after this we returned to town.

My aunt went some time after, I forget how long, to the house, to see Ann, and to inquire more of her. But she had left the service of Mr. F.

L.—2355. (Thought-transference.)

From Mr. Russell, of Aden, Mintlaw, Aberdeenshire.

November 4th, 1885.

In the autumn of 1874, when at Berlin, I was most anxious to know what was happening in a remote part of the North of Scotland. Events of the greatest possible consequence to myself were occurring, and I could obtain but little information, and that very unreliable, about them. Accidentally I heard of a middle-aged woman, Frau Meyer, the wife of a bookbinder, living in an obscure part of that capital, in very modest circumstances, who had a marvellous talent for acquainting one with what was going on at a distance, as also, to a certain extent, of foretelling the future. I called upon her, and such was her position, she being uneducated and quite of an inferior class of life, that at that time (my knowledge of the language being sufficiently fluent for it to have been almost impossible for her to have even recognised me as a foreigner, much less to identify my actual nationality) she could not possibly have guessed who I was.

The process she employed was to pour the white of a raw egg into a tumbler of cold water, and then to describe the meaning of the fantastic forms assumed by the egg.

I may mention that during repeated visits to her, she tried to explain her theories to me, which, however, I never could understand.

In the first instance she actually described to me the age and personal appearance of the individual in whom I was interested; his surroundings, and the house he lived in, as having three doors, and a room with a dome but no windows; the country also I fully recognised from her description.

After explaining, as was proved later on to be most correct, his *then*

temperament and feelings, she told me she saw him start on a long journey to a large capital (London).

At a visit I paid her immediately afterwards she clearly described to me a room she saw him in at a hotel, and a stormy interview he had with another man, refusing at first to see certain papers, but eventually consenting ; also his sudden return to the North. I subsequently ascertained the absolute accuracy of all that she had told me, both as to date, interviews, &c. When describing the interview, she asserted it had taken place the previous evening, which proved to be literally true.

For several months I was able distinctly to follow the course of events in the remote part of Europe previously referred to, although far distant from it. The temper, state of health, and influences by which the person in question was surrounded, as also the personal appearance and character of those who surrounded him, was elaborately laid before me during each of the many visits I made to Frau Meyer. Eventually she told me one day with great vehemence, that a woman whom she had previously often referred to, had succeeded in extracting from the man in whom I was so much interested a signed document of great importance.

She told me its existence was unknown to any but the two said parties, and strongly urged me at once to acquaint my friends with this transaction, assuring me that the fact of the existence of the document having been known to outsiders being represented to the giver of it, would cause it at once to be cancelled. I immediately reported the fact, but without giving my authority for fear of ridicule, to the proper quarter, but was not believed, and there the matter rested.

For two months and more I had frequent and most interesting interviews with Frau Meyer, she, almost day by day, narrating to me the course of events about which I had been unable to obtain detailed information from others, until at last she told me she saw a grave and a hearse in the egg and water tumbler, and that I should have a speedy summons to take a long journey. This I had to do immediately after that interview, and after my departure she told a friend of mine, who interviewed her, that she saw I was in much trouble, and that I was instantly to be charged from her to take a very firm and high tone in matters.

Some weeks later my lawyer acquainted me, as a great secret, with the fact of the woman previously referred to possessing the document I had been warned about, a secret he believed to be unknown to any one but himself and the party interested, as its whole value consisted in its secrecy until the time came for its being utilised. The person to whom I had written about it months before, who was present on this occasion, then turned to the lawyer and said, "What a fool I am ! he" (pointing to myself) "told me all about this months ago, and I would not believe him."

I have little more to add to this narrative than a few details about Frau Meyer ; during our many interviews she invariably explained to me what she saw, and how she saw it, but I never could follow her. Her position being so humble and obscure, her fees were most trifling ; from people in her own class of life she never asked more than the equivalent to a shilling, and from people like myself was most grateful for even the double of that sum. I have since ascertained that royalty and the highest personages in the land

used to consult her, either in disguise or by deputy, particularly before a war. That she could have traced anybody out, so as to ascertain about their position, was a material impossibility; she lived without a servant, tended by a young niece, to whom she had in vain tried to teach her art.

She told me she had learnt the said art as a child from a dwarf, to whom her family had shown kindness, and who, out of gratitude, taught it to her in order that she might always possess a means of livelihood.

J. G. F. RUSSELL.

[Though there are elements in this case which suggest independent clairvoyance, it is not impossible that the whole may be accounted for by thought-transference, as the incidents may have corresponded with Mr. Russell's anticipations or suspicions. Some of the elements, at any rate, suggest nothing but thought-transference: e.g., it is hard to imagine how a person's starting "on a long journey" to a particular place, or his "sudden return to the North" could be viewed by any momentary extension of the diviner's sense-perceptions.]

L.—2356. (Thought-transference.)

From Miss Curtis, of 15, Parade Villas, Herne Bay, Kent.

November 12th, 1885.

About the year 1847 or 1848, the Dr. Lee who wrote a book on the German Baths, consulted with two friends interested on the subject of clairvoyance, and made an arrangement with Alexis Didier, a clairvoyant at Paris, and M. Marcillet, his mesmeriser, to come to Brighton. There was to be no public exhibition, but only séances at private houses, and about 12 persons to be present, and each to have an opportunity of trying Alexis in the manner he or she wished; and Dr. Lee was to be at each séance and make notes. I was at Brighton at the time, and before going to see Alexis, wrote his name on a piece of paper, and doubled it three or four times, and then put it in a box that had held steel pens, and tied it up. When my turn came, I gave the box to Alexis, and he began reading the letters on the outside. I told him there was a paper inside I wanted him to read, and Dr. Lee asked me to give my hand to Alexis, and think of the words. Alexis then said, "The first letter is A, the second, L." I answered "Yes"; and he turned the box, and wrote Alexis Didier on the back. Before I saw him the second time I took a small smelling bottle out of its leather case, put two seals inside—one seal was in the form of a basket. I gave the case to Alexis, and asked him how many things were inside, and he said two, and they were seals; he took a pencil and paper and drew them; they were then taken out, and the drawings exactly resembled them. Some one asked if Alexis could read what was on one of the seals; he said he could not, because it was written backwards. Dr. Lee asked me to give my hand; I thought of the word, and Alexis directly said, "Croyez," which was correct. [This, however, is no test; as we find, on inquiry, that Alexis had taken the seals into his hand, and had had an opportunity of reading the word.] I then asked him two or three questions about the persons who had given me the seals, and he made a mistake, and said the lady who

had given me one was in England, whereas she was in Africa. Alexis was unequal, some days telling almost everything, and other days failing in several things. The notes Dr. Lee made were printed, and I had a copy, but gave it away.

SELINA CURTIS.

L.—2357. (Collective Hallucination.)

From a lady who desires that names may not be printed.

October 28th, 1885.

In the month of November, 1843, myself, my eldest sister, and the man-servant were driving home from a small town to our parsonage in the country. The time might be about half-past 4 or 5 p.m. As we came slowly up the hill by the churchyard wall, we saw a gentleman in walking costume, going into the vestry door. We both exclaimed, "That's papa," and the man George said at the same moment, "Why there's the master." My father was then ill, and away from home many miles away. He died the following January 23rd, 1844. He wore a particular long cloak which I should have recognised anywhere, and which he had many years, and wore as a loose wrap. [What is meant clearly is that the cloak in which the figure appeared to be dressed exactly resembled that of the narrator's father.] He looked exactly like himself, and was going in by the small vestry door he used to enter the church by when going to take duty. I do not think he looked at us, but seemed intent on entering the church, and disappeared inside. We were all much frightened, and searched round the house and church but could see no one, and no one had been seen about.

I recollect the occurrence as if it had been yesterday, and, as I write, see all distinctly in my mind's eye.

The man-servant is dead ; my sister begs to corroborate my account.

S. R.

My sister has always, when I have talked of the vision, said she saw it so likewise, and she reiterated that only last summer, but she is not equal to write about it. I quite see the weak point if the church was not searched inside. I can't say it *was*, nor can I say it was *not*. Old George, the man, was most fond of his master, and may have gone into the church, but I can't say. I only know we were all so terribly frightened. The vision was sudden, as true to life, and even to the particular long cloak, all gathered in to a collar clasped at the throat. I ought to have said that the figure *seemed* in the act of going in by the vestry door ; we did *not* see him enter, as we drove on in great fright to the house. My father was then under medical treatment at Northampton.

Mrs. R. adds details, showing the absolute impossibility that her father could really have come to the spot where he was seen, unknown to all his friends ; and adds : You will see the utter impossibility of his having left Northampton, being a *dying* man, so to speak, when admitted. Then, again, the church was always kept locked, the keys at the parsonage, supposing for a moment that we saw a living figure. I recollect that inquiry was made of the villagers as to any strange gentleman having been seen about, and the answer was "No."

L.—2358.—A* P*

From Mrs. Fielding, Yarlington Rectory, near Bath.

November, 1885.

The other night my husband and I dreamt at the *same hour*, the *same* dream—a subject on which neither of us had been thinking for months. It was a dream of wandering about our first home, and in it looking at the same spot.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Fielding adds:—

I do not remember anything more about the dream I spoke of. It was 17 years since we left Linacre Court, near Dover, the place my husband and I dreamt of at the *same hour*, as we had been awake about 3 o'clock a.m., and we both dreamt of walking about the old place—and the old woodman—*just before* we awoke, and we had not been either of us thinking of it in the least.

My husband laughs at all such things as having any import, but to please me wrote the enclosed:—

I remember awaking one morning about three weeks ago, and my wife telling me she had had a long dream about our first married home. I said: "How strange, as I have been dreaming the same just before I awoke."

J. M. FIELDING.

L.—2359. (Collective Auditory Experience.)

Miss Ellen Twynam, of 8, Waterloo Place, Southampton, early in 1884, filled up a form with the information that 14 or 15 years before, when in good health, she had several times, by day and night, had an auditory hallucination. She added:—

The voice was not that of any one I knew, but sounded like a clear, refined woman's voice.

The voice called my name, "Ellen," distinctly many times, and over a period of some months. It was heard not only by myself but by others, and on one special occasion by everybody in the house at the same moment. I was also in the habit of hearing the sound, as of a person walking about my room, and the sweeping of a dress over the floor was very plain, though I never saw any presence.

ELLEN B. TWYNAM.

In answer to inquiries Miss Twynam says:—

November 12th, 1885.

I had myself repeatedly heard the voice calling me at various intervals, extending over some months, and had mentioned the fact to the different members of the family, but never to my knowledge in the presence of the servants. I have always been laughed at, and told it was only my fancy, and no one then had heard it but myself. On the occasion referred to, I and my sister were in the drawing-room, and my mother and aunt, who were both invalids, were in their respective bedrooms upstairs, on opposite sides of the house; while my brother was in another sitting-room downstairs, on the other side of the hall; and the servants were both in the kitchen,

which was an underground one. I and my sister heard the voice distinctly call "Ellen, Ellen!"—a clear, high, refined woman's voice, but with something strange and unusual about it. My sister at once noticed it, turning to me and saying, "There, I have heard it myself this time." I still, however, thought it might really be some one, so went to my mother, asking whether she had called. She said "No," but she had heard someone calling me, and thought it was my aunt. I went to *her*, and she said exactly the same, only thought it was my mother. I then went to my brother. He said "No;" but had heard someone call quite plainly. I then went down to the servants, and asked whether they had heard anyone calling. They said "Yes;" they thought it was mistress. But there was nothing about them to lead me to think they were playing any trick, and they had never any idea that I had heard this voice before. The voice sounded to me as though it were above me, and yet very close to me, and it gave me a strange uncomfortable feeling. I do not think it was the servants, as they answered so naturally, as a matter of course, that it was their mistress who had called. Our house stood in a garden near the village, but I am sure it was no one from outside, as the voice was so decidedly *in* the house, and apparently close to us. My brother is away at present, but when I have the opportunity I will ask him whether he remembers the circumstances, and if he does I will let you know. Of the rest of those who heard the "call" some are dead, and others so much dispersed that I do not know where to find them. It struck us all at the time as being very strange, but, as nothing seemed to come of it, it gradually passed away, and we thought no more of the circumstances. I hope the above account is such as you desire. There is nothing very striking about it, but I believe it is exactly what happened at the time.

Miss Twynam's sister says:—

I perfectly remember the occurrence alluded to by my sister. I distinctly heard the voice calling her name, and noticed at the time that it was very clear, and resembled a woman's voice, but with a strangely unnatural sound which attracted my attention. I remember turning to her and saying, "I have heard it for myself this time," as she had mentioned the fact of repeatedly hearing her name called, but I had never heard it, though other people had done so before; but on this occasion everybody in the house heard it at the same time. I have no doubt whatever that the voice came from no one in the house.

MARIA TWYNAM.

L.—2360.—A^d Pⁿ

A lady, Miss H., whose name and address may be given to private inquirers, and who would gladly have allowed their publication had friends not been unwilling, filled up a printed form with the information that on Thursday, November 16th, 1854, about 10 o'clock at night, she had had a vision of an intimate friend, who died that evening at 7. On E. G.'s writing for particulars, she replied:—

"I had had 16 hours' travelling in the interior of a diligence, crossing

the Apennines from Bologna to Florence. I was perfectly well, but unusually tired. I was in the Hotel Europa, in Florence, and was quite wide awake, not having had the necessary moments in which to compose myself to sleep. My sister had just fallen asleep. My friend stood at the side of the bed nearest me, near the foot, and looked at me fixedly. She was in white and looked exactly as she did in life. She was an old lady, and had been almost bed-ridden for long. She had taken very keen interest in our Italian tour. I lost my presence of mind, and woke my sister. I also called out to my father, who was in an adjoining room, not yet asleep, but too tired to do more than answer, though he remembered the circumstance of my calling to him the next morning. Directly this alarm was shown the vision disappeared. It was both vivid, and produced a *supernatural* sensation which I never before or since experienced to anything like the same extent.

“E. H. H.”

We find from the *Times* obituary that the death took place on Thursday, November 16th, 1854. Inquiries have been made at the hotel in Florence, in order to obtain confirmation of the date of Miss H.'s stay there; but the hotel changed hands a few years later, and the information cannot be got.

Miss H. has experienced only one other hallucination, and that was “in the height of a severe illness,” when she fancied that her maid was at the bedside.

In answer to inquiries, Miss H. writes that the sister who was with her cannot recall the occurrence.

“The fact is she only awoke for an instant, and as she is 9 years younger than myself, and I saw she *believed* I had only been dreaming this, I spared her. I had not fallen asleep. I did not argue the point with her, or refer to it again for some long time after. It was the same with my father. I called out Mrs. W.'s name, and he referred to it as a dream in the morning. But I *confided* in a sister, then recently married to a Norfolk clergyman, who was very near my own age. I was the more led to do this as the lady who stood near me was her husband's mother.” The account goes on to say how exceptionally interested the lady had been in the route and experiences of the travellers; and concludes thus: “In those days such things were subjects of ridicule and unbelief more than they now are, and I am surprised how lightly I took what yet I felt positive was no dream.”

The following is a letter to Miss H., from the sister to whom she mentioned her experiences:—

December 4th, 1885.

MY DEAR ELISE,—I fully remember your naming the vision of Mrs. W., which you had on the very evening on which she died. We compared notes faithfully at the time; and it was most remarkable, because she had not been visibly worse, and died at the last suddenly. She had thought a great deal about you being in a Roman Catholic country at the time of some great council, and had named in two or three letters that she should be glad when you got home; so you were on her mind. I believe you named it in a letter, but I can't find it. But I am as *sure* of the *fact* of your *telling* me (on your return home, and coming here on the way) *all particulars* as if it was yesterday—the rooms *en suite*, and our father hearing you call out to Memie, who had fallen asleep before you; and you naming “Mrs. W.”

to father, and he, supposing it was a dream, trying to soothe you. And you, though feeling *sure* you were awake, yet tried to *think* it was a sort of dream "as when one awaketh." The first news you received from England was the account of the peaceful and rather sudden death of one who was renowned for energy of spirit all her life, and who was full of imagination and great love for you. This is my statement. The dates were *carefully* compared, that I am sure of. My husband is as certain as I am of all I say.—Your affectionate sister

M. A. W.

L.—2361.—A° Pa

From Mrs. Clerke, Clifton Lodge, Farquhar-road, Upper Norwood, S.E.

November 18th, 1885.

My two boys returned to school on the 18th September. They intended to try the route *via* Swindon and Andover, on account of the trains being more convenient, instead of going by Paddington.

They left home about 3 o'clock, and I heard no more about them until the Monday following, but I was very uneasy all the evening, and about 9.30 I remarked to my daughter, "I am perfectly convinced that those boys have never got to Marlborough; I am quite sure they are *walking about the roads* this minute." She said, "What nonsense! of course they are all right. Gus" (the youngest) "is so sensible, he never would make a mistake." I said, "I don't know, but I feel quite sure they have missed one train after another, and have never got there." On the Monday following I heard from them. They *had* missed the train at Waterloo, had then gone to Paddington, missed the special there, and had gone by a later, which, by a curious combination of circumstances, had landed them at *Woodborough*. They got out, mistaking it in the dark for Marlborough, and only found out their mistake too late, and had walked 11 miles on a road unknown to them, and got to their school at 1 o'clock in the morning. They managed to scale the walls, and found a class-room open, where they got what sleep they could—very little.

M. CLERKE.

Miss Clerke corroborates as follows:—

November 30th, 1885.

I remember distinctly, when my brothers returned to school, that my mother remarked several times to me that she felt quite sure that they were walking about the roads somewhere. We found out afterwards that it was just as my mother said, and, at the time she spoke, they actually were walking to Marlborough.

H. F. B. CLERKE.

[In describing the incident, Mrs. Clerke especially dwelt on her impression that her sons were *wandering on roads*. This particular idea seems a far less likely one to have been purely subjectively caused, through maternal apprehension, than that of some calamity, such as a railway accident. It was also a very unlikely thing to occur in reality. Mrs. Clerke is the very reverse of a nervous or fanciful person.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

EXPERIMENTS IN THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE MADE NOVEMBER 28TH, 1885.

We have received the following account of experiments in Thought-transference from Mr. Octavius Beatty, of Exeter College, Oxford, who contributed a paper on the subject to the *Journal* for last September. The experiments cannot, unfortunately, be continued as the ladies who carried them out find that they produce sleeplessness and headache.

The agent and percipient are sisters, and Mr. Beatty informs us that there is a remarkably strong sympathy between them, and that they occasionally dream the same dreams, &c. They do not wish their names to be published, though they are willing to give them to persons genuinely interested in the experiments, but Mr. Beatty has known them for many years, and has every confidence in them. Moreover, the experiments were carried out in his presence and under his superintendence.

We give the method of experimenting, and the results, as well as Mr. Beatty's comments on them, in his own words:—

"The percipient was blindfolded while the card was written down. No pack was used; the agent merely thought of a card,* and then wrote it down in a book. The percipient sat near the middle of a small, round drawing-table, the agent near, but looking in a different direction. The percipient took her hand, and after about a minute *told* the card chosen. I then compared her answer with what was written in the book.

PERCIPIENT, M. L. AGENT, A. L.

CARD CHOSEN.	CARD GUESSED.
1. Ace of Hearts.	Ace of Hearts.
2. Five of Spades.	Three of Spades.
3. Four of Hearts.	Eight of Hearts.
4. Ace of Spades.	Ace of Clubs.
5. Six of Hearts.	Six of Hearts.
6. Ace of Clubs.	Three of Clubs.
7. Six of Clubs.	Six of Clubs.
8. Four of Spades.	Nine of Spades.
9. Four of Clubs.	Five of Clubs.
10. Eight of Hearts.	Eight of Hearts.

REMARKS.—Four complete successes. It is noteworthy that only once was the percipient wrong in the suit and always right in the colour.

In experiment No. 10 the percipient said first, "Three of Hearts." I asked whether that was right. Before the agent had replied she said, "It's either the three or the eight." "Which is it?" I asked. "I think the eight."

* We think this is to be regretted, since the agent might have a tendency to choose the card within certain limits or in certain successions, which might be unconsciously perceived by the percipient, and this would to some extent affect the chances of her guessing right. If the card were chosen at random from a shuffled pack the chances each time of the percipient's guess being right would be 1 to 52.—ED.

In no case was there a second guess.

PERCIPIENT, A. L. AGENT, M. L.

CARD CHOSEN.

1. Three of Hearts.
2. Two of Clubs.
3. Six of Diamonds.
4. Four of Spades.
5. Five of Hearts.
6. Three of Diamonds.
7. Eight of Spades.
8. Six of Clubs.
9. Two of Clubs.
10. Ace of Spades.

CARD GUESSED.

- Ace of Spades.
Two of Clubs.
Six of Hearts.
Four of Spades.
Nine of Spades.
Eight of Hearts.
Eight of Spades.
Nine of Clubs.
Two of Clubs.
Wrong. (I omitted to note card guessed unaccountably.)

REMARKS.—The percipient was not so successful as to colour, still she was generally right in this respect.”

SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

The following additions have been made since last month.

- CROUIGNEAU (Dr. Georges) Etude clinique et expérimentale sur la vision mentale..... Paris, 1884
- DESCOURTIS (Gabriel) Du fractionnement des opérations cérébrales Paris, 1882
- DUMONT-PALLIER. De l'action vaso-motrice de la suggestion chez les hystériques hypnotisables (*Gazette des Hôpitaux*, 1885, p. 619) Paris, 1885
- HÉRICOURT (J.) Le Magnétisme Animal en dehors de l'hystérie (*Revue Scientifique*, 1884, i., 812)Paris, 1884
- MAGNIN (Paul) De quelques effets des excitations périphériques chez les hystéro-épileptiques à l'état de veille et d'hypnotisme Paris, 1884
- OCHOROWICZ (Julien) Essai sur le sens de toucher et le sens du magnétisme (*Revue Scientifique*, 1884, i., 553).....Paris, 1884
- DE ROCHAS (A.) La lévitation, ou l'enlèvement des corps (*Revue Scientifique*, 1885, ii., 336)Paris, 1885
-
- BRENDEL (Franz) Kritik der Commissarischen Berichte und Protokolle über die Somnambule C. HöhneFreiberg, 1840
- HÖHNIN (J. C.) Berichte und Protokolle über die Sogenannte SomnambuleDresden, 1840
- LAMBL. Geschichte einer Hellseherin als Beiträge zur Lehre der Porencephalie. (*Archiv für Psych.* XV.)Berlin, 1884
- PICK (Arnold) Von Bewusstsein in Zuständen sogenannter Bewusstlosigkeit. (*Archiv für Psych.* XV.)Berlin, 1882
- RÖMER (C.) Ausführliche historische Darstellung einer höchst merkwürdigen SomnambuleStuttgart, 1821
-
- SERGI (Prof. G.) L'origine dei Fenomeni PsichiciMilano, 1885