

JOURNAL

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
New Associates	185
Meeting of the Council	185
Experiments with Madame B. in September, 1880	186
Experiments in Apparent Clairvoyance	188
Cases received by the Literary Committee	191
Correspondence	199

NEW ASSOCIATES.

- ASHTON, ARTHUR J., M.A., Congregational School, Caterham, Surrey.
 BOIS, HERBERT G., 4, Clarendon-place, Hyde Park-square, W.
 CANNON, MRS., Hillcot, Sharples, near Bolton.
 CHARLESWORTH, MISS A. M., Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.
 HEATON, CHARLES, M.R.C.S., Watford, Herts.
 HUDDLESTON, MRS., Llwynderw, Welshpool, Montgomeryshire.
 INNES, LIEUT.-COLONEL P. R., 11, Cheniston-gardens, London, W.
 OPIE, EDWARD A. D., Pirie-street, Adelaide.
 PROTHERO, MRS., 63, Trumpington-street, Cambridge.
 RAVENSBURG, DR. F. FREIHERR GOELER VON, 4, Nettelbeckstrasse,
 Berlin, W.
 REYNOLDS, COLONEL H. C., Thorncliffe, Cheltenham.
 SAMS, REV. GEORGE F., M.A., Emberton Rectory, Newport Pagnell.
 STEVENSON, GEORGE, Care of Messrs. Grindlay and Co., 55, Parliament-
 street, S.W.
 THOMPSON, ISAAC C., F.L.S., F.R.M.S., Woodstock, Waverley-road,
 Liverpool.
 WATSON, MRS. W. C., 39, Gloucester-square, London, W.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

A Meeting of the Council was held on January 3rd, the President in the chair, the following Members being also present:—Dr. A. T. Myers, Messrs. Thomas Barkworth, Walter Leaf, Frank Podmore, F. W. H. Myers, H. Arthur Smith, and R. Pearsall Smith.

Fifteen new Associates, whose names and addresses are given above, were elected.

Two Members were, by request, transferred to the list of Associates, and one Associate desired to become a Member for the ensuing year. The resignations of one Member and of several Associates, who, from various causes, desired to leave the Society at the end of the year, were accepted.

The Assistant Secretary was instructed to send out the notices for the Annual Business Meeting on the 31st inst., according to the Rules.

A vote of thanks was recorded to Professor H. Beaunis for copies of two recent books as presents to the Library, from the author.

A vote of thanks was also passed to Mr. Edward Grubb, Hon. Associate, for a donation of a guinea to the funds of the Society.

Various other matters of routine business were attended to, and the Council agreed to meet—as previously arranged—either at the close of the Annual Business Meeting on the 31st, or after the General Meeting.

EXPERIMENTS WITH MADAME B. IN SEPTEMBER, 1889.

BY MR. R. A. H. BICKFORD-SMITH.

M. 671.

I twice saw L.—an initial familiar to readers of the *Journal*—under the influence of M. Janet. On both occasions she remarked that I could put her to sleep, or *me faire venir*, as she calls it, referring to the process of summoning her second or somnambule personality. A few evenings afterwards I was sitting in the same room with her, when she gradually showed symptoms of drowsiness. A lady who was present told me she thought I might as well send her off to sleep. This I did with no difficulty, merely holding her hand. I repeated the experiment on several subsequent occasions. The results were of three kinds: physical phenomena, suggested phenomena, and clairvoyance. In going to sleep she invariably sighed at intervals, on one occasion five times, on one eleven, but oftenest seven or nine. In waking I noticed a corresponding number of sighs, the opening of the eyes being relatively placed at the same sigh as the shutting of them. The sigh was sometimes sharp and spasmodic, sometimes deep-drawn, there being occasionally considerable convulsion. I was able easily to wake her when Dr. Gibert had mesmerised her; this I did twice; on the second occasion she was asleep when Dr. Gibert left, and got very excited and distressed when she woke (still magnetised) to discover that he was gone, so that I had to re-mesmerise her before de-magnetising her. On the other occasion she was awake when he left, and I did not have to re-mesmerise her. One evening a M.B.—attempted to magnetise her against her will, and succeeded in making her quite drowsy; I completed the sleep; but on his raising her arm, and my not being able to move it, I supposed her to be under his influence. She remained greatly agitated; so that I re-mesmerised her, which had the effect of making her perfectly tranquil. He afterwards tried to re-subject her to his in-

fluence, but without success. When asleep her fingers frequently began to go through the movements of writing, on which occasion I generally gave her pencil and paper; what she wrote was always intelligible. Often she would ask for Dr. Gibert, M. Richet, or M. Janet. Her other writings almost always appeared to be related to what was passing in my mind at the time. She has a way of feeling the thumb-nails of those present, who, in accordance with the result of her investigation, are treated with friendship, or indifference, or even contempt.

The first time she was with me she objected to my smoking, but on my telling her it was English tobacco and entirely without smell, she was perfectly satisfied, and never objected afterwards; in fact, every kind of suggestion seemed to operate perfectly on her. The oddest circumstance of this kind, perhaps, was that one day when she had a headache, I told her I would take her headache from her and keep it myself, which I did, although I am quite a novice at headaches. With me it lasted rather over an hour. One evening she came and sat next me on a sofa, took my right hand in hers, and with her left began to make passes, saying she was going to mesmerise me; in less than a minute she was sound asleep. When under influence her eyes are usually about three-quarters shut, though one can open or close them at pleasure. There seemed to be close relationship between her mood and mine; once I had some difficulty in magnetising her, and once in awakening her; on both of which occasions I was independently excited myself.

One afternoon she gave me a description of my father's country house which was certainly correct in every particular. One remark was extremely singular; after portraying the ponds, and stating that she saw a row of tall fir trees by the lower end of the upper pond, she said she saw me reading in a boat, in that corner, which is undoubtedly an old habit of mine. In describing the gardeners she said that two had aprons on, and she hazarded the guess that they attended to the greenhouses. She observed that one of the gardeners was *concierge*, and described the lodge in which she said he lived, the idea appearing very droll to her. (I do not know as yet if this is a fact, but I knew at the time that the old lodge-keeper had left.)* She plays *écarté* much better than when in a normal state, playing her trumps out with admirable pluck. On several occasions when stray remarks were made by bystanders in English and German, she replied to them as if she understood, though she usually objected to other languages than French

* Mr. Bickford-Smith has since ascertained that the lodge is occupied by a groom, not a gardener.—E.D.

being used in her presence. (L. has made a stay of about a fortnight in England, but is, I believe, quite ignorant of German.)

As to prevision, there were no very startling facts, though her description on September 27th of the bicycle race run on September 29th was sufficiently so. She named the winner, described his principal opponent, who was to fall, and said that M. A. B. would win, because the next man would be unable to spurt; she added that there would be three prizes for the winner. The latter prophecy was fulfilled by a telegraphically added prize from the Minister of War, and by the winner gaining the "lap prize" as well. The only inaccuracy is as to the spurling, presuming that she meant the *final* spurt.

Her clairvoyance is fuller and more precise when she is L.3 than L.2; probably each successive stage is an improvement on the lesser ones. L.2 knows all about the inferior L., and controls her, being treated in the same way in her turn by L.3, &c. L. is shy and uneducated, a good Norman matron; L.2 is gay and demonstrative, with considerable wit; L.3 is a very Melpomene, though a trifle slow and sententious; L.4 is ecstatic.

L.2 recognises the acquaintance of L., while L.3 recognises only those who have summoned her or L.2, and L.4 only recognises her summoner for the time being.

The impression prevailing in my own mind all through these experiments has been that mesmerism, whatever it may be, brings into action ordinarily dormant mental powers, revealing at each successive stage a more cultured and more sensitive nature. Whether there be a superlative, or whether each human brain has infinite potentiality, of course no experiments can prove.

R. A. H. BICKFORD-SMITH.

Asked if he could recall further details of L.'s description of his father's house, Mr. Bickford-Smith replied on November 14th: "I find it very difficult to recall other details at this date. I remember, however, her surprise at the size of the kitchen and the number of books in the library (over 10,000, I believe). She also accurately placed several trees. This is interesting from the fact that I am a considerable tree planter, and specially addicted to tree-biography. The trees she mentioned were 'chums' of mine."

EXPERIMENTS IN APPARENT CLAIRVOYANCE.

I should like briefly to bring before readers of the *Journal* a remarkable series of experiments conducted by a friend of mine, which, though still too incomplete for publication, is suggestive and

encouraging enough to make it, in my opinion, very important that others should try to obtain similar results.

The experiments consist simply in guessing playing cards drawn at random from a pack and not looked at by anyone. My friend has made about 2,585 trials of this kind, and in 187 cases has guessed the card correctly both as to suit and number. In 75 of these cases, however, two alternative guesses were made (*e.g.*, 3 of hearts or clubs); counting these as half successes we have what is equivalent to 149½ complete successes, or three times the most probable number by chance alone. So large an excess over the most probable number of successes in so large a number of trials is of course most unlikely to be due to chance.

My friend does not, however, wish to commit herself to any opinion as to what it is due to without further investigation. One reason for this is that all the above-mentioned trials were made when she was entirely alone. Circumstances make it specially difficult in her case to arrange for joint experiments with others. She is so much accustomed to being alone, moreover, that companionship disturbs her in all kinds of work requiring mental concentration. It is therefore not surprising that a series of experiments which she and I made together—under circumstances of great bustle and excitement compared with her ordinary life—should have failed. We do not despair, however, of future success; only in the meanwhile we are anxious that others should try the experiment and give us the benefit of their experience. If a faculty of clairvoyance really exists, experiments of this kind seem to be a simple mode of proving its existence. On the other hand, it is possible that the experience of others may suggest some mode, which has not occurred to us, of explaining my friend's results by known causes.

It is of course impossible in our present state of knowledge to say what kind of person is most likely to succeed, but if, as some think, thought-transference, or rather thought-reading, is only one form of a more far-reaching faculty of clairvoyance, it would seem to be specially desirable that all who have had any kind of success as percipients in thought-transference experiments should try these also.

As a guide to anyone who may be willing to try, I will describe my friend's method. She draws a card at random from a pack, which is either spread out on the table before her or kept in a compact heap. The pack is continually shuffled. At first she used to hold the card in her hand and gaze at the back of it, but it occurred to her that in this way she might possibly sometimes unconsciously recognise the card by its back, and she therefore substituted for the card a small piece of white cardboard as an object on which to fix her eyes. On

this she would see, not a complete image of a card, but something as it were symbolic of it and which suggested her guess. She found it undesirable to use the same piece of white card twice in succession, as the image persisted. This method of gazing at some surface is not indispensable to success. She thinks that on the whole it conduces to success in her case, but it does so at the expense of greater fatigue to herself than merely waiting for an idea to come without fixing the eyes on anything in particular. She usually made about twenty trials at a time—sometimes more and sometimes less.

With regard to conditions of mind or body suitable to the experiments, my friend has little to say. She has not been able to trace any clear connection between success and various conditions of health or of inclination to the work. She believes, however, that she does not succeed immediately after eating. A state of mind free from anxiety—at least about the experiments themselves—seems desirable.

The number given above includes, we believe, all the trials made between May 29th and September 4th, 1889; but the total 2,585 is only approximate, because the record of certain guesses on unsuccessful days was destroyed in the early days of experimenting before it occurred to my friend that it was important to retain all. She has reasons for thinking that 80 is an outside estimate of these rejected trials, and as 80 we have therefore reckoned them. The trials may be arranged chronologically in groups as follows:—

	No. of trials.	No. of complete successes.	No. of successes with alternative guesses.	Total equivalent No. of successes.	Most probable No. of successes by chance.
1st Series, May 29th to June 18th, 1889 ...	581*	37	12	43	11·2
2nd Series, June 19th to July 24th, 1889 ...	500	21	8	25	0·6
3rd Series, July 25th to August 20th, 1889 ...	504	15	27	28½	0·7
4th Series, August 27th to August 30th, 1889 ...	500	23	10	28	0·6
5th Series, August 30th to Sept. 4th, 1889 ...	500	16	18	25	0·6
Total	2585	112	75	149½	49·7

The above account of the experiments has been revised by my friend, though I am primarily responsible for it.

ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK.

* Including the rejected trials estimated at 80.

CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

L.—1050. (Collective).

In the following case—unless there was a mistake of identity and the figure taken for Mr. Williams was really another man, which is certainly shown to be highly improbable—we have an instance of hallucinations representing the same person appearing to several persons at different times—a kind of coincidence which certainly affords some evidence that the appearances were not purely subjective in origin. This type of case is discussed in *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., pp. 77-90, where several instances of it are given. In the present instance there are two special features, namely, that one of the appearances was collective, *i.e.*, seen by two people at once, and that it included the figure of a child.

MISS DALISON'S ACCOUNT.

On Sunday, April 28th, 1889, died Charles Williams, tailor, of Plaxtol, Sevenoaks, Kent, of pleuro-pneumonia, at 6 p.m. He was taken ill on the Tuesday evening previous, and never again left his bed, being carefully tended by his wife. Two doctors were with him on Saturday afternoon, but little hope was entertained for him by the doctors from the first, and he was forbidden to speak for fear of breaking a blood vessel. During Saturday he showed a great desire to speak, but his wife restrained him with the promise that after Tuesday he could speak as much as he liked; it being hoped that if he lived over the crisis he might then recover.

On Saturday, the 27th, Anna Dalison and Kathleen Sinclair, cousins, were in Plaxtol distributing library books, and at one o'clock, while passing a certain shop met Mr. Williams, whose personality was well known to both, and they bowed their good day while he raised his hat; he had walking beside him a small girl.

On Monday morning the news of Mr. Williams' death reached Miss A. Dalison's home two miles from Plaxtol. On hearing it she exclaimed, "How awfully sudden it must have been; Kathleen and I met him in the street on Saturday." "Impossible, he never left his bed after Wednesday." "What child had Williams?" "Oh that was his wife's niece who had been living with them lately." N.B. Anna Dalison knew nothing of Williams' illness, nor had ever heard of the child.

The two young ladies were seen by a child at the time they were passing the "figure" and she ran in and said to her mother, "Two of the young ladies have just gone down," but it came out upon questioning later that neither Williams nor his niece was seen, though both were intimate friends of this little girl and her family.

The above was written by Miss Anna Dalison's sister on May 2nd, 1889. Miss Anna Dalison adds to it the words:—

This is a true account of what I saw.

ANNA M. DALISON.

MISS SINCLAIR'S ACCOUNT.

June 7th, 1889.

As my cousin and I were coming down the middle street of Plaxtol, we saw coming towards us the tailor Williams (who was well known to both of us). He looked exactly as usual and my cousin and I did not know even that he was ill at the time. We said good-morning, and he took off his hat. He had a child with him whom I observed wished to take his hand as he passed but he would not let it. This I remarked to my cousin at the time. I am not at all short sighted, indeed I have very good sight.

KATHLEEN V. SINCLAIR.

MR. HIND'S STATEMENT.

I divide this statement into two heads, 1ST. *Facts* which I can vouch for as having occurred on a certain day—what day I cannot now recall to mind sufficiently to be positive about, but which I am inclined to believe *must* have been Friday April 26th last—and 2ND. *The Reasons* for supposing that to have been the day.

1ST. **FACTS.** On this day (whenever it was) I walked to Plaxtol, Kent, to post a letter (or letters) in time for the 11 a.m. post there; when about half-way between my house and Plaxtol, about 20 yards or so beyond the house of a builder named Allcorn, I saw, about 100 yards in front of me, an indistinct figure coming towards me; being short sighted and not having my glass up at the moment I could not tell whether it was a man, woman, or horse and cart. I put up my glass to see, and at the same instant the figure appeared close to me, and I saw it was C. W[illiams]. Although I did not think very much about it at the time, the thought *did* float lazily through my mind, that he had come upon me very quickly, and I certainly did notice at once that he looked extremely ghastly and ill. He was dressed as I generally used to see him, in a costume the colour of which I cannot positively describe, but the impression left on my mind was that it was a very light brown. When I first mentioned this *rencontre*, I was under the impression (and said so) that he had saluted me as he invariably used to do, but on thinking the matter over it seems borne into my mind that he did not do so, but stared very hard, and I have now an impression (though this may be an afterthought) that this struck me at the time as rather strange. This was as nearly as I calculate about 10.40 a.m.

2ND. *Reasons* for supposing the above to have happened on Friday, April 26th last.

I was in London on 24th and 25th April, so they are out of the question. On Monday, 29th, I went up to town and on my return in the evening, my wife informed me of C. W.'s death. I at once exclaimed, "Why I only saw him a day or two ago." She asked "When?" I replied, "The last time I went to Plaxtol." She then said "Why that was" (or "must have been," I forget which) "last Friday."

I had not mentioned the name of any day to her as in fact I could not remember, so I do not see what should have made her think of Friday, unless it was the day. If it was not Friday, it must have been more than a week previously at least when I met C. W. and in that case I do not think I

should have thought anything about it, for what made the announcement of his death seemed so sudden to me, was the feeling that I had seen him only a day or two before.

My daughter, aged 13, is positive that Friday was the day, and she fixes it by the fact that she went to Hamptons (Mrs. Dalison's) on the Wednesday after the Saturday to which Miss Dalison's account refers, and remembers that the previous Friday she had no lessons with me (which I generally give her) *because I had to go to Plaxtol in the morning.*

If she is accurate in this, then it must be a fact that the day on which I met C. W. was the day before Miss Dalison and Miss Sinclair did the same, and a day on which he is supposed to have never left his bed.

I must confess, however, that while I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of my daughter's statement, my own memory is not much refreshed by it; that is to say I have even now not that degree of personal conviction which would justify me in *swearing* to the day. My nearest approach to conviction is the feeling that I don't think it can have been any other day. I was in London on the 25th, 24th, 18th, 17th, 16th, and 15th April, and I am positive I did not go to Plaxtol on either Good Friday (19th) or Easter Monday (22nd) (Sundays of course were out of the question), so that this leaves a very few days to choose from, and renders it all the more probable that my daughter's statement, about which she is positive, is the right one. I am certain it cannot have been *before* the 15th that the event occurred, as in that case, it would not have struck me as "only a day or two ago" (which it did) when I heard of his death on the 29th.

J. A. HIND.

Claygate, Shipbourne, Tonbridge.

June 11th, 1889.

The fact of the death of Mr. Williams and the duration of his illness is confirmed by the *Kent Messenger* of Saturday, May 4th, 1889, which announces "the death of Mr. Charles Williams . . . which took place, after only five days' confinement to his bed, on Sunday evening last."

We also have a letter from his medical attendant, stating that he saw him on Saturday, April 27th, and that it was quite impossible for him to have been out of doors on that day or the day before.

In answer to written questions Mr. Fryer learnt that the figure of Mr. Williams passed the ladies as near as possible on the road, that he was dressed in his ordinary clothes—light grey coat, tight buttoned up, and that his whole appearance was as natural and life-like as possible—nothing unusual about it. They lost sight of him, after passing, in a natural way, and did not look round.

As to the possibility of mistaken identity, they consider that he was quite unmistakable, being very tall and peculiar looking. His only brother was in America, so that there could have been no mistake between two brothers. They did not know Mrs. Williams' niece, and the child whose figure they saw with that of Mr. Williams was

unknown to them. They knew Eva Knowles, the child who saw them, too well for any possibility of confusion between them.

There were not many people about—two or three people opposite the shop were emptying barrels.

Neither of the ladies is short-sighted, and neither has ever had any similar hallucination.

In answer to the question whether Mr Williams looked ill, Mr. Fryer learnt that there was nothing in his appearance to attract attention, but after hearing of his death, Miss A. Dalison did think he had looked rather pale.

We have the evidence in writing of Eva Knowles, and of her mother, as to Eva's having seen the two ladies pass on the Saturday in question. They were also seen to pass ten days previously, on the 18th, when Mr. Williams and his niece were in the shop, but there seems to be no possibility of the ladies having confused the two days.

The following is from Mr. Fryer:—

On Monday, June 10th, 1889, I visited Plaxtol and saw nearly all the persons who have given their evidence in this case. Mrs. Williams showed me two photographs of her late husband, which proved him to have been a man of no common appearance but rather refined and striking. Mrs. W. is sure that there is no one in the neighbourhood who could have been mistaken for her husband. She says he was taken ill on Tuesday, April 23rd, and never rose from his bed again. During the illness he remarked to her "I feel so strange, there is only my frame lying here," and twice over he said to her, "The odd thing with this illness is I never seem to realise I am in my own room. I seem to be in a beautiful mansion, with beautiful grounds and flowers. I never saw anything so beautiful, and you are always with me. All the people are grandees, but they are not above us, but kind, and make us perfectly at home." Mr. Williams died on Sunday, April 28th, at 6 p.m.

Miss A. Dalison knew nothing of the illness.

Mrs. Knowles, the shopkeeper, is quite certain about the dates mentioned, and although she thought at first that Miss A. Dalison and Miss Sinclair must have mistaken the day and had a reminiscence of April 18th, when Mr. W. was in her shop with the little girl, she now remembers that when Mr. W. left her shop they must have been some way down the road below it and therefore would not have seen him go up the street, which he did. Eva Knowles is an intelligent child of 11, in the 5th standard. She saw Miss A. Dalison, Miss Sinclair and a gentleman, pass the shop on the 18th, whilst Mr. W. was inside. She remembers the time and date by the fact that she had come home from school and that Mr. W. brought the child Hilda an orange (which he had never done before—the child being only a recent visitor). Eva saw the ladies pass on the 27th, but no gentleman with them. When Miss A. Dalison and Miss Sinclair went to talk over the appearance with Mrs. Knowles on Tuesday, April 30th (date of visit noted in Miss S. Dalison's diary), Miss Sinclair at once pointed out Mr. Williams in a photo-

graphic group of 12 men. She had not seen the picture before the 30th, but Mr. W. had worked for her a year ago.

The child with Mr. Williams, when he appeared to Miss Dalison and Miss Sinclair, was of same height and build as Hilda Mary, age eight, niece of Mrs. Williams, and of her existence the ladies were unaware.

Mr. Williams knew the Dalisons well for at least 24 years.

L 832.—A^d Pⁿ

We are indebted for the following case to Mr. Spencer Curtis, who has taken much trouble in collecting all the evidence now obtainable about the occurrence.

The first account is from Mr. Curtis himself and is dated November 9th, 1888.

About five years ago, one Sunday night at about a quarter to 11 o'clock, I was sitting in my room with my nephew smoking. We suddenly heard screams, and on going out of the room found that they proceeded from the nursery maid's room. I went into her room and found her much excited, and she told me that she had heard her mother calling her. I spoke rather sharply to her about her fancy and told her she had much better go to sleep. My nephew and I thought no more about it.

On Tuesday morning following my wife received a letter from Guernsey, asking her to break the news to our nursery maid, that her brother and brother-in-law (who were fishermen) had been drowned on Sunday night. His body was recovered and it was found that his watch had stopped at a quarter to 11.

A few days later Mr. Curtis wrote :—

My wife informs me that it took place in December, 1878, not "about five years ago" as I mentioned.

Mr. Curtis' nephew writes on December 10th, 1888 :—

I recollect perfectly about 10 years ago (I forget the actual date) I was staying with my uncle, Mr. Spencer Curtis, at Totteridge House, from a Saturday to a Monday, which I was in the habit of often doing.

My uncle and myself were smoking in his smoking-room in the evening, after 10 o'clock (I think it was a Saturday), when we were alarmed between 10.30 p.m. and 10.45 p.m. by hearing shrieks issue from the nursery maid's room. My uncle hastened to the room, I remaining behind, and on his return he told me that the girl had had a dream that her mother was calling her, and she heard the church bells ringing, or something to that effect, I forget the actual words. My aunt also hastened to the room ; in fact the girl woke the whole house by her screams, and as she said it was no doubt a fit of indigestion, applied the necessary remedies, and we heard no more about it.

Some weeks after my uncle drew my attention to the above incident, and told me the girl's brother and brother-in-law had been drowned off Guernsey from a cutter, on that very night we had heard the screams. I have an idea of hearing that the brother's body was recovered, and his watch had stopped at 10.45 p.m., but of this I am not quite sure.

I thought the occurrence remarkable, and it has been impressed on my memory ever since, and I have often related the circumstances to friends.

E. CONSTABLE CURTIS.

The following account, signed by the nursery maid, Rose Aldridge, was dictated by her to Mr. Spencer Curtis's sister-in-law. We have a similar account in her own handwriting.

On the night of the 13th January, 1879, between sleeping and waking, I saw something shadowy rise up at the foot of my bed, I felt a hand passed over my face, and heard a voice say distinctly three times—"Poor Rose." I screamed, and Mrs. Curtis came to me; when I became calm I felt convinced there was something wrong at home.

ROSE ALDRIDGE.

Miss Curtis corroborates as follows:—

I distinctly remember, as a child, Rose Aldridge telling our nurse about what she saw.

MARGARET H. CURTIS.

Totteridge, Herts.

January 30th, 1889.

In sending these last two accounts Mr. Curtis writes:—

I believe that Rose Aldridge was able to fix the day as Monday as being the day she was found fault with about not sending some clothes to the wash.

I have got my daughter to state that she remembers the circumstance. She was about seven years old at the time.

This completes the evidence about the phantasm. It appears that Rose Aldridge (or Oldridge as she sometimes spells it) has some independent reason, mentioned above, for thinking that it occurred on a Monday night. Mr. Spencer Curtis and his nephew, on the other hand, have some independent reason for thinking that it happened on a Saturday or a Sunday night, namely that those were the days on which Mr. Constable Curtis usually stayed with his uncle. At this distance of time, however, we do not think that this recollection ought to weigh much against the conviction of Mr. Curtis that when the news of the deaths came he, as well as Rose Aldridge, believed them to have taken place on the night of her experience. The hour of her experience must have been late in the evening, after she went to bed, but before the gentlemen did.

The deaths occurred on the night of Monday, January 13th, to Tuesday, January 14th, 1879, but the hour is not known, all on board the vessel when she was wrecked having been drowned. We extract from copies of articles in the *Guernsey Star*, which Mr. Curtis has sent to us, the passages which seem to throw light on the subject.

From the *Guernsey Star* of January 14th (Tuesday), 1879.

Early this morning, considerable excitement was caused in the town by the rumour that the well-known St Malo trader *Reindeer* had been wrecked off Jersey and all hands were missing . . . She was commanded by

Captain George Piprell . . . and a crew of four men, named W. Oldridge, R. Hughes, G. Paul, and T. Phillips.

From the *Guernsey Star*, Thursday, January 16th, 1879.

The finding of the St. Malo mail bag at once set at rest all doubt as to the fate of the unfortunate vessel, and this was quickly followed by portions of the cabin furniture, including the cabin clock, which had stopped at two o'clock, thus indicating the time at which the catastrophe happened. The *Reindeer*, which was of 59 tons burthen, was well-known for her excellent sailing qualities; and her captain was a skilled and careful man, acquainted with every portion of this dangerous coast; the cause of this calamity can, therefore, but be conjectured, as none remain to tell the harrowing tale. When she sailed from our harbour on Monday the weather was very stormy and hazy, but scarcely sufficient to cause the delay of the voyage. Shortly afterwards, however, the wind increased, and a thick fog ensued. At about 11 o'clock the *Reindeer* was seen on the fishing bank off St. Martin's Point, and the wind at that time bearing more on her southerly quarter it is believed that the captain, while trying to make the Corbière light, must have been carried on the rocks in St. Ouen's Bay, where the vessel was quickly dashed to pieces and all on board drowned.

From the report of the inquest on the bodies given in the *Guernsey Star* for January 18th, 1879, it appears that the bodies came on shore by degrees. The captain's was only found on Thursday morning. In the captain's pocket was found a watch, stopped at 5.15.

Mr. Edward F. Piprell, a brother of the deceased captain, residing in Guernsey, said . . . that vessel . . . was to have left Guernsey for St. Malo at three o'clock on Monday afternoon, but did not leave till 6.30, having got aground. He gave the names of the crew, all of whom he identified. His brother was 24 years of age, the ages of the men varying from 26 to 28. The jury returned a verdict that the bodies were those of the men above-mentioned, accidentally drowned in the wreck of the cutter *Reindeer*, of Guernsey, which took place in the night of the 13th to the 14th inst., at the Havre du Dehors, near L'Étecq, in the parish of St. Ouen's.

L 833.—A^d Pⁿ

For the following narrative we are indebted to the Rev. H. Kendall, of Darlington. Mr. Bastow, whose vision is recounted, is the author of a Bible Dictionary which has passed through five editions. His experience is of a rare and interesting type; but it is undeniable that 56 years is a long time through which to carry back the memory. Mr. Bastow's memory of things that happened to him at that time seems, however, to be vivid, and it will be observed that the account of the experience, though only now signed by Mr. Bastow, was written by Mr. Kendall after hearing it from Mr. Bastow 19 years ago:—

The Rev. J. A. Bastow, Primitive Methodist Minister, had once a remarkable experience. It was when he was a young, unmarried man, travelling in the Bolton circuit in Lancashire. The Rev. James Garner was also a young

man at that time and was his colleague, and they lodged together at the house of the superintendent minister at Bolton. One evening when they were studying in the same room, Mr. Bastow was writing at 9 or 10 o'clock and a sudden feeling came over him that his mother was dying. He looked up and said, "Garner! my mother's dying." Mr. Garner of course pooh-poohed the idea and tried to dispossess him of what he thought a foolish fancy. They did not study any more that night but sat talking, and by-and-bye they went to bed. They slept together. Mr. Bastow got into bed first, and no sooner was his head laid upon the pillow than he seemed to be in a room out of which a door opened into a bedroom where his mother lay in bed dying. He saw everything distinctly and all before Mr. Garner joined him. He started up and said, "It is of no use, Garner! my mother is dying. I've just seen her." Next day Mr. Flesher, who travelled at Scarborough, passed through the town on the way to Manchester. Mr. Bastow asked him if he had seen their people at Leeds but he replied that the coach only stayed just long enough to change horses and he didn't get down. Just then the superintendent's wife called out, "Bastow, you must come downstairs, here's a letter for you." He went down and read the letter. It was from Leeds and informed him that his mother had died the night before at the time when he saw her. She had died in child-bearing. When he saw her in vision the house seemed strange to him, but when he went over to the funeral he found that they had removed to another house since he was at home last, and there were the rooms exactly as he had seen them.

Mr. Bastow does not know how it was he saw what he did, only that he saw it all in his mind, that it seemed as natural as possible at the moment, and that it was accompanied with the conviction that it was a reality. He has never had any experience like it before or since. He was in good health at the time.

To this Mr. Bastow adds the words:—

This account is correct.

JAMES AUSTIN BASTOW.

Mr. Kendall continues:—

Rev. J. A. Bastow now resides at 120, Paulton-road, Southport. He writes September 19th, 1889, to Rev. James Garner, now of Sale, near Manchester, for confirmation of the above account and says: "I think you will recollect the night in March, 1833, when the impression of my mother's death seized me. You will also recollect that I went home to the funeral and when I came back you met me at Mr. Tillotson's door, and told me that I had to go back to Preston as Mr. Calvert had died." Rev. James Garner replies: "I cannot recollect any of the particulars respecting death of your mother, but I have no doubt respecting the correctness of your statements."*

The general minutes of Conference of the Primitive Methodist Connection for 1832 give the names of preachers at Bolton as S. Tillotson, J.

* Mr. Garner states in the same letter that sight has failed him and that his general health has much failed, so that his not remembering the incident need not surprise us.

Garner, J. Bastow. This arrangement would be in force from June, 1832, to June 1833, and would, therefore, include the time, March, 1833, when Mr. Bastow had his vision. Previous to 1832 Mr. Bastow's name does not appear in the minutes. In those of 1833 it is down for Preston Brook. The account states that Mr. Flesher was travelling at Scarborough at the time, and passed through Bolton on his way to Manchester. He was a minister of wide repute, often sent for to a distance on special occasions. The minutes of 1832 give his name along with many others for Hull circuit, but the Hull circuit was very extensive, including many branches, and of these branches Scarborough was one.

I wrote the account of Mr. Bastow's vision, which he now endorses, in 1870. It was given to me a little before that time by him, when his mind and memory were in full vigour.

Darlington, October 1st, 1889.

H. KENDALL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

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

SIR,—In reply to my objection made on November 24th to Mr. Podmore's theory that phantasms of the dead are probably "casual hallucinations engendered by some condition of the percipient," caused by "vague alarm" or "expectancy," in which I expressed surprise that, if it were so, the hallucinations never took the form of "things with wings," angels, fairies, or demons, Mr. Podmore says in the last *Journal* of the Society, "It has been well established that a large proportion of the hallucinations seen by sane and healthy persons resemble the human form." I founded my objection to his theory on this very fact. His answer tends to reinforce my objection. The large proportion of hallucinations seen by healthy persons to resemble the human form, quoted in *Phantasms of the Living*, were admittedly caused in some way by the agency of the human beings seen. I submit that when the hallucination takes the form of a person who is dead we should refer the cause of it to that person till some better cause is discovered, unless, of course, telepathy as an explanation of the phenomena recorded in *Phantasms of the Living* has broken down.—I am, yours truly,

R. M. COLLEGE,

G. M. LE M. TAYLOR.

December 14th, 1889.

P.S.—Mr. Podmore also says we are not dealing with persons suffering from *delirium tremens*; true, but we are with hallucinations. When the cause of these manifestly does not emanate from the persons they represent, but they are "casual," engendered by some condition of the percipient such as delirium of various kinds, and "vague fear" with "expectancy" (as when a child left in the dark sees the devil), the hallucinations frequently take the grotesque form so conspicuous in the other case by their absence.

The argument of Mr. Podmore, which is attacked by Colonel Taylor, is put so shortly in the abstract given in the *Journal* for December that it is perhaps hardly clear, and we do not think that Colonel Taylor has quite caught the point. The facts seem to be that while the majority of apparitions seen by sane and healthy persons are human in form, most of these are unrecognised; of the recognised ones most are of living people, and of these apparitions of living people most seem to be perfectly casual, corresponding to nothing whatever in the experience of the person whose figure is seen.

For instance, A. meets his son in the passage and afterwards ascertains that he was at the time playing with his brother in the dining-room, and nothing happens to connect the appearance with any state, mental or physical, of his son.

To give definiteness to our argument we may take, as provisionally representing the proportion of recognised to unrecognised apparitions, &c., the numbers of those reported as affecting the sense of sight only in our census of hallucinations as so far worked out.* Out of 205 such experiences 178 were human apparitions—that is, appearances of the human form or parts of the human form (including under this head one case of an angel with wings, and one of a cherub); the other 27 represented animals or inanimate objects. Of the 178 human apparitions 99 were unrecognised, 59 represented recognised living people, and 20 represented recognised dead people.

Of the 59 apparitions of living people, 14 are reported as being *prima facie* coincidental—happening at the same time as an event with which there is some reason to connect them. The remainder, *i.e.*, more than three-fourths, of the apparitions of living people, seem to have been purely subjective, or at least no reason is shown for supposing any of them to be otherwise.†

Of the 20 apparitions of dead people, 3 occurred before the fact of the death was known to the percipient, but we have no special reason for supposing that the remaining 17 were veridical.

Turning to the unrecognised human apparitions, there is some reason to connect 5 of them with deaths that occurred about the same time, but in the majority of the remaining 94 cases we have no reason to suppose that the apparitions represented any actual person, living or dead, at all. They may have been purely fancy portraits made up in the brain of the percipient, and not representing anyone in particular, any more than the parrots, laurel leaves, ostrich feathers, &c., of the non-human apparitions represent any particular parrots or laurel leaves. In some cases, however, besides these where there is coincidence in time with a death, there are circumstances which may indicate an origin external to the percipient's brain for those unrecognised apparitions. Thus in cases of the type of most of those discussed by Mr. Podmore at the last general meeting, there seems to be some connection between apparitions and particular localities,—different people seeing apparitions in the same so-called haunted house; in other cases, again, an apparition is visible to more than one person at a time. It is not our object now to discuss the difficult and complex question how far such things tend to indicate a connection between the phantoms and deceased persons; but at any rate the opinion that a large proportion of the apparitions seen by sane and healthy people are purely subjective in origin is not a mere conjecture; it is solidly founded on the fact brought out by statistical investigation, that when the person whose figure is seen is alive, in the large majority of cases no connection is discoverable between his state or his action and the apparition.—Ed.

* The numbers given will be found to correspond with those in the *ad interim* report on the census of hallucinations in *Proceedings XV.*, only to be somewhat differently divided.

† Readers of *Phantasms of the Living* will remember that Mr. Gurney (Vol. II., p. 19) estimates that about 1 in 40 of the recognised apparitions of living persons occur within 12 hours of their death. Our larger proportion of apparently veridical cases is partly due (1) to our including other coincidences besides that of death; (2) to Mr. Gurney's counting as coincidental cases only those where the coincidence had been carefully established, whereas ours are unsifted; and (3) it is probably partly due also to Mr. Gurney's calculation being to some extent founded on conjectural data, which he always endeavoured to assume in such a way that any error might weigh on the side against his argument.