

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00018654118





PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING

19-30-70

PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING

BY

EDMUND GURNEY, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

AND

FRANK PODMORE, M.A.

ABRIDGED EDITION PREPARED BY

MRS. HENRY SIDGWICK

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE, CARTER LANE, E.C.

NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON AND CO.

1918

IF1031

.G8
1918

260395
19

22

EDITOR'S PREFACE

TO THE PRESENT ABRIDGED EDITION

Phantasms of the Living, published in 1886, which embodies much of the early work of the Society for Psychical Research, and in particular much valuable discussion by its earliest honorary secretary, Edmund Gurney, has long been out of print. But as its value has been but little affected by subsequent investigations, and it still forms the basis on which much of the present-day work on telepathy, and especially on apparitions, rests, it is thought that a new edition is likely to be appreciated by the public. Had the authors been with us still, a new edition would no doubt have been brought up to date. New evidence would have been included, and the discussion might perhaps have been added to or diminished, to suit the new atmosphere which the book itself has helped to create. Changes of this sort I have not felt justified in attempting. The text is substantially as the authors left it with the exception of omissions for the sake of brevity in Chapters IV and XIII (indicated in their places), and no new cases have been introduced.

The original edition, however, occupies two large volumes and it was desired to reduce the present one by nearly half. This has been effected mainly by omitting a large number of the cases quoted. In the original work, besides descriptions of experiments, accounts of some 700 numbered incidents, *prima facie* telepathic, were given. Of these the present edition includes only 186. The whole of the supplement which contains more than half the cases—the less well-evidenced ones—has been omitted. Of the rest the cases retained are selected first as required to illustrate Gurney's remarks, and secondly as being, in my judgment, the best evidenced of their class. They must be regarded as typical cases, not as exhibiting the mass of evidence obtainable at the time, and which for reasons explained in the introduction, it was an important part of the plan of the original work to present. In order to retain as far as possible the effect of this mass, I have given the cases their original numbers, thus showing how many have been omitted at each point. Further omissions for the sake of brevity are some experimental cases; some illustrative cases in foot-notes; and, more important, a long note by Gurney on Witchcraft and one by Myers "On a Suggested Mode of Psychical Interaction," neither of which belongs to the general course of the work.

It remains to explain that I have inserted in their proper places some of the cases from the "Additional Chapter" of the original edition, and have introduced further information about a few cases and other matters, not only from Gurney's "Additions and Corrections," but from other sources, especially from articles published by Gurney himself in reply to criticisms. A few foot-notes, attached to omitted cases, have been

transferred to equally appropriate places elsewhere. Finally there are a very few editorial notes in text and foot-notes. These are clearly distinguished by being enclosed in square brackets and signed "Ed." Square brackets were also used by Gurney to indicate remarks of his own in the course of cases, but there is I think no risk of confusion. The omission of cases has necessitated some changes in sentences connecting one case with another. These also, when other than purely verbal, have been enclosed in square brackets.

I must in conclusion remind readers, especially those who have not followed regularly the *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychical Research, that the present work, excellent as I think it is, cannot now be regarded as a complete exposition of the subject with which it deals. In the thirty-one years since it was originally published, much new and illuminating evidence for telepathy—both experimental and spontaneous—has been accumulated; our knowledge about transient hallucinations of the sane (*see* Chap. XI), veridical and other, has been considerably added to by the "Census of Hallucinations," of which the results were published in *Proceedings*, vol. x; motor automatism, in the form especially of automatic writing, has been much studied; and finally evidence pointing to the operation of telepathy, not only between minds in the body, but between the living and the dead, has so much increased, that had he written now I think it probable that Gurney (as well as Myers) would have referred to this possibility less tentatively than he does on pages 331 and 479-481.

ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK.

Office of the Society for Psychical Research,
20, Hanover Square, W.
January, 1918.

PREFACE TO ORIGINAL EDITION

A LARGE part of the material used in this book was sent to the authors as representatives of the Society for Psychical Research ; and the book is published with the sanction of the Council of that Society.

The division of authorship has been as follows. As regards the writing and the views expressed,—Mr. Myers is solely responsible for the Introduction, and for the “ Note on a Suggested Mode of Psychical Interaction,” which immediately precedes the Supplement ; and Mr. Gurney is solely responsible for the remainder of the book. But the most difficult and important part of the undertaking—the collection, examination, and appraisal of evidence—has been a joint labour, of which Mr. Podmore has borne so considerable a share that his name could not have been omitted from the title-page.

In the free discussion and criticism which has accompanied the progress of the work, we have enjoyed the constant advice and assistance of Professor and Mrs. Sidgwick, to each of whom we owe more than can be expressed by any conventional phrases of obligation. Whatever errors of judgment or flaws in argument may remain, such blemishes are certainly fewer than they would have been but for this watchful and ever-ready help. Professor and Mrs. Sidgwick have also devoted some time and trouble, during vacations, to the practical work of interviewing informants and obtaining their personal testimony.

In the acknowledgment of our debts, special mention is due to Professor W. F. Barrett. He was to a great extent the pioneer of the movement which it is hoped that this book may carry forward ; and the extent of his services in relation, especially, to the subject of experimental Thought-transference will sufficiently appear in the sequel. Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, Professor Oliver J. Lodge, and M. Charles Richet have been most welcome allies in the same branch of the work. Professor Barrett and M. Richet have also supplied several of the non-experimental cases in our collection. Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth has rendered valuable assistance in points relating to the theory of probabilities, a subject on which he is a recognised authority. Among members of our own Society, our warmest thanks are due to Miss Porter, for her well-directed, patient, and energetic assistance in every department of the work ; Mr. C. C. Massey has given us the benefit of his counsel ; and Mrs. Walwyn,

Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, of Clerkenwell, the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, of Rhyl, and Mr. Richard Hodgson, have aided us greatly in the collection of evidence. Many other helpers, in this and other countries, we must be content to include in a general expression of gratitude.

Further records of experience will be most welcome, and should be sent to the [office of the Society for Psychical Research.]

June, 1886.

SYNOPSIS

INTRODUCTION

I

§ 1. The title of this book embraces all transmissions of thought and feeling from one person to another, by other means than through the recognised channels of sense ; and among these cases we shall include apparitions . . . xxxiii

§ 2. We conceive that the problems here attacked lie in the main track of science . . . xxxiii-xxxiv

§ 3. The Society for Psychical Research merely aims at the free and exact discussion of the one remaining group of subjects to which such discussion is still refused. Reasons for such refusal . . . xxxiv-xxxvi

§ 4. Reasons, on the other hand, for the prosecution of our inquiries may be drawn from the present condition of several contiguous studies. Reasons drawn from the advance of biology . . . xxxvi-xxxvii

§ 5. Specimens of problems which biology suggests, and on which inquiries like ours may ultimately throw light. Wundt's view of the origination of psychical energy . . . xxxvii-xxxviii

§ 6. The problems of hypnotism . . . xxxviii-xxxix

§ 7. Hope of aid from the progress of " psycho-physical " inquiries xxxix-xl

§ 8. Reasons for psychical research drawn from the *lacunæ* of anthropology . . . xl-xli

§ 9. Reasons drawn from the study of history, and especially of the comparative history of religions. Instance from the S.P.R.'s investigation of so-called " Theosophy " . . . xli-xliii

§ 10. In considering the relation of our studies to religion generally, we observe that, since they oblige us to conceive the psychical element in man as having relations which cannot be expressed in terms of matter, a possibility is suggested of obtaining scientific evidence of a supersensory relation between man's mind and a mind or minds above his own . . . xliii-xlv

§ 11. While, on the other hand, if our evidence to recent supernormal occurrences be discredited, a retrospective improbability will be thrown on much of the content of religious tradition . . . xlv-xlvii

§ 12. Furthermore, in the region of ethical and æsthetic emotion, telepathy indicates a possible scientific basis for much to which men now cling without definite justification . . . xlvii-l

§ 13. Investigations such as ours are important, moreover, for the purpose of checking error and fraud, as well as of eliciting truth . . . l-li

II

§ 14. Place of the present book in the field of psychical research. Indications of experimental thought-transference in the normal state. 1876-1882 . . . li-lii

§ 15. Foundation of the Society for Psychical Research, 1882. Telepathy selected as our first subject for detailed treatment on account of the mass of evidence for it received by us . . . lii-liii

§ 16. There is also a theoretic fitness in treating of the direct action of mind upon mind before dealing with other supernormal phenomena . . . liii-liv

§ 17. Reasons for classing apparitions occurring about the moment of death as phantoms of the *living*, rather than of the *dead* . . . liv-lvi

§ 18. This book, then, claims to show (1) that experimental telepathy exists, and (2) that apparitions at death, &c., are a result of something beyond chance ; whence it follows (3) that these experimental and these spontaneous cases of the action of mind on mind are in some way allied lvi-lvii

§ 19. As to the nature and degree of this alliance different views may be taken, and in a " Note on a Suggested Mode of Psychological Interaction " [omitted in the present edition.—ED.] a theory somewhat different from Mr. Gurney's is set forth lvii-lix

§ 20. This book, however, consists much more largely of evidence than of theories. This evidence has been almost entirely collected by ourselves lix-lx

§ 21. Inquiries like these, though they may appear at first to degrade great truths or solemn conceptions, are likely to end by exalting and affirming them lx

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY REMARKS : GROUNDS OF CAUTION

§ 1. The great test of scientific achievement is often held to be the power to *predict* natural phenomena ; but the test, though an authoritative one in the sciences of *inorganic* nature, has but a limited application to the sciences that deal with *life*, and especially to the department of *mental* phenomena 1-2

§ 2. In dealing with the implications of life and the developments of human faculty, caution needs to be exercised in two directions. The scientist is in danger of forgetting the unstable and unmechanical nature of the material, and of closing the door too dogmatically on phenomena whose relations with established knowledge he cannot trace ; while others take advantage of the fact that the limits of possibility cannot here be scientifically stated, to gratify an uncritical taste for marvels, and to invest their own hasty assumptions with the dignity of laws 3-4

§ 3. This state of things subjects the study of " psychical " phenomena to peculiar disadvantages, and imposes on the student peculiar obligations 4-5

§ 4. And this should be well recognised by those who advance a conception so new to psychological science as the central conception of this book—to wit, *Telepathy, or the ability of one mind to impress or to be impressed by another mind otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense*. (Of the two persons concerned, the one whose mind *impresses* the other will be called the *agent*, and the one whose mind is *impressed* the *percipient*) 5-6

§ 5. Telepathy will be here studied chiefly as a system of *facts*, theoretical discussion being subordinated to the presentation of evidence. The evidence will be of two sorts—*spontaneous* occurrences, and the results of direct *experiment* ; which latter will have to be carefully distinguished from spurious " thought-reading " exhibitions 6-7

CHAPTER II

THE EXPERIMENTAL BASIS : THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE

§ 1. The term *thought-transference* has been adopted in preference to *thought-reading*, the latter term (1) having become identified with exhibitions of *muscle-reading*, and (2) suggesting a power of reading a person's thoughts against his will 8-9

§ 2. The phenomena of thought-transference first attracted the attention of competent witnesses in connection with " mesmerism," and were regarded as one of the peculiarities of the mesmeric *rapport* ; which was most prejudicial to their chance of scientific acceptance 9-10

§ 3. Hints of thought-transference between persons in a normal state were obtained by Professor Barrett in 1876 ; and just at that time the attention of others had been attracted to certain phenomena of the " willing-game," which

were not easily explicable (as almost all the so-called "willing" and "thought-reading" exhibitions are) by unconscious muscular guidance. But the issue could never be definitely decided by cases where the two persons concerned were in any sort of *contact* 10-13

§ 4. And even where contact is excluded, other possibilities of unconscious guidance must be taken into account; as also must the possibility of conscious *collusion*. Anyone who is unable to obtain conviction as to the *bona fides* of experiments by himself acting as agent or percipient (and so being himself one of the persons who would have to take part in the trick, if trick it were), may fairly demand that the responsibility for the results shall be spread over a considerable group of persons—a group so large that he shall find it impossible to extend to all of them the hypothesis of deceit (or of such imbecility as would take the place of deceit) which he might apply to a smaller number . . . 14-16

§ 5. Experiments with the Creery family; earlier trials 16-18

More conclusive experiments, in which knowledge of what was to be transferred (usually the idea of a particular card, name, or number) was confined to the members of the investigating committee who acted as agents; with a table of results, and an estimate of probabilities 18-21

In many cases reckoned as failures there was a degree of approximate success which was very significant 21-22

The form of the impression in the percipient's mind seems to have been sometimes visual and sometimes auditory 22

§ 6. Reasons why these experiments were not accessible to a larger number of observers; the chief reason being the gradual decline of the percipient faculty 22-24

§ 7. In a course of experiments of the same sort conducted by M. Charles Richet, in France, the would-be percipients were apparently not persons of any special susceptibility; but a sufficient number of trials were made for the excess of the total of successes over the total most probable if chance alone acted to be decidedly striking 24-26

The pursuit of this line of inquiry on a large scale in England has produced results which involve a practical certainty that some cause other than chance has acted 26-27

§ 8. Experiments in the reproduction of diagrams and rough drawings. In a long series conducted by Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, two percipients and a considerable number of agents were employed 27-30

Specimens of the results 30-40

§ 9. Professor Oliver J. Lodge's experiments with Mr. Guthrie's "subjects," and his remarks thereon 41-43

§ 10. Experiments in the transference of elementary sensations—tastes, smells, and pains 43-48

§ 11. A different department of experiment is that where the transference does not take effect in the percipient's consciousness, but is exhibited in his *motor* system, either automatically or semi-automatically. Experiments in the inhibition of utterance 48-50

§ 12. The most conclusive cases of transference of ideas which, nevertheless, do not affect the percipient's consciousness are those where the idea is reproduced by the percipient *in writing*, without his being aware of what he has written. Details of a long series of trials carried out by the Rev. P. H. and Mrs. Newnham 50-56

The intelligence which acted on the percipient's side in these experiments was in a sense an *unconscious* intelligence—a term which needs careful definition 56-57

§ 13. M. Richet has introduced an ingenious method for utilising what he calls "mediumship"—*i.e.*, the liability to exhibit intelligent movements in which consciousness and will take no part—for purposes of telepathic experiment. By this method it has been clearly shown that a word on which the agent concentrates his attention may be unconsciously reproduced by the percipient 57-61

And even that a word which has only an unconscious place in the agent's mind may be similarly transferred 61-64

These phenomena seem to involve a certain *impulsive* quality in the transference 64-65

§ 14. Apart from serious and systematic investigation, interesting results are sometimes obtained in a more casual way, of which some specimens are given. It is much to be wished that more persons would make experiments, under conditions which preclude the possibility of unconscious guidance. At present we are greatly in the dark as to the proportion of people in whom the specific faculty exists 65-69

CHAPTER III

THE TRANSITION FROM EXPERIMENTAL TO SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

- § 1. There is a certain class of cases in which, though they are experiments on the agent's part, and involve his conscious concentration of mind with a view to the result, the *percipient* is not consciously or voluntarily a party to the experiment. Such cases may be called *transitional*. In them the distance between the two persons concerned is often considerable 70
- § 2. Spurious examples of the sort are often adduced; and especially in connection with mesmerism, results are often attributed to the operator's *will*, which are really due to some previous command or suggestion. Still, examples are not lacking of the induction of the hypnotic trance in a "subject" at a distance, by the deliberate exercise of volition 70-72
- § 3. Illustrations of the induction or inhibition of definite *actions* by the agent's volition, directed towards a person who is unaware of his intent . . . 72-74
- The relation of the *will* to telepathic experiments is liable to be misunderstood. The idea, which we encounter in romances, that one person may acquire and exercise at a distance a dangerous dominance over another's actions, seems quite unsupported by evidence. An extreme example of what may really occur is given 74-76
- § 4. Illustrations of the induction of definite *ideas* by the agent's volition 76
- § 5. The transference of an idea, deliberately fixed on by the agent, to an unprepared percipient at a distance, would be hard to establish, since ideas whose origin escapes us are so constantly suggesting themselves spontaneously. Still, telepathic action may possibly extend considerably beyond the well-marked cases on which the proof of it must depend 76-77
- § 6. Illustrations of the induction of *sensations* by the agent's volition . . . 77-79
- § 7. And especially of sensations of *sight* 79-82
- § 8. The best-attested examples being hallucinations representing the figure of the agent himself 82-92
- § 9. Such cases present a marked departure from the ordinary type of experimental thought-transference, inasmuch as what the percipient perceives (the agent's form) is not the reproduction of that with which the agent's mind has been occupied; and this seems to preclude any simple *physical* conception of the transference, as due to "brain-waves," sympathetic vibrations, &c. A similar difficulty meets us later in most of the *spontaneous* cases; and the *rapprochement* of experimental and spontaneous telepathy must be understood to be limited to their *psychical* aspect—a limitation which can be easily defended 92-94

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL CRITICISM OF THE EVIDENCE FOR SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

§ 1. When we pass to spontaneous exhibitions of telepathy, the nature of the evidence changes; for the events are described by persons who played their part in them unawares, without any idea that they were matter for scientific observation. The method of inquiry will now have to be the *historical* method, and will involve difficult questions as to the judgment of human testimony, and a complex estimate of probabilities 95-96

§ 2. The most general objection to evidence for phenomena transcending the recognised scope of science is that, in a thickly populated world where mal-observation and exaggeration are easy and common, there is (within certain limits) no marvel for which evidence of a sort may not be obtained. This objection is often enforced by reference to the superstition of *witchcraft*, which in quite modern times was supported by a large array of contemporary evidence 96

But when this instance is carefully examined, we find (1) that the direct testimony came exclusively from the uneducated class; and (2) that, owing to the ignorance which, in the witch-epoch, was universal as to the psychology of various abnormal and morbid states, the hypothesis of unconscious self-deception on the part of the witnesses was never allowed for 96-97

Our present knowledge of hypnotism, hysteria, and hystero-epilepsy enables us to account for many of the phenomena attributed to demonic possession, as neither fact nor fraud, but as *bona fide* hallucinations 97

While for the more bizarre and incredible marvels there is absolutely no direct, first-hand, independent testimony 98-99

The better-attested cases are just those which, if genuine, might be explained as telepathic; but the evidence for them is not strong enough to support any definite conclusion 99-100

§ 3. The evidence for telepathy in the present work presents a complete contrast to that which has supported the belief in magical occurrences. It comes for the most part from educated persons, who were not predisposed to admit the reality of the phenomena; while the phenomena themselves are not strongly associated with any prevalent beliefs or habits of thought, differing in this respect, *e.g.*, from alleged apparitions of the *dead*. Still we must not, on such grounds as these, assume that the evidence is trustworthy 101-102

§ 4. The errors which may affect it are of various sorts. Error of *observation* may result in a *mistake of identity*. Thus a stranger in the street may be mistaken for a friend, who turns out to have died at that time, and whose phantasm is therefore asserted to have appeared. But it is only to a very small minority of the cases which follow that such a hypothesis could possibly be applied 102-103

Error of inference is not a prominent danger; as what concerns the telepathic evidence is simply what the percipient *seemed to himself* to see or hear, not what he inferred therefrom 103-104

§ 5. Of more importance are errors of *narration*, due to the tendency to make an account edifying, or graphic, or startling. In first-hand testimony this tendency may be to some extent counterbalanced by the desire to be believed; which has less influence in cases where the narrator is not personally responsible, as, *e.g.*, in the spurious and sensational anecdotes of anonymous newspaper paragraphs, or of dinner-table gossip 104-106

§ 6. Errors of *memory* are more insidious. If the witness regards the facts in a particular speculative or emotional light, facts will be apt, in memory, to accommodate themselves to this view, and details will get introduced or dropped out in such a manner as to aid the harmonious effect. Even apart from any special bias, the mere effort to make definite what has become dim may fill in the picture with wrong detail; or the tendency to lighten the burden of retention may invest the whole occurrence with a spurious trenchancy and simplicity of form 106-108

§ 7. We have to consider how these various sources of error may affect the evidence for a case of spontaneous telepathy. Such a case presents a coincidence of a particular kind, with four main points to look to:—(1) A particular state of the agent, *e.g.*, the crisis of death; (2) a particular experience of the percipient, *e.g.*, the impression of seeing the agent before him in visible form; (3) the date of (1); (4) the date of (2) 108

§ 8. The risk of mistake as to the state of the agent is seldom appreciable: his death, for instance, if that is what has befallen him, can usually be proved beyond dispute 108-109

For the experience of the percipient, on the other hand, we have generally nothing but his own word to depend on. But for what is required, his word is often sufficient. For the evidential point is simply his statement that he has had an impression or sensation of a peculiar kind, which, if he had it, he knew that

he had ; and this point is quite independent of his *interpretation* of his experience, which may easily be erroneous, *e.g.*, if he attributes objective reality to what was really a hallucination 109

The risk of misrepresentation is smallest if his description of his experience, or a distinct course of action due to his experience, has *preceded* his knowledge of what has happened to the agent 109-110

§ 9. Where his description of his experience dates from a time *subsequent* to his knowledge of what has happened to the agent, there is a possibility that this knowledge may have made the experience seem more striking and distinctive than it really was. Still, we have not detected definite instances of this sort of inaccuracy. Nor would the fact (often expressly stated by the witness) that the experience did not at the time of its occurrence suggest the agent, by any means destroy—though it would of course weaken—the presumption that it was telepathic 111-112

§ 10. As regards the interval of time which may separate the two events or experiences on the agent's and the percipient's side respectively, an arbitrary limit of 12 hours has been adopted—the coincidence in most cases being very much closer than this ; but no case will be presented as telepathic where the percipient's experience *preceded*, by however short a time, some grave event occurring to the agent, if at the time of the percipient's experience the state of the agent was normal 112-113

§ 11. It is in the matter of the *dates* that the risk of misstatement is greatest. The instinct towards simplification and dramatic completeness naturally tends to make the coincidence more exact than the facts warrant 114-115

§ 12. The date of the event that has befallen the agent is often included in the news of that event ; which news, in these days of posts and telegraphs, often follows close enough on the percipient's experience for the date of that experience to be then safely recalled 115-116

§ 13. But if a longer interval elapse, the percipient may assume too readily that his own experience fell on the critical day ; and as time goes on, his certainty is likely to increase rather than diminish. Still, if the coincidence was then and there noted, and if the attention of others was called to it, it may be possible to present a tolerably strong case for its reality, even after the lapse of a considerable time 116-117

§ 14. These various evidential conditions may be arranged in a graduated scheme 117-119

§ 15. Second-hand evidence (except of one special type) is excluded from the body of the work ; but the Supplement [omitted in this edition.—ED.] contains a certain number of second-hand cases, received from persons who were well acquainted with the original witnesses, and who had had the opportunity of becoming thoroughly acquainted with their statement of the facts 119-120

§ 16. A certain separation of cases according to their evidential value has been attempted, the body of the work being reserved for those where the *prima facie* probability that the essential facts are correctly stated is tolerably strong. But even where the *facts* are correctly reported, their force in the *argument for telepathy* will differ according to the class to which they belong ; purely *emotional* impressions, for instance, and *dreams*, are very weak classes 120-121

The value of the several items of evidence is also largely affected by the mental qualities and training of the witnesses. Every case must be judged on its own merits, by reference to a variety of points ; and those who study the records will have an equal opportunity of forming a judgment with those who have collected them—except in the matter of personal acquaintance with the witnesses, the effect of which it is impossible to communicate 121-123

§ 17. An all-important point is the *number* of the coincidences adduced. A few might be accounted accidental ; but it will be impossible to apply that hypothesis throughout. Nor can the evidence be swept out of court by a mere general appeal to the untrustworthiness of human testimony. If it is to be explained away, it must be met (as we have ourselves endeavoured to meet it) in detail ; and this necessitates the confronting of the single cause, telepathy (whose *a priori* improbability is fully admitted), with a multitude of causes, more or less improbable, and in cumulation incredible 123-124

§ 18. With all their differences, the cases recorded bear strong signs of

belonging to a true natural group; and their harmony, alike in what they do and in what they do not present, is very unlikely to be the accidental result of a multitude of disconnected mistakes. And it is noteworthy that certain sensational and suspicious details, here conspicuous by their absence, which often make their way into remote or badly-evidenced cases, are precisely those which the telepathic hypothesis would not cover 124-126

§ 19. But though some may regard the cumulative argument here put forward for spontaneous telepathy as amounting to a proof, the proof is not by any means of an *éclatant* sort: much of the evidence falls far short of the ideal standard. Still, enough has perhaps been done to justify our undertaking, and to broaden the basis of future inquiry 126-128

§ 20. The various items of evidence are, of course, not the links in a chain, but the sticks in a faggot. It is impossible to lay down the precise number of sticks necessary to a perfectly solid faggot; but the present collection is at least an instalment of what is required 128-129

§ 21. The instinct as to the amount of evidence needed may differ greatly in a mind which *has*, and a mind which has *not*, realised the facts of *experimental* telepathy (Chap. ii.), and the intimate relation of that branch to the spontaneous branch. Between the two branches, in spite of their difference—a difference as great in appearance as that between lightning and the electrical attraction of rubbed amber for bits of straw—the great psychological fact of a supersensuous influence of mind on mind constitutes a true generic bond 129-130

[THE FOLLOWING IS GURNEY'S SYNOPSIS OF HIS IMPORTANT NOTE ON WITCHCRAFT OMITTED IN THE PRESENT EDITION.—ED.]

The statement made in Chapter iv. as to the lack of first-hand evidence for the phenomena of magic and witchcraft (except so far as they can be completely accounted for by modern psychological knowledge) may seem a sweeping one. But extensive as is the literature of the subject, the actual records are extraordinarily meagre; and the staple prodigies, which were really nothing more than popular legends, are quoted and re-quoted *ad nauseam*. Examples of the so-called evidence which supported the belief in *lycanthropy*, and in the *nocturnal rides and orgies*.

The case of witchcraft, so far from proving (as is sometimes represented) that a more or less imposing array of evidence will be forthcoming for any belief that does not distinctly fly in the face of average public opinion, goes, in fact, rather surprisingly far towards proving the contrary

This view of the subject is completely opposed to that of Mr. Lecky, whose treatment seems to suffer from the neglect of two important distinctions. He does not distinguish between *evidence*—of which, in respect of the more bizarre marvels, there was next to none; and *authority*—of which there was abundance, from Homer downwards. Nor does he discriminate the wholly incredible allegations (*e.g.*, as to transportations through the air and transformations into animal forms) from the *pathological* phenomena, which in the eyes of contemporaries were equally supernatural, and for which, as might be expected, the direct evidence was abundant.

A most important class of these pathological phenomena were *subjective hallucinations of the senses*, often due to terror or excitement, and sometimes probably to hypnotic suggestion, but almost invariably attributed to the direct operation of the devil. Other phenomena—of insensibility, inhibition of utterance, abnormal *rapport*, and the influence of reputed witches on health—were almost certainly hypnotic in character; "possession" is often simply hystero-epilepsy; while much may be accounted for by mere hysteria, or by the same sort of faith as produces the modern "mind-cures."

Learned opinion on the subject of witchcraft went through curious vicissitudes; the recession to a rational standpoint, which in many ways was of course a sceptical movement, being complicated by the fact that many of the phenomena were too genuine to be doubted. Now that the separation is complete, we see that the exploded part of witchcraft never had any real evidential foundation;

while the part which had a real evidential foundation has been taken up into orthodox physiological and psychological science. With the former part we might contrast, and with the latter compare, the evidential case for telepathy.

CHAPTER V

SPECIMENS OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

§ 1. As the study of any large amount of the evidence that follows is a task for which many readers will be disinclined, a selection of typical cases will be presented in this chapter, illustrative of the various classes into which the phenomena fall 131-132

§ 2. The logical starting-point is found in the class that presents most analogy to experimental thought-transference—*i.e.*, where the percipient's impression is *not externalised* as part of the objective world. An example is given of the transference of *pain*, and a possible example of the transference of *smell*; but among the phenomena of spontaneous telepathy, such literal reproductions of the agent's bodily sensation are very exceptional 132-135

§ 3. Examples of the transference of a somewhat *abstract idea*; of a *pictorial image*; and of an *emotional impression*, involving some degree of physical discomfort 135-141

§ 4. Examples of *dreams*,—a class which needs to be treated with the greatest caution, owing to the indefinite scope which it affords for accidental coincidences. One of the examples (No. 23) presents the feature of *deferment* of percipience—the telepathic impression having apparently failed at first to reach the threshold of attention, and emerging into consciousness some hours after the experience on the agent's side in which it had its origin 141-146

§ 5. Examples of the "*borderland*" class—a convenient name by which to describe cases that belong to a condition neither of sleep nor of provably complete waking consciousness; but it is probable that in many of the cases so described (as in No. 26), the percipient, though in bed, was quite normally awake 146-151

§ 6. Examples of *externalised* impressions of *sight*, occurring in the midst of ordinary waking life. In some of these we find an indication that a close personal *rapport* between the agent and percipient is not a necessary condition of the telepathic transference; and another is peculiar in that the phantasmal figure is *not recognised* by the percipient 151-162

§ 7. Examples of *externalised* impressions of *hearing*; one of which was of a recognised voice, and one of an inarticulate shriek 162-166

§ 8. Example of an impression of *touch*; which is also, perhaps, an example of the *reciprocal* class, where each of the persons concerned seems to exercise a telepathic influence on the other 166-168

§ 9. Example of the *collective* class, where more percipients than one take part in a single telepathic incident 168-170

§ 10. Among the various conditions of telepathic agency, the *death*-cases form by far the commonest type. Now in these cases it is not rare for the agent to be comatose and unconscious; in other cases, again, he has been in a swoon or a deep sleep; and there is a difficulty in understanding an abnormal exercise of psychical energy at such seasons. The explanation may possibly be found in the idea of a wider consciousness, and a more complete self, which finds in what we call life very imperfect conditions of manifestation, and recognises in death not a cessation but a liberation of energy 170-172

CHAPTER VI

TRANSCERENCE OF IDEAS AND MENTAL PICTURES

§ 1. The popular belief in the transference of thought, without physical signs, between friends and members of the same household, is often held on quite insufficient grounds; allowance not being made for the similarity of associations, and for the slightness of the signs which may be half-automatically interpreted 173-174

It often happens, for instance, that one person in a room begins humming a *tune* which is running in another's head; but it is only very exceptionally that such a coincidence can be held to imply a psychical transference. Occasionally the idea transferred is closely connected with the *auditory image* of a *word or phrase* 174-175

§ 2. Examples of the transference of ideas and images of a simple or rudimentary sort 175-177

§ 3. Examples of the transference of more complex ideas, representing definite events 177-181

§ 4. Cases where the idea impressed on the percipient has been simply that of the agent's *approach*—a type which must be accepted with great caution, as numerous coincidences of the sort are sure to occur by pure accident . . . 181-183

§ 5. Transferences of mental images of concrete objects and scenes with which the agent's attention is occupied at the time 183-188

Some of these impressions are so detailed and vivid as to suggest *clairvoyance*; nor is there any objection to that term, so long as we recognise the difference between such *telepathic clairvoyance*, and any supposed *independent extension* of the percipient's senses 188-189

Occasionally the percipient seems to obtain the true impression, not by passive reception, but by a deliberate effort 189

CHAPTER VII

EMOTIONAL AND MOTOR EFFECTS

§ 1. Emotional impressions, alleged to have coincided with some calamitous event at a distance, form a very dubious class, as (1) in retrospect, after the calamity is realised, they are apt to assume a strength and definiteness which they did not really possess; and (2) similar impressions may be common in the *soi-disant* percipient's experience, and he may have omitted to remark or record the *misses*—the many instances which have *not* corresponded with any real event. All cases must, of course, be rejected where there has been any appreciable ground for anxiety 190-191

§ 2. Examples which may perhaps have been telepathic; some of which include a sense of physical distress 191-195

§ 3. Examples of such transferences between *twins* 195-197

§ 4. Examples where the primary element in the impression is a sense of *being wanted*, and an impulse to *movement or action* of a sort unlikely to have suggested itself in the ordinary course of things 197-202

The telepathic influence in such cases must be interpreted as emotional, not as definitely directing, and still less as abrogating, the percipient's power of choice: the movements produced may be such as the agent cannot have desired, or even thought of 202-204

CHAPTER VIII

DREAMS

PART I.—THE RELATION OF DREAMS TO THE ARGUMENT FOR TELEPATHY

§ 1. Dreams comprise the whole range of transition from *ideal and emotional* to *sensory* affections; and at every step of the transition we find instances which may reasonably be regarded as telepathic 205-206

The great interest of the distinctly sensory specimens lies in the fundamental resemblance which they offer, and the transition which they form, to the externalised "phantasms of the living" which impress *waking* percipients; the difference being that the dream-percepts are recognised, on reflection, as having been hallucinatory, and unrelated to that part of the external world where the percipient's body is; while the waking phantasmal percepts are apt to be regarded as objective phenomena, which really impressed the eye or the ear from outside 206-207

§ 2. But when we examine dreams in respect of their *evidential* value—of the proof which they are capable of affording of a telepathic correspondence with the reality—we find ourselves on doubtful ground. For (1) the details of the reality, when known, will be very apt to be *read back* into the dream, through the general tendency to make vague things distinct; and (2) the great *multitude* of dreams may seem to afford almost limitless scope for *accidental* correspondences of a dream with an actual occurrence resembling the one dreamt of. Any answer to this last objection must depend on statistics which, until lately, there has been no attempt to obtain; and though an answer of a sort can be given, it is not such a one as would justify us in basing a theory of telepathy on the facts of dreams alone 207-208

§ 3. Most of the dreams selected for this work were exceptional in *intensity*; and produced marked distress, or were described, or were in some way acted on, *before* the news of the correspondent experience was known. In *content*, too, they were mostly of a distinct and unusual kind; while some of them present a considerable amount of true detail 208-209

And more than half of those selected on the above grounds are dreams of *death*—a fact easy to account for on the hypothesis of telepathy, and difficult to account for on the hypothesis of accident 209-210

§ 4. Dreams so definite in content as dreams of death afford an opportunity of ascertaining what their actual frequency is, and so of estimating whether the specimens which have coincided with reality *are* or *are not* more numerous than chance would fairly allow. With a view to such an estimate, a specimen group of 5360 persons, taken at random, have been asked as to their personal experiences; and, according to the result, the persons who have had a vividly distressful dream of the death of a relative or acquaintance, within the 12 years 1874-1885, amount to about 1 in 26 of the population. Taking this datum, it is shown that the number of *coincidences* of the sort in question that, according to the law of chances, ought to have occurred in the 12 years, among a section of the population even larger than that from which we can suppose our telepathic evidence to be drawn, is only 1. Now (taking account only of cases where nothing had occurred to suggest the dream in a normal way), we have encountered 24 such coincidences—*i.e.*, a number 24 times as large as would have been expected on the hypothesis that the coincidence is due to chance alone . . . 210-213

Certain objections that might be taken to this estimate are to a considerable extent met by the precautions that have been used 214-215

§ 5. The same sort of argument may be cautiously applied to cases where the event exhibited in the coincident dream is not, like death, unique, and where, therefore, the basis for an arithmetical estimate is unattainable . . . 215-216

But many more specimens of a high evidential rank are needed, before dreams can rank as a strong integral portion of the argument for telepathy. Meanwhile, it is only fair to regard them in connection with the stronger evidence of the *waking* phenomena; since in respect of many of them an explanation that is admitted in the waking cases cannot reasonably be rejected 216-217

PART II.—EXAMPLES OF DREAMS WHICH MAY BE REASONABLY REGARDED
AS TELEPATHIC

- § 1. Examples of similar and simultaneous dreams 217-219
An experience which has coincided with some external fact or condition may be described as a *dream*, and yet be sufficiently exceptional in character to preclude an application of the theory of chances based on the limitless *number* of dreams 219-221
- § 2. Examples of the reproduction, in the percipient's dream, of a special thought of the agent's, who is at the time awake and in a *normal* state 221-223
- § 3. Examples of a similar reproduction where the agent is in a *disturbed* state 223-226
- § 4. Cases where the agent's personality appears in the dream, but not in a specially pictorial way. Inadmissibility of dreams that occur at times of anxiety, of dreams of trivial accidents to children, and the like 226-230
- § 5. Cases where the reality which the eyes of the agent are actually beholding is pictorially represented in the dream. Reasons why the majority of alleged instances must be rejected 230-231
- The appearance in the dream of the agent's own figure, which is not presumably occupying his own thoughts, suggests an independent development, by the percipient, of the impression that he receives 232
- § 6. The familiar ways in which dreams are shaped make it easy to understand how a dreamer might supply his own setting and imagery to a "transferred impression." Examples where the elements thus introduced are few and simple 232-237
- § 7. Examples of more complex investiture, and especially of imagery suggestive of death. Importance of the feature of *repetition* in some of the examples 237-242
- § 8. Examples of dreams which may be described as *clairvoyant*, but which still must be held to imply some sort of telepathic "agency"; since the percipient does not see any scene, but the *particular* scene with some actor in which he is connected 242-250

CHAPTER IX

"BORDERLAND" CASES

- § 1. The transition-states between sleeping and waking—or, more generally the seasons when a person is in bed, but not asleep—seem to be specially favourable to *subjective* hallucinations of the senses; of which some are known as *illusions hypnagogiques*; others are the prolongations of dream-images into waking moments; and some belong to neither of these classes, though experienced in the moments or minutes that precede or follow sleep 251-254
- § 2. It is not surprising that the same seasons should be favourable also to the hallucinations which, as connected with conditions external to the percipient, we should describe, not as subjective, but as *telepathic* 254
- As evidence for telepathy, impressions of this "borderland" type stand on an altogether different footing from dreams; since their incalculably smaller number supplies an incalculably smaller field for the operation of chance 254-255
- Very great injustice is done to the telepathic argument by confounding such impressions with dreams; as where Lord Brougham explains away the coincidence of a unique "borderland" experience of his own with the death of the friend whose form he saw, on the ground that the "vast number of dreams" give any amount of scope for such "seeming miracles" 255-257
- § 3. Examples where the impression was not of a sensory sort 257
- § 4. Auditory examples. Cases where the sound heard was not articulate 257-258
- Cases where distinct words were heard 258-264

§ 5. Visual examples: One (No. 168) illustrates the feature of the appearance of <i>more than one figure</i> ; and one (No. 170) that of <i>misrecognition</i> on the percipient's part	264-273
§ 6. Cases where the sense of touch was combined with that of sight or hearing	273-275
§ 7. Cases affecting the two senses of sight and hearing	275-285

CHAPTER X

HALLUCINATIONS: GENERAL SKETCH

§ 1. Telepathic phantasms of the externalised sort are a species belonging to the larger genus of *hallucinations*; and the genus requires some preliminary discussion 286

Hallucinations of the senses are distinguished from other hallucinations by the fact that they do not necessarily imply false belief 287

They may be defined as *percepts which lack, but which can only by distinct reflection be recognised as lacking, the objective basis which they suggest*; a definition which marks them off on the one hand from true perceptions, and on the other hand from remembered images or mental pictures 287-289

§ 2. The old method of defining the *ideational* and the *sensory* elements in the phenomena was very unsatisfactory. It is easy to show that the delusive appearances are not merely *imagined*, but are actually *seen* and *heard*—the hallucination differing from an ordinary percept only in lacking an objective basis; and this is what is implied in the word *psycho-sensorial*, when rightly understood 289-292

§ 3. The question as to the physiological starting-point of hallucinations—whether they are of *central* or of *peripheral* origin—has been warmly debated, often in a very one-sided manner. The *construction* of them, which is central and the work of the brain, is quite distinct from the *excitation* or *initiation* of them, which (though often central also) is often peripheral—*i.e.*, due to some other part of the body that sets the brain to work 292-294

§ 4. This excitation may even be due to some objective external cause, some visible point or mark, at or near the place where the imaginary object is seen; and in such cases the imaginary object, which is, so to speak, attached to its point, may follow the course of any optical illusion (*e.g.*, doubling by a prism, reflection by a mirror) to which that point is subjected. But such dependence on an external stimulus does not affect the fact that the actual sensory element of the hallucination, in these as in all other cases, is imposed from within by the brain 295-297

§ 5. There, are, however, a large number of hallucinations which are *centrally initiated*, as well as centrally constructed—the excitation being due neither to an external point, nor to any morbid disturbance in the sense-organs themselves. Such, probably, are many visual cases where the imaginary object is seen in free space, or appears to move independently of the eye, or is seen in darkness. Such certainly, are many auditory hallucinations; some hallucinations of pain; many hallucinations which conform to the course of some more general delusion; and hallucinations voluntarily originated 297-305

§ 6. Such also are hallucinations of a particular internal kind common among mystics, in which the sensory element seems reduced to its lowest terms; and which shade by degrees, on the one side into more externalised forms, and on the other side into a mere feeling of presence, independent of any sensory affection 305-309

§ 7. A further argument for the central initiation may be drawn from the fact that *repose* of the sense-organs seems a condition favourable to hallucinations; and the psychological identity of waking hallucinations and dreams cannot be too strongly insisted on 309

§ 8. As regards the *construction* of hallucinations—the cerebral process involved in their having this or that particular form—the question is whether it takes place in the specific sensory centre concerned, or in some higher cortical tract 310-312

§ 9. There are reasons for considering that *both* places of construction are available; that the simpler sorts of hallucination, many of which are clearly "after-images," and which are often also recurrent, may take shape at the sensory centres themselves; but that the more elaborate and variable sorts must be traced to the higher origin; and that when the higher tracts are first concerned, the production of the hallucination is due to a downward escape of the nervous impulse to the sensory centre concerned 312-317

§ 10. The construction of hallucinations in the cortical tracts of the brain, proper to the higher co-ordinations and the more general ideational activities, is perfectly compatible with the view that the specific sensory centres are themselves situated not below, but in, the cortex 317-318

CHAPTER XI

TRANSIENT HALLUCINATIONS OF THE SANE: AMBIGUOUS CASES

§ 1. Transient hallucinations of the sane (a department of mental phenomena hitherto but little studied) comprise two classes: (1) hallucinations of *purely subjective* origin; and (2) hallucinations of *telepathic* origin—i.e., "phantasms of the living" which have an objective basis in the exceptional condition of the person whom they recall or represent. Comparing the two classes, we should expect to find a large amount of *resemblance*, and a certain amount of *difference*, between them 319-320

§ 2. Certain marked resemblances at once present themselves; as that (generally speaking) neither sort of phenomenon is observably connected with any morbid state; and that each sort of phenomenon is rare—occurring to a comparatively small number of persons, and to most of these only once or twice in a lifetime 320-321

§ 3. But in pressing the comparison further, we are met by the fact that the dividing line between the two classes is not clear; and it is important to realise certain *grounds of ambiguity*, which often prevent us from assigning an experience with certainty to this class or that 322-323

§ 4. Various groups of hallucinations are passed in review;—"after-images"; phantasmal objects which are the result of a special train of thought; phantasms of inanimate objects, and of animals, and non-vocal auditory phantasms; visual representations of fragments of human forms; auditory impressions of meaningless sentences, or of groaning, and the like; and visions of the "swarming" type. Nearly all specimens of these types may safely be referred to the purely subjective class 323-325

It is when we come to visual hallucinations representing complete and natural-looking human forms, and auditory hallucinations of distinct and intelligible words (though here again there is every reason to suppose the majority of the cases to be purely subjective), that the *ambiguous* cases are principally to be found; the ground of ambiguity being that either (1) the person represented has been in an only *slightly* unusual state; or (2) a person in a *normal* state has been represented in hallucination to *more than one* percipient at different times; or (3) an abnormal state of the person represented has coincided with the representation *loosely*, but not exactly; or (4) the percipient has been in a condition of *anxiety*, *awe*, or *expectancy*, which might be regarded as the independent cause of his experience 325-327

§ 5. The evidence that mere *anxiety* may produce sensory hallucination is sufficient greatly to weaken, as evidence for telepathy, any case where that condition has been present 327-330

§ 6. The same may be said of the form of *awe* which is connected with the near sense of death; and (except in a few "collective" cases) abnormal experiences which have *followed* death have been excluded from the telepathic evidence, if the fact of the death was *known* to the percipient. As to the included cases that have followed death by an appreciable interval, reasons are given for preferring the hypothesis of *deferred development* to that of *post mortem influence*—though the latter hypothesis would be quite compatible with the psychical conception of telepathy 330-332

- § 7. There is definite evidence to show that mere *expectancy* may produce hallucination 332-334
- One type which is probably so explicable being the delusive impression of seeing or hearing a person whose *arrival* is expected 334-335
- § 8. There is, however, a group of arrival-cases where the impending arrival was unknown or unsuspected by the percipient; or where the phantasm has included some special detail of appearance which points to a telepathic origin 335-336

CHAPTER XII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TELEPATHIC HALLUCINATIONS

- § 1. There are two very principal ways in which phantasms of telepathic origin often resemble purely subjective hallucinations: (1) gradualness of development; and (2) originality of form or content, showing the activity of the percipient's own mind in the construction 337-338
- § 2. *Gradual development* is briefly illustrated in the purely subjective class 338-339
- § 3. And at greater length in the telepathic class. It may exhibit itself (1) in delayed recognition of the phantasm on the part of the percipient . . . 339-342
- Or (2) in the way in which the phantasm gathers visible shape . . . 342-344
- Or (3) in the progress of the hallucination through several distinct stages, sometimes affecting more than one sense 344-348
- § 4. *Originality of construction* is involved to some extent in every sensory hallucination which is more than a mere revival of familiar images; but admits of very various degrees 348-349
- § 5. In telepathic hallucinations, the signs of the percipient's own constructive activity are extremely important. For the difference from the results of experimental thought-transference, which telepathic phantasms exhibit, in representing what is not consciously occupying the agent's mind—to wit, his own form or voice—ceases to be a difficulty in proportion as the extent of the impression transferred from the agent to the percipient can be conceived to be small, and the percipient's own contribution to the phantasm can be conceived to be large 349-350
- It may be a peculiarity of the transferred idea that it impels the receiving mind to react on it, and to embody and project it as a hallucination; but the form and detail of the embodiment admit—as in dream—of many varieties, depending on the percipient's own idiosyncrasies and associations . . . 350-352
- § 6. Thus the percipient may invest the idea of his friend, the agent, with features of dress or appurtenance that his own memory supplies. (One of the examples given, No. 202, illustrates a point common to the purely subjective and to the telepathic class, and about equally rare in either—the appearance of more than one figure) 352-357
- § 7. Or the investing imagery may be of a more fanciful kind—sometimes the obvious reflection of the percipient's habitual beliefs, sometimes the mere bizzarerie of what is literally a "waking dream." Many difficulties vanish, when the analogy of dream is boldly insisted on 357-358
- Examples of phantasmal appearances presenting features which would in reality be impossible 358-359
- The *luminous* character of many visual phantasms is specially to be noted, as a feature common to the purely subjective and to the telepathic class . . . 359
- Examples of imagery connected with ideas of death, and of religion . . . 359-362
- § 8. Sometimes, however, the phantasm includes details of dress or aspect which could not be supplied by the percipient's mind. Such particulars may sometimes creep without warrant even into evidence where the central fact of the telepathic coincidence is correctly reported; but where genuinely observed, they must apparently be attributed to a conscious or sub-conscious image of his own appearance (or of some feature of it) in the agent's mind, to which the percipient obtains access by what may be again described as *telepathic clairvoyance*. Examples 362-367

In cases where the details of the phantasm are such as either mind might conceivably have supplied, it seems simpler to regard them as the contributions of the percipient, than to suppose that a clean-cut and complete image has been transferred to him from indefinite unconscious or sub-conscious strata of the agent's mind 367-368

§ 9. The development of a phantasm from the nucleus of a transferred impression is a fact strongly confirmatory of the view maintained in the preceding chapters, as to the physiological starting point of many hallucinations. Especially must the hypothesis of *centrifugal* origin (of a process in the direction from higher to lower centres) commend itself in cases where the experience seems to have implied the quickening of vague associations and distant memories, whose physical record must certainly lie in the highest cerebral tracts 369-370

§ 10. Summary of the various points of parallelism between purely subjective and telepathic phantasms, whereby their identity as phenomena for the senses seems conclusively established. But they present also some very important contrasts 370-371

CHAPTER XIII

THE THEORY OF CHANCE-COINCIDENCE

§ 1. Assuming the substantial correctness of much of the evidence for phantasms which have markedly coincided with an event at a distance, how can it be known that these coincidences are not due to *chance* alone? In examining this question, we must be careful to distinguish *waking* cases from *dreams*—in which latter class (as we have seen) the scope for chance-coincidences is indefinitely large 372-374

§ 2. The answer to this question depends on *two* points—the frequency of phantasms which *have* markedly coincided with real events, and the frequency of phantasms which have *not*. If the latter class turned out to be extremely large—*e.g.*, if we each of us once a week saw some friends' figure in a place which was really empty—it is certain that occasionally such a subjective delusion would fall on the day that the friend happened to die. The matter is one on which there have been many guesses, and many assertions, but hitherto no statistics 374-376

§ 3. To ascertain what proportion of the population have had experience of purely subjective hallucinations, a definite question must be asked of a group large and varied enough to serve as a fair sample of the whole. The difficulty of taking such a census has been much increased by a wide misunderstanding of its purpose 376-377

§ 4. But answers have been received from a specimen group of 5705 persons; and there is every reason to suppose this number sufficient 377-379

§ 5. It may be objected that persons may have wrongly denied such experiences (1) through forgetfulness—but the experiences of real importance for the end in view are too striking to be readily forgotten; (2) by way of a joke or a hoax—but this would lead rather to false confessions than false denials; (3) in self-defence—but such error as may have been produced by this motive has probably been more than counter-balanced in other ways 379-381

§ 6. As to *visual* hallucinations, representing a recognised face or form—in the last 12 years such an experience has, according to the census, befallen 1 adult in every 248; but it would have had to befall *every* adult *once*, and some adults *twice*, to justify the assumption that the cases recorded in the present work on first-hand testimony, of the coincidence of the experience in question with the death of the person represented, were due to chance. The odds against the accidental occurrence of the said coincidences are counted in trillions 381-383

§ 7. The *extreme closeness* of some of the coincidences affords the basis for another form of estimate, which shows the improbability of their accidental occurrence to be almost immeasurably great 384-386

And a number of further cases and further considerations remain, by which even this huge total of improbability would be again swelled. The conclusion, therefore, after all allowances, that at any rate a large number of the coincidences here adduced have had some other cause than chance seems irresistible 386

§ 8. An argument of a quite different sort may be drawn from *certain peculiarities* which the group of coincidental hallucinations present, when compared, as a whole, with the general mass of transient hallucinations of the sane 386-389

CHAPTER XIV

FURTHER VISUAL CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT

§ 1. Visual hallucinations may present various degrees of apparent externalisation, beginning with what is scarcely more than a picture in the mind's eye, and ending with a percept which seems quite on a par with all surrounding objects. Examples of these varieties in telepathic phantasms . . . 390-397

§ 2. Examples of completely externalised phantasms. One case (No. 242) is remarkable in that the actual percipient had no direct connection with the agent, but was in the vicinity of a person intimately connected with him 397-411

§ 3. Cases where the hypothesis of *illusion* or *mistaken identity* has to be taken into account. This hypothesis would not exclude a telepathic origin, as telepathic *illusions* are quite conceivable phenomena. But more probably these cases were hallucinations; and if so, their telepathic origin would hardly be doubtful. One of them (No. 243) exhibits the point of a *previous compact* between the agent and percipient, that whichever died first should endeavour to make the other sensible of his presence. Such a compact, latent in either mind, may quite conceivably have some conditioning efficacy . . . 412-417

§ 4. Cases of a *rudimentary* type—perhaps of *arrested development*—not representative of a human form; they might be compared to a *motor* effect which is limited to a single start or twitch. The class is too small to carry any conviction on its own account, but its type is not so improbable as might at first appear . . . 417-419

§ 5. Certain cases involving no coincidence with any ostensibly abnormal condition of the agent. (1) Instances where *several* percipients, at different times, have had hallucinations representing the *same* person, in whom a specific faculty for producing telepathic impressions may therefore be surmised 419-426

§ 6. And (2) instances where a presumption that a hallucination was not purely subjective is afforded by peculiarities of dress or aspect in the figure presented . . . 426-431

§ 7. And (3) instances where the phantasm appears at a time when the person whom it represents is, unknown to the percipient, actually approaching him, with thoughts more or less consciously turned in his direction 431-432

CHAPTER XV

FURTHER AUDITORY CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT

§ 1. Cases where the phantasm has been of a *recognised* voice—the words heard having been, certainly in some cases and possibly in others, those which the distant agent was uttering . . . 433-436

§ 2. Cases where what was heard was the percipient's own name—which is a very common form of purely subjective hallucination.

In most of these cases there may probably have been a certain occupation of the agent's thoughts with the percipient . . . 436-439

§ 3. Cases where the phantasm has been of an *unrecognised* voice . . . 439-442

§ 4. Cases where the impression was of a complete sentence, conveying either a piece of information or a direction, projected by the percipient as a message from without . . . 442-443

§ 5. An example [omitted.—ED.] where the sound heard was vocal, but not recognised and articulate . . . 443

§ 6. Phantasms of non-vocal noises or shocks. These are parallel to the

rudimentary visual hallucinations ; but need a more jealous scrutiny, since odd noises are often due to undiscovered physical causes in the vicinity. Still, some impressions of the sort are pretty clearly hallucinatory ; and the form is one which telepathic hallucinations seem occasionally to take. [Gurney's examples are omitted.—Ed.] 443-444

CHAPTER XVI

TACTILE CASES AND CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES

§ 1. Purely subjective impressions of touch, of at all a distinct kind, are rare ; and when they occur, may often be accounted for as illusions due to an involuntary muscular twitch. It is not surprising, therefore, that telepathic hallucinations of this type should be rare 445

The most conclusive examples are those where an affection of touch is combined with one of sight or hearing. Examples 446-448

§ 2. Combined affections of the senses of sight and hearing : one case (No. 299) is peculiar in that the person who was probably the agent was in the percipient's company at the time 448-453

CHAPTER XVII

RECIPROCAL CASES

§ 1. It occasionally happens that at the time when A telepathically influences B, A on his side has an impression which strongly suggests that B has reciprocally influenced *him*. The best proof of this is where A expresses in words some piece of knowledge as to B's condition. Other more doubtful cases (of which two are quoted) may be provisionally referred to the same type ; but unless A's description includes something which he could not have known or guessed in a normal manner, his alleged percipience of B cannot be assumed to have been more than mere subjective dream or vision 454-458

§ 2. Examples of apparently reciprocal action. They may be regarded as special cases of " telepathic clairvoyance " ; A's percipience of B being apparently active rather than passive, and due to some extension of his own faculties, connected with the abnormality of condition that occasions his agency, and not to any special abnormality in B's condition 458-465

The cases which, on the evidence, would be clearly reciprocal, are so few in number as to justify a doubt whether they represent a genuine type. Supposing them to be genuine, however, their rarity is not hard to account for ; and it may be hoped that time will bring us more well-attested specimens 465

CHAPTER XVIII

COLLECTIVE CASES

§ 1. Phantasms which have affected the senses of more than one percipient, are a specially perplexing class. On the face of them, they suggest a real objective presence of the person seen or heard. But such " objectivity " (unless conceived as some illusive form of *matter*) can hardly be defined except just as a temporary existence in more minds than one : it does not explain, but merely repeats, the fact that the experience is collective 466-467

In the absence of evidence (worthy of the name) that a telepathic phantasm has ever given a test of *physical* reality—*e.g.*, by opening a door or a window—we are led to inquire how far the phenomena of collective hallucination can be covered by a theory of purely *psychical* impressions. Two views (which will subsequently prove capable of amalgamation) present themselves:—(1) that

A, at a distance, produces *simultaneous telepathic impressions* on the minds of B and C, who happen to be together ; (2) that B's impression, however originated, passes on to C by a process of *thought-transference*—the hallucination itself being, so to speak, infectious 467-468

§ 2. The *first* of these hypotheses presents great difficulties. For our review of telepathic hallucinations, so far, has shown that they may take very various forms, and may be projected at various intervals of time (within a range of a few hours) from the crisis or event to which we trace them ; so that, supposing several persons to have been the joint recipients of a telepathic impression, it seems most improbable that they should independently invest it at the *same* moment with the *same* sensory form. Nor, again, should we expect to find, among those jointly affected, any person who was a *stranger* to the distant agent ; nevertheless, cases occur where such a person has shared in the collective percipience. And yet again, on this theory of independent affection of several persons, there seems no special reason why they should be *in one another's company* at the time, since the agent may presumably exercise his influence equally in any direction ; nevertheless, cases where the percipients have been apart are, in fact, extremely rare 468-469

A few examples of the sort are given ; but in several even of these, the percipients, though not together, were very near one another, and had been to some extent sharing the same life 469-473

§ 3. As to the *second* of the proposed hypotheses—that one percipient catches the hallucination from another by a process of thought-transference—the question at once suggests itself whether such communicability is ever found in cases where no distant agent is concerned—cases of *purely subjective* hallucination. Such an idea would, no doubt, be as new to scientific psychology as every other form of thought-transference ; but transient hallucinations of the sane have been so little studied or collected that it is not surprising if the evidence for collective experiences of the sort has escaped attention—though collective *illusions* have sometimes been described as hallucinations 473-474

It is in collective cases that the importance of distinguishing illusions from hallucinations becomes plain. In illusions, the persons affected receive an actual sensory impression from a real object, the error being simply in their way of *interpreting* it ; and in the interpretation they are often greatly at the mercy of one another's suggestions. Many historical incidents—such as visions of signs in the heavens and of phantom champions—might be thus explained 474-476

In other alleged instances of "collective hallucination" there is no proof that the impression was really more than a vivid mental picture, evoked under excitement. And even where the image probably has been externalised in space—as, *e.g.*, in religious epidemics, or in experimentation with hypnotised subjects—most cases may be at once explained, without any resort to thought-transference, as due to a common idea or expectancy. (Apart, however, from special excitement or from hypnotism, the power of mere verbal suggestion to produce delusions of the senses may easily be exaggerated) 476-478

It is only when these various conditions are absent—when the joint percept is clearly *hallucination*, and is also projected by the several percipients *without emotional preparation or suggestion*—that the hypothesis of thought-transference from one percipient to another can reasonably be entertained 478-479

§ 4. The examples to be adduced, of collective hallucinations, not apparently originating in the condition of any absent living person, include cases which may be regarded by some as indicating *post-mortem* agency. It is not necessary to enter into the vexed question as to whether the power of exercising psychical energy can or cannot continue after physical death. Whatever answer that question received, these cases would still, in the writer's opinion (for reasons set forth in § 2), bear witness to a quite mundane transference between the minds of the living percipients 479-481

§ 5. *Visual* examples. Hallucinations of light 481

Various out-of-door experiences, not easy to explain as illusions 481-484

Examples of the simultaneous appearance of an *unrecognised* figure to two percipients, who in most instances were in each other's company at the time. The two impressions received in several cases were not precisely similar, and in one (No. 322) were markedly different 484-489

Similar appearances of recognised phantasms; one of which (case 333) represented the form of one of the percipients 489-495

The *auditory* class requires special care, owing to the liability of real sounds (whose source is often uncertain) to be misinterpreted. Example 495-496

The examples may at all events show that a purely psychical account of these joint experiences is possible. It is not, indeed, obvious *why* hallucinations of the senses should be a form of experience liable to transmission from mind to mind; but as regards the cases which are telepathically originated, some explanation may perhaps be found in the fact that they at any rate involve a disturbance of a very peculiar kind 496-497

§ 6. Collective hallucinations of telepathic origin. Auditory examples, representing *vocal* sounds 497-499

And *non-vocal* sounds 499-502

Visual examples. In one of these (No. 345) the experiences of the two percipients were not precisely similar 502-513

§ 7. The fact that in most of the examples the two percipients, B and C, were *together* suggests that mere community of scene, or of immediate mental occupation, may establish a *rapport* favourable to "psychical" transferences 513-514

And this conception may lead us, in cases where a distant agent, A, is concerned, to an amalgamation of the two hypotheses (see § 1) which have hitherto been treated separately. C's experience, *quâ* hallucination, that is to say in its *sensory* character, may be derived from B's; but, for all that, A may be telepathically affecting C. It may be A's joint influence on B and C that has conditioned the transference of sensation between them; or, in cases where C holds no intimate relation to A, a *rapport* may be established, *ad hoc*, between A and C by the *rapport* of both of them with B—who thus serves, so to speak, as a *channel* for C's percipience; and this would even help to explain the cases where B is not himself consciously percipient 514-515

The conception of *rapport* through community of mental occupation might explain the various cases where the telepathic influence seems to have been *locally* conditioned, by the presence of the percipient in a place that was interesting to the agent. And the idea may receive a still further extension in cases where there is reason to suppose a reciprocal telepathic clairvoyance of the scene on the agent's part 515-516

Conjectures of this sort concerning the more outlying telepathic phenomena have an air of rashness; but the mere fact that "psychical" transferences are possible, when once admitted, opens up a scheme of Idealism within whose bounds (if bounds there be) the potential unity between individual minds is at any rate likely to realise itself in surprising ways 516-517

CONCLUSION

§ 1. The case for spontaneous telepathy, being essentially a cumulative one, hardly admits of being recapitulated in a brief and attractive form. Nothing but a detailed study of the evidence—dull as that study is—can justify definite conclusions concerning it. After all, the dullness is perhaps not greater than attaches to the mastery of details in other departments of knowledge; and it cannot be too clearly realised that what the research requires is not sensational incidents, but verified dates 518-519

§ 2. The present instalment of evidence, with all its defects, may yet, by making the idea of telepathy better understood, facilitate collection in the future; and already various difficulties and prejudices show signs of giving way 519-520

§ 3. But though a fair field is sure, in time, to be allowed to the work, its advance must depend on very wide co-operation; and the more so as the several items of proof tend to lose their effect as they recede into the past. The experimental investigations must be greatly extended, the spontaneous phenomena must be far more intelligently watched for and recorded, before the place of telepathy in scientific psychology can be absolutely assured 520

LIST OF NUMBERED CASES, TRANSITIONAL AND SPONTANEOUS, INCLUDED IN THIS EDITION

No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page	No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page	No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page
1	Esdaile .	71	65	Dyne .	188	184	Keulemans .	277
2	Sisson .	72	70	Reay .	191	185	Sherman .	278
5	Thompson .	73	73	" England " .	193	190	Lightfoot .	282
6	Thompson .	73	74	M. S. .	194	191	Goodyear .	340
7	S.H.B. .	75	77	Carroll .	195	194	E. W. R. .	342
9	Smith .	76	79	Banister .	197	195	Rogers .	344
10	Thompson .	77	80	Mrs. C. .	198	197	Bishop .	345
11	Thompson .	78	81	Skirving .	199	199	Mr. B. .	347
12	Thompson .	78	86	Rowlands .	201	201	Bolland .	352
	Wesermann .	81	87	Liébeault .	203	202	E. L. S. .	354
13	Moses .	83	89	Page Hopps .	218	205	Chatterton .	358
14	S. H. B. .	83	90	Fielding .	218	206	Jones .	359
15	S. H. B. .	85	94	Bevan .	219	207	Larcombe .	360
16	S. H. B. .	87	96	Crellin .	221	208	Udny .	361
	Godfrey .	89	98	Sladen .	223	213	Hernaman .	364
17	Severn .	132	99	Walsh .	224	215	Rouse .	366
18	Newnham .	134	104	McDougall .	226	219	Mr. A. .	391
19	Drake .	135	105	Hobbs .	227	220	Gottschalk .	391
20	Bettany .	137	109	Fleming .	231	221	Chatterton .	394
21	Keulemans .	140	112	Gouldrick .	233	222	Searle .	395
22	Martyn .	140	115	Fielding .	234	223	Taunton .	396
23	Wingfield .	142	116	Saunders .	235	224	Fournier .	398
24	West .	145	123	Freese .	236	227	King .	399
25	Collyer .	146	126	Bolland .	238	228	Barker .	400
26	Marchant .	149	127	Varah .	240	236	Bale .	402
27	Rawlinson .	157	131	Hilton .	241	237	Greany .	404
28	N. J. S. .	152	132	Hilton .	241	238	Duck .	405
29	De Freville .	155	133	Busk .	243	239	Merrill .	407
30	Reddell .	156	134	Storie .	244	240	Ellis .	408
31	Carslake .	159	135	Pierce .	247	241	Masters .	409
32	Bee .	160	138	Green .	248	242	Clerke .	410
33	John B. .	163	146	Brougham .	255	243	Fenzi .	412
34	A. Z. .	163	151	Jukes .	259	244	Owen .	415
35	Newnham .	167	154	Thompson .	260	249	Carr .	416
36	Done .	168	157	Field .	261	251	Wright .	418
37	Griffin .	174	158	Stent .	263	254	Hawkins .	420
38	Keulemans .	175	161	Barr .	264	256	Hopkinson .	423
44	Saunders .	178	168	Mrs. T. .	265	257	Stone .	424
45	Davy .	179	170	Stewart .	268	259	Beaumont .	427
49	Arundel .	180	172	Duthie .	269	260	Beaumont .	428
54	Pritchard .	182	173	Byrne .	270	261	Gladstone .	429
56	Keulemans .	183	174	C. P. .	271	262	Bigge .	430
58	Hopkins .	184	175	Runciman .	272	263	Carroll .	431
62	Mrs. L. .	185	180	Coombs .	274	267	Stone .	433
63	H. G. B. .	187	182	Jenour .	275	268	Fryer .	434

No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page	No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page	No.	Name of Agent, Percipient, or a Witness	Page
272	Ives .	435	307	Parker .	461	339	Beilby .	497
273	Witt .	437	308	Connie and Margaret .	462	340	W. L. .	498
274	Stella .	438	309	Bettany .	469	343	Paget .	499
277	Burrows .	438	311	Evens .	470	345	Cox .	502
280	Goodyear .	439	314	Coote .	472	348	Elgee .	503
282	Wylde .	440	317	Montgomery .	483	350	Willink .	505
283	Harriss .	441	318	Chesterfield .	484	352	Falkinburg .	508
286	C. .	442	319	Cant .	485	355	Ayre .	510
293	Gundry .	446	320	Smith .	486	356	Barwell .	511
295	Lichfield .	446	322	Lady C. .	487	691	Lethbridge .	222
297	Paget .	448	323	Bettany .	488	692	Grant .	175
298	Barnes .	449	325	Norton .	489	694	Russell .	264
299	Brown .	450	329	Mouat .	490	695	Teale .	401
300	Sings .	452	331	Lett .	491	696	Hill .	341
303	J.H.W. .	455	332	Jupp .	493	697	Mrs. B. .	267
304	Pierce .	457	333	Hall .	494	700	Fielding .	222
305	Varley .	458	335	Saxon .	495	701	H. E. M. .	229
306	Smith .	459				702	Griffin .	280

INTRODUCTION

καὶ τὸν θεὸν τοιοῦτον ἐξεπίσταμαι,
σοφοῖς μὲν αἰνικτῆρα θεσφάτων ἀεὶ,
σκαριοῖς δὲ φαῦλον κἂν βραχέϊ διδάσκαλον.

SOPHOCLES

I

§ 1. THE subject of this book is one which a brief title is hardly sufficient to explain. For under our heading of "Phantasms of the Living," we propose, in fact, to deal with all classes of cases where there is reason to suppose that the mind of one human being has affected the mind of another, without speech uttered, or word written, or sign made;—has affected it, that is to say, by other means than through the recognised channels of sense.

To such transmission of thoughts or feelings we have elsewhere given the name of *telepathy*; and the records of an experimental proof of the reality of telepathy will form a part of the present work. But, for reasons which will be made manifest as we proceed, we have included among telepathic phenomena a vast class of cases which seem at first sight to involve something widely different from a mere transference of thought.

I refer to *apparitions*; excluding, indeed, the alleged apparitions of the *dead*, but including the apparitions of all persons who are still living, as we know life, though they may be on the very brink and border of physical dissolution. And these apparitions, as will be seen, are themselves extremely various in character; including not visual phenomena alone, but auditory, tactile, or even purely ideational and emotional impressions. All these we have included under the term *phantasm*; a word which, though etymologically a mere variant of *phantom*, has been less often used, and has not become so closely identified with *visual* impressions alone.

Such, then, is the meaning of our title; but something more of explanation is necessary before the tone and purport of the book can be correctly apprehended. In a region so novel we could hardly be surprised at any amount of misinterpretation. Some readers, for instance, may fancy that a bulky and methodical treatise on phantoms can be but a half-serious thing. Others may suspect that its inspiration is in the love of paradox, and that a fantastic craving for originality has led the authors along a path where they cannot expect, and can hardly desire, that the sober world should follow them.

§ 2. It is necessary, therefore, to state at once that we have no wish either to mystify or to startle mankind. On the contrary, the conjoint

and consultative scheme according to which this book has been compiled is thus arranged mainly with a view to correcting or neutralising individual fancies or exaggerations, of leaving as little as possible to the unchecked idiosyncrasy of any single thinker. And, again, we wish distinctly to say that so far from aiming at any paradoxical reversion of established scientific conclusions, we conceive ourselves to be working (however imperfectly) in the main track of discovery, and assailing a problem which, though strange and hard, does yet stand next in order among the new adventures on which Science must needs set forth, if her methods and her temper are to guide and control the widening curiosity, the expanding capacities of men.

We anticipate, in short, that although it may at first be said of us that we have performed with needless elaboration a foolish and futile task, the ultimate verdict on our work will rather be that we have undertaken—with all too limited a knowledge and capacity—to open an inquiry which was manifestly impending, and to lay the foundation-stone of a study which will loom large in the approaching age.

Our only paradox, then, is the assertion that we are not paradoxical; and that assertion it is the main business of this Introduction to justify.

§ 3. For this purpose two principal heads of exposition will be required. In the first place, since this book (for whose contents we are solely responsible) was undertaken by us at the request of the Council of the Society for Psychical Research, and is largely based on material which that Council has placed at our disposal, it will be necessary to say something as to the scope and object of the Society in question;—its grounds for claiming a valid scientific position, and its points of interconnection with established branches of philosophic inquiry.

And, secondly, it will be needful to indicate the precise position which the theme of this book occupies in the field of our investigations; the reason why we have isolated these special phenomena in a separate group, and have selected them for discussion at this early stage of the Society's labours.

A reader of the programme of the Society will probably feel that although the special topics to which attention is there invited may be unfamiliar, yet its general plea is such as he has often noted in the history of science before. "To approach these various problems without prejudice or prepossession of any kind, and in the same spirit of exact and unimpassioned inquiry which has enabled Science to solve so many problems, once not less obscure nor less hotly debated";—phrases like these have no more of novelty than there might be, for instance, in the proposal of a Finance Minister to abolish the last of a long series of protective embargoes. Free Trade and free inquiry have each of them advanced step by step, and by dint of the frequent repetition, under varying difficulties, of very similar, and very elementary, truths. The special peculiarity of our topic is that it is an article (so to say) on which the Free Traders themselves have imposed an additional duty; that it has been more sternly discountenanced by the men who appeal to experiment than by the men who appeal to authority;—that its dispassionate discussion has since the rise of modern science been tabooed more jealously

than when the whole province was claimed by theology alone. There have been reasons, no doubt, for such an exclusion ; and I am not asserting that either Free Trade or free inquiry is always and under all circumstances to be desired. But it is needful to point out yet once more how plausible the reasons for discouraging some novel research have often seemed to be, while yet the advance of knowledge has rapidly shown the futility and folly of such discouragement.

It was the Father of Science himself who was the first to circumscribe her activity. Socrates, in whose mind the idea of the gulf between *knowledge* and mere *opinion* attained a dominant intensity which impressed itself on all ages after him,—Socrates expressly excluded from the range of exact inquiry all such matters as the movements and nature of the sun and moon. He wished—and as he expressed his wish it seemed to have all the cogency of absolute wisdom—that men's minds should be turned to the ethical and political problems which truly concerned them,—not wasted in speculation on things unknowable—things useless even could they be known.

In a kindred spirit, though separated from Socrates by the whole result of that physical science which Socrates had deprecated, we find a great modern systematiser of human thought again endeavouring to direct the scientific impulse towards things serviceable to man ; to divert it from things remote, unknowable, and useless if known. What, then, in Comte's view, are in fact the limits of man's actual home and business ? the bounds within which he may set himself to learn all he can, assured that all will serve to inform his conscience and guide his life ? It is the *solar system* which has become for the French philosopher what the street and market-place of Athens were for the Greek. And this enlargement (it need hardly be said) is not due to any wider grasp of mind in Comte than in Socrates, but simply to the march of science ; which has shown us that the whole solar system does, in fact, minister to our practical needs, and that the Nautical Almanack demands for its construction a mapping of the paths of those ordered luminaries which in the time of Socrates seemed the very wanderers of Heaven.

I need not say that Comte's prohibition has been altogether neglected. No frontier of scientific demarcation has been established between Neptune and Sirius, between Uranus and Aldebaran. Our knowledge of the fixed stars increases yearly ; and it would be rash to maintain that human conduct is not already influenced by the conception thus gained of the unity and immensity of the heavens.

To many of the comments that have been made on our work, even by men who are not formal Comtists, the above reflections furnish a fitting reply. But it is not only, nor perhaps mainly, on account of the remoteness of our subject, or its unimportance to human progress, that objection is taken to our inquiry. The criticisms which have met us, from the side sometimes of scientific, sometimes of religious orthodoxy, have embodied, in modernised phraseology, nearly every well-worn form of timid protest, or obscurantist demurrer, with which the historians of science have been accustomed to give piquancy to their long tale of discovery and achievement. It would have been convenient had these objections been presented to us in a connected and formal manner. But this has

not been the case ; and, in fact, they are in their very nature too incoherent, too self-contradictory, for continuous statement. Sometimes we are told that we are inviting the old theological spirit to encroach once more on the domain of science ; sometimes that we are endeavouring to lay the impious hands of Science upon the mysteries of Religion. Sometimes we are informed that competent *savants* have already fully explored the field which we propose for our investigation ; sometimes that no respectable man of science would condescend to meddle with such a reeking mass of fraud and hysteria. Sometimes we are pitied as laborious triflers who prove some infinitely small matter with mighty trouble and pains ; sometimes we are derided as attempting the solution of gigantic problems by slight and superficial means.

§ 4. The best way of meeting objections thus confused and contradictory will be to show as clearly as we can at what points our inquiries touch the recent results of science ; what signs there are which indicate the need of vigorous advance along the lines which we have chosen. We shall show, perhaps, that there is a kind of convergence towards this especial need—that in several directions of research there is felt that kind of pause and hesitancy which is wont to precede the dawn of illuminating conceptions. We shall not, of course, thus prove that our own attempt has been *successful*, but we shall prove that it was *justified* ; that if the problems which we set ourselves to solve are found to be insoluble, the gaps thus left in the system of thought on which man's normal life is based will be such as can neither be ignored nor supplied, but will become increasingly palpable and increasingly dangerous.

Let us consider how far this remark can be justified with regard to some of the leading branches of human knowledge in turn. And let us take first Biology, the science which on the whole approaches the closest to our own inquiries. Biology has, during the last half-century, made an advance which, measured by the hold exercised on the mass of cultivated minds, has perhaps had no parallel since the forward stride of astronomy and physics in the days of Newton. A glance at the text-books of the last generation, in physical or mental science—Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*, or Mill's *Logic*,—as compared, for instance, with the works of their immediate successor, Mr. Herbert Spencer, shows something which is not so much progress as revolution—the transformation of Biology from a mere special department of knowledge into the key to man's remotest history, the only valid answer to the profoundest questions as to his present being.

For, in truth, it is Biology above all other sciences which has profited by the doctrine of evolution. In evolution,—in the doctrine that the whole cosmical order is the outcome of a gradual development,—mankind have gained for the first time a working hypothesis which covers enough of the known facts of the universe to make its possible extension to *all* facts a matter of hopeful interest. And Biology, which even at the date of Whewell's book could barely make good its claim to be regarded as a coherent science at all, has now acquired a co-ordinating and continuous principle of unity which renders it in some respects the best type of a true science which we possess. It traces life from the protozoon to the

animal, from the brute to the man; it offers to explain the complex fabric of human thought and emotion, viewed from the physical side, as the development of the molecular movements of scarcely-differentiated fragments of protoplasm.

And along with this increased knowledge of the processes by which man has been upbuilt has come also an increased knowledge of the processes which are now going on within him. The same inquiries which have brought our organic life into intelligible relation with the whole range of animal and vegetable existence have enabled us also to conceive more definitely the neural side of our mental processes, and the relation of cerebral phenomena to their accompanying emotion or thought. And hence, in the view of some ardent physiologists, it is becoming more and more probable that we are in fact physiological automata; that our consciousness is a mere superadded phenomenon—a mere concomitant of some special intensity of cerebral action, with no basis beyond or apart from the molecular commotion of the brain.

But this view, as it would seem, depends in a great part upon something which corresponds in the mental field to a familiar optical illusion. When we see half of some body strongly illuminated, and half of it feebly illuminated, it is hard to believe that the brilliant moiety is not the larger of the two. And, similarly, it is the increased definiteness of our conception of the physical side of our mental operations which seems to increase its relative importance,—to give it a kind of priority over the psychical aspect of the same processes. Yet, of course, to the philosophic eye the central problem of the relation of the objective and subjective sides of these psycho-neural phenomena can be in no way altered by any increase of definiteness in our knowledge of the objective processes which correspond to the subjective states.

And, on the other hand, there is one singular logical corollary which seems thus far to have escaped the notice of physiologist and psychologist alike. It is this: that our increased vividness of conception of the physical side of mental life, while it cannot possibly *disprove* the independence of the psychical side, may quite conceivably *prove* it. I will again resort to the (very imperfect) analogy of a partially illuminated body. Suppose that one hemisphere of a globe is strongly lit up, and that the other is lit up by faint and scattered rays.¹ I am trying to discern whether the two hemispheres are symmetrically marked throughout. Now no clearness of marks on the bright hemisphere can disprove the existence of corresponding marks on the dim one. But, on the other hand, it is conceivable that one of the few rays which fall on the dim hemisphere may reveal some singular mark which I can see that the bright hemisphere does not possess. And the brighter the bright hemisphere is made, the more certain do I become that this particular mark is not to be found on it.

§ 5. I will give two concrete examples of what I mean—one of them drawn from the conclusions of a great physiologist, the other from the

¹ The analogy will be closer if we suppose that the second half is lit, not *dimly* but *from within*,—since in one sense consciousness gives us *more* information as to the psychical than as to the physical side of life, though it is information of a different *quality*.

obvious condition of a new branch of experimental inquiry. I shall not discuss either instance in detail, since I am here only endeavouring to show that with increased precision in psycho-physical researches the old problems of free-will, soul and body, etc., are presenting more definite issues, and offering a far more hopeful field to the exact philosopher than their former vagueness allowed.

My first illustration, then, is from the form which the old free-will controversy has assumed in the hands of Wundt. Wundt stands, of course, among the foremost of those who have treated human thought and sensation as definite and measurable things, who have computed their rate of transit, and analysed their elements, and enounced the laws of their association. It is not from him that we need look for any lofty metaphysical view as to the infinite resources of spiritual power,—the transcendental character of psychical phenomena. But, nevertheless, Wundt believes himself able to assert that there is within us a residue—an all-important residue—of psychical action which is incommensurable with physiological law. So far, he holds, is the principle of conservation of energy from covering the psychical realm, that the facts of mental evolution proclaim that the very contrary is the case;—and that what really obtains is rather “an unlimited new creation of psychical energy.”¹ Nay, so convinced is he of the inadequacy of any system of physiological determinism to explain psychical facts, that he holds that we must directly reverse the materialistic view of the relation of the corporeal to the psychical life. “It is not the psychical life,” he says, “which is a product of the physical organisation; rather it is the physical organism which, in all those purposive adjustments which distinguish it from inorganic compounds, is itself a psychical creation.”²

I am not here expressing either agreement or disagreement with this general view. I am merely pointing out that here is an opinion which, whether right or wrong, is formed as a result not of *vagueness* but of *distinctness* of physiological conceptions. And my illustration shows at any rate that the development of physiology is tending not always to make the old psychical problems seem meaningless or sterile, but rather to give them actuality and urgency, and even to suggest new possibilities of their solution.

§ 6. But, to come to my second instance, it is perhaps from the present position of *hypnotism* that the strongest argument may be drawn for the need of such researches as ours, to supplement and co-ordinate the somewhat narrower explorations of technical physiology. For the actual interest of the mesmeric or hypnotic trance—I am not now dealing with the rival theories which these words connote—the central interest, let us say, of induced somnambulism, or the sleep-waking state—has hardly as yet revealed itself to any section of inquirers.

¹ “Hier gilt vielmehr ein Gesetz unbegrenzter Neuschöpfung geistiger Energie, welches nur durch die sinnliche Bestimmtheit des geistigen Lebens gewisse Hemmungen erleidet.”—Wundt, *Logik*, ii., p. 507.

² “Nicht das geistige Leben ist ein Erzeugniss der physischen Organisation, sondern diese ist in allem, was sie an zweckvollen Einrichtungen der Selbstregulirung und der Energie-verwerthung vor den Substanzcomplexen der unorganischen Natur voraussetzt, eine geistige Schöpfung.”—Wundt, *Logik*, ii., p. 471.

That interest lies neither in mesmerism as a curative agency, as Elliotson would have told us, nor in hypnotism as an illustration of inhibitory cerebral action, as Heidenhain would tell us now. It lies in the fact that here is a psychical experiment on a larger scale than was ever possible before ; that we have at length got hold of a handle which turns the mechanism of our being ; that we have found a mode of shifting the threshold of consciousness which is a dislocation as violent as madness, a submergence as pervasive as sleep, and yet is waking sanity ; that we have induced a change of personality which is not *per se* either evolutive or dissolutive, but seems a mere allotropic modification of the very elements of man. The prime value of the hypnotic trance lies not in what it inhibits, but in what it reveals ; not in the occlusion of the avenues of peripheral stimulus, but in the emergence of unnoted sensibilities, nay, perhaps even in the manifestation of new and centrally initiated powers.

The hypnotic trance is an eclipse of the normal consciousness which can be repeated at will. Now the first observers of eclipses of the sun ascribe them to supernatural causes, and attribute to them an occult influence for good or evil. Then comes the stage at which men note their effects on the animal organism, the roosting of birds, the restlessness of cattle. Then come observations on the intensity of the darkness, the aspect of the lurid shade. But to the modern astronomer all this is trifling as compared with the knowledge which those brief moments give him of the orb itself in its obscurity. He learns from that transient darkness more than the noon of day can tell ; he sees the luminary no longer as a defined and solid ball, but as the centre of the outrush of flaming energies, the focus of an effluence which coruscates untraceably through immeasurable fields of heaven.

There is more in this parallel than a mere empty metaphor. It suggests one of the primary objects which psychical experiment must seek to attain. Physical experiment aims at correcting the deliverances of man's consciousness with regard to the external world by instruments which extend the range, and concentrate the power, and compensate the fallacies of his senses. And similarly, *our* object must be to correct the deliverances of man's consciousness concerning the processes which are taking place *within* him by means of artificial displacements of the psychophysical threshold ; by inhibiting normal perception, obliterating normal memory, so that in this temporary freedom from preoccupation by accustomed stimuli his mind may reveal those latent and delicate capacities of which his ordinary conscious self is unaware.

§ 7. It was thus, in fact, that thought-transference, or telepathy, was first discovered. In the form of community of sensation between operator and subject, it was noted nearly a century ago as a phenomenon incident to the mesmeric trance. Its full importance was not perceived, and priceless opportunities of experiment were almost wholly neglected. In order to bring out the value and extent of the phenomenon it was necessary, we venture to think, that it should be investigated by men whose interest in the matter lay not in the direction of practical therapeutics but of psychical theory, and who were willing to seek and " test

for it " under a wide range of conditions, not in sleep-waking life only, but in normal waking, and normal sleep, and, as this book will indicate, up to the very hour of death.

The difficulties of this pursuit are not physiological only. But, nevertheless, in our endeavours to establish and to elucidate telepathy, we look primarily for aid to the most recent group of physiological inquirers, to the psycho-physicists whose special work—as yet in its infancy—has only in our own day been rendered possible by the increased accuracy and grasp of experimental methods in the sciences which deal with Life.

The list of Corresponding Members of our Society will serve to show that this confidence on our part is not wholly unfounded, and to indicate that we are not alone in maintaining that whatever may be the view of these perplexing problems which ultimately prevails, the recent advances of physiology constitute in themselves a strong reason—not, as some hold, for the abandonment of all discussion of the old enigmas, but rather for their fresh discussion with scientific orderliness, and in the illumination of our modern day.

§ 8. From Biology we may pass, by an easy transition, to what is commonly known as Anthropology,—the comparative study of the different races of men in respect either of their physical characteristics, or of the early rudiments of what afterwards develops into civilisation.

The connection of anthropology with psychical research will be evident to any reader who has acquainted himself with recent expositions of Primitive Man. He may think, indeed, that the connection is *too* evident, and that we can hardly bring it into notice without proving a good deal more than we desire. For as the creeds and customs of savage races become better known, the part played by sorcery, divination, apparitions becomes increasingly predominant. Mr. Tylor and Sir John Lubbock have made this abundantly clear, and Mr. Spencer has gone so far as to trace all early religion to a fear of the ghosts of the dead. In the works of these and similar authors, I need hardly say, we are led to regard all these beliefs and tendencies as due solely to the childishness of savage man—as absurdities which real progress in civilisation must render increasingly alien to the developed common-sense, the rational experience of humanity. Yet it appears to me that as we trace the process of evolution from savage to civilised man, we come to a point at which the inadequacy of this explanation is strongly forced on our attention. Certainly this was my own case when I undertook some years ago to give a sketch of the Greek oracles. It soon became evident to me that the mass of phenomena included under this title had, at any rate, a psychophysical importance which the existing works on the subject for the most part ignored. I scarcely ventured myself to do more than indicate where the real *nodi* of the inquiry lay. But when a massive treatise on Ancient Divination appeared from the learned pen of M. Bouché-Leclercq, I looked eagerly to see whether his erudition had enabled him to place these problems in a new light. I found, however, that he explicitly renounced all attempt to deal with the phenomena in more than a merely external way. He would *record*, but he would make no endeavour to *explain*;—taking for granted, as it appeared, that the explanation de-

pended on fraud alone, and on fraud whose details it would now be impossible to discover.

I cannot think that such a view can any longer satisfy persons adequately acquainted with the facts of hypnotism. Whatever else, whether of fraud or reality, there may have been on the banks of Cassotis or Castaly,—*unde superstitiosa primum sacra evasit vox fera*,—there were at least the hypnotic trance and hystero-epilepsy. And until these and similar elements can be sifted out of the records left to us, with something of insight gained by familiarity with their modern forms, our knowledge of Pythia or of Sibyl will be shallow indeed.

Still more markedly is such insight and experience needed in anthropology proper—in the actual observation of the savage peoples who still exist. It is to be hoped that shamans and medicine-men will not vanish before the missionary until they have yielded some fuller lessons to the psycho-physicist—until the annals of the Salpêtrière and the experiments of Dean's Yard¹ have been invoked in explanation of the weird terrors of the Yenisei and the Congo.

§ 9. Passing on from Anthropology to history in its wider acceptance, we find these psycho-physical problems perpetually recurring, and forming a disturbing element in any theory of social or religious evolution. The contagious enthusiasms of the Middle Ages—the strange endemic maladies of witchcraft, vampirism, lycanthropy—even the individual inspiration of a Mahomet or a Joan of Arc—these are phenomena which the professed historian feels obliged to leave to the physician and the alienist, and for which the physician and the alienist, in their turn, have seldom a satisfactory explanation.

Nor do phenomena of this kind cease to appear with the advance of civilisation. In detailed modern histories, in the biographies of eminent men, we still come upon incidents which are, at any rate at first sight, of a *supernormal*² kind, and over which the narrator is forced to pass with vague or inadequate comment.

But it is, of course, in dealing with the history of *religions* that our lack of any complete grasp of psychical phenomena is most profoundly felt. And here, also, it is as a result of recent progress,—of the growth of the comparative study of religions,—that we are able to disengage,

¹ [The then office of the Society for Psychical Research.—Ed.]

² "I have ventured to coin the word 'supernormal' to be applied to phenomena which are *beyond what usually happens*—*beyond*, that is, in the sense of suggesting unknown psychical laws. It is thus formed on the analogy of *abnormal*. When we speak of an abnormal phenomenon we do not mean one which *contravenes* natural laws, but one which exhibits them in an unusual or inexplicable form. Similarly by a *supernormal* phenomenon, I mean, not one which *overrides* natural laws, for I believe no such phenomenon to exist, but one which exhibits the action of laws higher, in a psychical aspect, than are discerned in action in every-day life. By *higher* (either in a psychical or in a physiological sense), I mean 'apparently belonging to a more advanced stage of evolution.'—*Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. iii. p. 30. Throughout this treatise we naturally need a designation for phenomena which are inexplicable by recognised physiological laws, and belong to the general group into the nature of which we are inquiring. The term *psychical* (which is liable to misapprehension even in the title of our Society) can hardly be used without apology in this specialised sense. The occasional introduction of the word *supernormal* may perhaps be excused.

in a generalised form, the chief problems with which our "psychical" science, if such could be established, would be imperatively called on to deal.

For we find throughout the world's history a series of great events which, though differing widely in detail, have a certain general resemblance both to each other and to some of those incidents both of savage and of ordinary civilised life to which reference has already been made.

The elements which are common to the great majority of religions seem to be mainly two—namely, the promulgation of some doctrine which the religious reformer claims to have received, or actually to communicate, in some supernormal manner; and the report of a concurrent manifestation of phenomena apparently inexplicable by ordinary laws.

Now, with the rise of one religion our Society has already had practically to deal. Acting through Mr. Hodgson, whose experiences in the matter have been elsewhere detailed,¹ a committee of the Society for Psychical Research has investigated the claim of the so-called "Theosophy," of which Madame Blavatsky was the prophetess, to be an incipient world-religion, corroborated by miraculous, or at least supernormal, phenomena,—and has arrived at the conclusion that it is merely a *réchauffé* of ancient philosophies, decked in novel language, and supported by ingenious fraud. Had this fraud not been detected and exposed, and had the system of belief supported thereon thriven and spread, we should have witnessed what the sceptic might have cited as a typical case of the origin of religions. A Gibbon of our own day, reviewing the different motives and tendencies which prompt, or spread, revelations, might have pointed to Theosophy and Mormonism as covering between them the whole ground;—from the adroit advantage taken of mystical aspiration in the one religion, to the commonplace action of greed and lust upon helplessness and stupidity which forms the basis of the other.

But if it should be argued from these analogies that in no case of the foundation of a religion would any scientific method of psychical inquiry prove necessary or fruitful, if we knew all the facts; but that such developments might be sufficiently dealt with by ordinary common-sense, or, like Mormonism, by the criminal law, the generalisation would be hasty and premature. We need not go far back to discover two religions whose central fact is not a fact of fraud at all, but an unexplained psychical phenomenon. I allude to the vision-life of Swedenborg, and the speaking with tongues which occurred in the church of Irving,—each of which constitutes a central point of faith for a certain number of intelligent and educated persons at the present day. Of neither of these facts can Science at present offer a satisfactory explanation. The speaking with tongues seems plainly to have been for the most part (though not entirely) a genuine automatic phenomenon. But as to the *origin* of such automatic utterances (conveyed in speech or writing), as to the range from which their contents are drawn, or the kind of attention which they can claim, there is little or nothing to be learnt from accepted textbooks. We are groping among the first experiments, the simplest instances, on which any valid theory can be based.²

¹ *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vol. iii.

² See papers on "Automatic Writing" in *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vols. ii. and iii.

The case of Swedenborg carries us still further beyond the limits of our assured knowledge. Of madness and its delusions, indeed, we know much; but it would be a mere abuse of language to call Swedenborg mad. His position must be decided by a much more difficult analogy. For before we can even begin to criticise his celestial visions we must be able in some degree to judge of his visions of things terrestrial; we must face, that is to say, the whole problem of so-called *clairvoyance*, of a faculty which claims to be not merely receptive but active,—a projection of super-sensory percipience among scenes distant and things unknown.

And the existence of such a faculty as this will assuredly never be proved by a mere study of the transcendental dicta of any single seer. This problem, too, must be approached, partly through the hypnotic trance, in which the best-attested instances of clairvoyance are alleged to have occurred, and partly through the collection of such supernatural narratives as some of those which find place in the present book.

Even a sketch like this may indicate how complex and various may be the problems which underlie that "History of Sects" in which a Bossuet might see only the heaven-sent penalty for apostasy against the Church,—a Gibbon, the mere diverting panorama of the ever-varying follies of men.

§ 10. But reflections like these lie on the outskirts of a still larger and graver question. What (it is naturally asked) is the relation of our study—not to eccentric or outlying forms of religious creed—but to central and vital conceptions; and especially to that main system of belief to which in English-speaking countries the name of *religion* is by popular usage almost confined?

Up till this time those who have written on behalf of the Society for Psychical Research have studiously refrained from entering on this important question. Our reason for this reticence is obvious enough when stated, but it has not been universally discerned. We wished to avoid even the semblance of attracting the public to our researches by any allurements which lay outside the scientific field. We could not take for granted that our inquiries would make for the spiritual view of things, that they would tend to establish even the independent existence, still less the immortality, of the soul. We shrank from taking advantage of men's hopes or fears, from representing ourselves as bent on rescuing them from the materialism which forms so large a factor in modern thought, or from the pessimism which dogs its steps with unceasing persistency. We held it to be incumbent on us, in an especial degree, to maintain a neutral and expectant attitude, and to conduct our inquiries in the "dry light" of a dispassionate search for truth.

And this position we still maintain. This book, as will be seen, does not attempt to deal with the most exciting and popular topics which are included in our Society's general scheme. And we shall be careful in the pages that follow to keep within our self-assigned limits, and to say little as to any light which our collected evidence may throw on the possibility of an existence continued after our physical death.

That master-problem of human life must be assailed by more deliberate approaches, nor must we gild our solid arguments with the radiance of an unproved surmise. But it would, nevertheless, be impossible, in a

discussion of this general kind, to pass over the relation of psychical research to religion altogether in silence. And, indeed, since our inquiries began, the situation has thus far changed that we have now not anticipation merely, but a certain amount of actual achievement, to which to appeal. We hold that we have proved by direct experiment, and corroborated by the narratives contained in this book, the possibility of communications between two minds, inexplicable by any recognised physical laws, but capable (under certain rare spontaneous conditions) of taking place when the persons concerned are at an indefinite distance from each other. And we claim further that by investigations of the higher phenomena of mesmerism, and of the automatic action of the mind, we have confirmed and expanded this view in various directions, and attained a standing-point from which certain even stranger alleged phenomena begin to assume an intelligible aspect, and to suggest further discoveries to come.

Thus far the authors of this book, and also the main group of their fellow-workers, are substantially agreed. But their agreement as to the facts actually proved does not extend—it is not even to be desired that it *should* extend—to the speculations which in one direction or another such facts must inevitably suggest. They are facts which go too deep to find in any two minds a precisely similar lodgment, or to adjust themselves in the same way to the complex of pre-existent conceptions. The following paragraphs, therefore, must be taken merely as reflecting the opinions provisionally held by a single inquirer.

I may say, then, at once that I consider it improbable that telepathy will ever receive a purely physical explanation,—an explanation, that is to say, wholly referable to the properties of matter, as molecular matter is at present known to us. I admit, of course, that such an explanation is logically conceivable; that we can imagine that undulations should be propagated, or particles emitted, from one living organism to another, which should excite the percipient organism in a great variety of ways. But it seems to me,—and I imagine that in this view at any rate the majority of Materialists will concur,—that if the narratives in this book are to be taken as, on the whole, trustworthy, the physical analogies are too faint, and the physical difficulties too serious, to allow of our intruding among the forces of material Nature a force which—unlike any other—would seem (in some cases at least) neither to be diminished by any distance nor to be impeded by any obstacle whatsoever.

I lay aside, for the purposes of the present argument, the possibility of a *monistic* scheme of the universe,—of a *consentiens conspirans continuata cognatio rerum* which may present in an unbroken sequence both what we know as Matter and what we know as Mind. Such a view,—though to higher intelligences it may perhaps be an intuitive certainty,—can for us be nothing more than a philosophic opinion. Our scientific arguments must needs be based on the *dualism* which our intellects, as at present constituted, are in fact unable to transcend.

I maintain, therefore, that if the general fact of telepathic communication between mind and mind be admitted, it must also be admitted that an element is thus introduced into our conception of the aggregate of empirically known facts which constitutes a serious obstacle to the materialistic synthesis of human experience. The psychical element in man, I

repeat, must henceforth almost inevitably be conceived as having relations which cannot be expressed in terms of matter.

Now this dogma, though wholly new to experimental science, is, of course, familiar and central in all the higher forms of religions. Relations inexpressible in terms of matter, and subsisting between spirit and Spirit,—the human and the Divine,—are implied in the very notion of the interchange of sacred love and love, of grace and worship. I need hardly add that the reality of any such communion is rigidly excluded by the materialistic view. The Materialist, indeed, may regard prayer and aspiration with indulgence, or even with approval, but he must necessarily conceive them as forming merely the psychical side of certain molecular movements of the particles of human organisms, and he must necessarily regard the notion of Divine response to prayer as an illusion generated by subsequent molecular movements of the same organisms,—the mere recoil and reflux of the wave which the worshipper himself has created.

It would, of course, be mere offensive presumption to draw a parallel between our telepathic experiments and such a relation between a human and Divine spirit as the devout soul believes itself to realise in prayer. One side of that communion must *ex hypothesi* transcend the measurement or analysis of finite minds. But, confining our view wholly to the part played by the human organism, it seems to me incontestable that our experiments suggest possibilities of influence, modes of operation, which throw an entirely fresh light on this ancient controversy between Science and Faith. I claim at least that any presumption which science had established against the possibility of spiritual communion is now rebutted; and that inasmuch as it can no longer be affirmed that our minds are closed to all influences save such as reach them through sensory avenues, the Materialist must admit that it is no longer an unsupported dream but a serious scientific possibility, that if any intelligences do in fact exist other than those of living men, influences from those intelligences may be conveyed to our own mind, and may either remain below the threshold of consciousness, or rise into definite consciousness, according as the presence or absence of competing stimuli, or other causes as yet unknown to us, may determine.

§ 11. I shall leave this proposition expressed thus in its most abstract and general form. And I may add—it is a reflection which I must ask the reader to keep steadily in mind,—that any support or illumination which religious creeds may gain from psychical inquiry is likely to affect not their *clauses* but their *preamble*; is likely to come, not as a sudden discovery bearing directly on some specific dogma, but as the gradual discernment of laws which may fundamentally modify the attitude of thoughtful minds.

Now, in what I have called the *preamble* of all revelations two theses are generally involved, quite apart from the subject-matter, or the Divine sanction, of the revelation itself. We have to assume, first, that human testimony to supernormal facts may be trustworthy; and secondly, that there is something in the nature of man which is capable of responding to—I may say of participating in—these supernormal occurrences. That is to say, revelations are not proved merely by large external facts, per-

ceptible to every one who possesses the ordinary senses, nor again are they proved solely by what are avowedly mere subjective impressions, but they are largely supported by a class of phenomena which comes between these two extremes; by powers inherent in certain individuals of beholding spiritual visions or personages unseen by common eyes, of receiving information or guidance by interior channels, of uttering truths not consciously acquired, of healing sick persons by the imposition of hands, with other faculties of a similarly supernormal kind.

And I hope that I shall not be thought presumptuous or irreverent if (while carefully abstaining from direct comment on any Revelation) I indicate what, in my view, would be the inevitable effect on the attitude of purely scientific minds towards these preliminary theses,—this *preamble*, as I have said, of definite religions,—were the continued prosecution of our inquiry to lead us after all to entirely negative conclusions, were all our evidence to prove untrustworthy, and all our experiments unsound.

For in the first place it is plain that this new science of which we are endeavouring to lay the foundations stands towards religion in a very different position from that occupied by the rising sciences, such as geology or biology, whose conflict or agreement with natural or revealed religion has furnished matter for so much debate. The discoveries of those sciences can scarcely in themselves add support to a doctrine of man's soul and immortality, though they may conceivably come into collision with particular forms which that doctrine has assumed. Religion, in short, may be able to assimilate them, but it would in no way have suffered had they proved altogether abortive.

But with our study the case is very different. For, to take the first of the two preliminary theses of religion already referred to, the question whether human evidence as to supernormal occurrences can *ever* be trusted has been raised by our inquiries in a much more crucial form than when Hume and Paley debated it with reference to *historical* incidents only. We discuss it with reference to alleged *contemporary* incidents; we endeavour to evaluate by actual inspection and cross-examination the part which is played in supernormal narratives by the mere love of wonder, "the mythopœic faculty," the habitual negligence and ignorance of mankind. And if all the evidence offered to us should crumble away on exact investigation—as, for instance, the loudly vaunted evidence for the marvels connected with Theosophy has crumbled—it will no doubt be questioned whether the narratives on which the historic religions depend for their acceptance could have stood the test of a contemporaneous inquiry of a similarly searching kind.

And more than this, it will not only be maintained that the collapse of our modern evidence to supernormal phenomena discredits all earlier records of the same kind by showing the ease with which such marvels are feigned or imagined, but also that it further discredits those records by making them even more *antecedently* improbable than they were before. Not only will it be said that the proved fallibility of the modern witnesses illustrates the probable fallibility of the ancient ones, but the failure of the inquiry to elicit any indication that supernormal faculties do now exist in man will *pro tanto* throw a retrospective improbability on the

second of the preliminary theses of religion, which assumes that some such supernormal faculty did at any rate exist in man at a given epoch. It may indeed be urged that such faculties were given for a time, and for a purpose, and were then withdrawn. But the instinct of scientific continuity, which even in the shaping of the solid continents is fain to substitute for deluge and cataclysm the tideway and the ripple and the rain, will rebel against the hypothesis of a bygone age of inward miracles,—a catastrophic interference with the intimate nature of man,

I will illustrate my meaning by a concrete example, which does not involve any actual article of Protestant faith. The ecstasy and the stigmata of St. Francis are an important element in Roman Catholic tradition. They are to some extent paralleled in the present day by the ecstasy and the stigmata of Louise Lateau. And Catholic instinct has discerned that if this modern case be decided to be merely *morbid*, and in no true sense *supernormal*, a retrospective discredit will be cast on the earlier legend. The old reluctance of the Catholic Church to submit her phenomena to scientific assessors has therefore to some extent been overcome; and Catholic physicians, under ecclesiastical authority, have discussed Louise Lateau's case in the forms of an ordinary medical report.

Enough will have been said to indicate the reality of the connection between our inquiries and the preliminary theses of religion. And so far as our positive results go in this direction, they will perhaps carry the more weight in that they are independently obtained, and intended to subserve scientific rather than religious ends;—coming, indeed, from men who have no developed theory of their own to offer, and are merely following the observed facts wherever they may seem to lead. I see no probability, I may add, that our results can ever supply a convincing proof to any specialised form of religion. The utmost that I anticipate is, that they may afford a solid basis of general evidence to the independence of man's spiritual nature, and its persistence after death, on which basis, at any rate, religions in their specialised forms may be at one with science, and on which the structure of definite *revelation* (which must be up-built by historical or moral arguments) may conceivably be planted with a firmness which is at present necessarily lacking.

§ 12. I have been speaking thus far of religion in its full sense, as a body of doctrine containing some kind of definite assurance as to an unseen world. But the form of religious thought which specially characterises our own day is somewhat different from this. We are accustomed rather to varying attempts to retain the spirit, the aroma of religion, even if its solid substratum of facts previously supposed provable should have to be abandoned. The discourses on things spiritual who have been most listened to in our own day—as Carlyle, Emerson, Mazzini, Renan, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, etc.—have been to a very small extent dogmatic on the old lines. They have expressed vague, though lofty, beliefs and aspirations, in which the eye of science may perhaps see little substance or validity, but which nevertheless have been in a certain sense more independent, more spontaneous, than of old, since they are less often prompted by any faith instilled from without, and

resemble rather the awakening into fuller consciousness of some inherited and instinctive need.

And this brings us by an easy transition to the next topic, on which I wish to dwell. For I wish to point out that the *emotional* creed of educated men is becoming divorced from their *scientific* creed; that just as the old orthodoxy of religion was too narrow to contain men's knowledge, so now the new orthodoxy of materialistic science is too narrow to contain their feelings and aspirations; and consequently that just as the fabric of religious orthodoxy used to be strained in order to admit the discoveries of geology or astronomy, so now also the obvious deductions of materialistic science are strained or overpassed in order to give sanction to feelings and aspirations which it is found impossible to ignore. My inference will, of course, be that in this vaguer realm of thought, as well as in the more distinctly defined branches of knowledge which we have already discussed, the time is ripe for some such extension of scientific knowledge as we claim that we are offering here—an extension which, in my view, lifts us above the materialistic standpoint altogether, and which gives at least a possible reality to those subtle intercommunications between spirit and spirit, and even between visible and invisible things, of which Art and Literature are still as full as in any "Age of Faith" which preceded us.

I point, then, to the obvious fact that the spread of Materialism has not called into being Materialists *only* of those simple types which were commonly anticipated a century since as likely to fill a world of complete secularity.

Materialists, indeed, of that old unflinching temper do exist, and form a powerful and influential body. It would have been strange, indeed, if recent advances in physiology had not evoked new theories of human life, and a new ideal. For the accepted commonplaces of the old-fashioned moralist are being scattered with a ruthless hand. Our free will, over great portions at least of its once supposed extent, is declared to be an illusion. Our highest and most complex emotions are traced to their rudimentary beginnings in the instincts of self-preservation and reproduction. Our vaunted personality itself is seen to depend on a shifting and unstable synergy of a number of nervous centres, the defect of a portion of which centres may alter our character altogether. And meantime Death, on the other hand, has lost none of its invincible terrors. The easy way in which our forefathers would speak of "our mortal and immortal parts" is hard to imitate in face of the accumulating testimony to the existence of the one element in us, and the evanescence of the other. And since the decay and dissolution of man seem now to many minds to be so much more capable of being truly known than his survival or his further evolution, it is natural that much of the weight which once belonged to the prophets of what man *hoped* should pass to those who can speak with authority on what man needs must *fear*. Thus "mad-doctors" tend to supplant theologians, and the lives of lunatics are found to have more lessons for us than the lives of saints. For these thinkers know well that man can fall *below* himself; but that he can rise *above* himself they can believe no more. A corresponding ideal is gradually created; an ideal of mere sanity and normality, which gets to look on

any excessive emotion or fixed idea, any departure from a balanced practicality, with distrust or disfavour, and sometimes rising to a kind of fervour of Philistinism, classes genius itself as a *neurosis*.

The alienists who have taken this extreme view have usually, perhaps, been of opinion that in thus discrediting the higher flights of imagination or sentiment we are not losing much ; that these things are in any case a mere surplusage, and that the ends which life is really capable of attaining can be compassed as well without them. But if the materialistic theory be the true one, these limitations of ideal might well be adopted even by men who would deeply regret what they were thus renouncing. It might well seem that, in abandoning the belief in any spiritual or permanent element in man, it were wise to abandon also that intensity of the affections which is ill adapted to bonds so perishable and insecure, that reach of imagination which befitted only the illusory dignity which was once attached to human fates.

But in fact, as I have already implied, the characteristic movement of our own country, at any rate, at the present day, is hardly in this direction. Our prevalent temper is not so much *materialistic* as *agnostic* ; and although this renouncement of all knowledge of invisible things does in a sense leave visible things in sole possession of the field, yet the Agnostic is as far as anyone from being "a hog from Epicurus' sty." Rather, instead of sinking into the materialistic ideal of plain sense and physical well-being, the rising schools of thought are transcending that ideal more and more. Altruism in morals, idealism in art, nay, even the sentiment of piety itself, as a decorative grace of life,—all these, it is urged, are consistent with a complete and contented ignorance as to aught beyond the material world.

I need not here embark on the controversy as to how far this aspiration towards "the things of the spirit" is logically consistent with a creed that stops short with the things of sense. It is quite enough for my present purpose to point out that here also, as in the case of more definite religions, we have a system of beliefs and emotions which may indeed be able to *accommodate* themselves to modern science, but which are in no sense *supported* thereby ; rather which science must regard as, at best, a kind of phosphorescence which plays harmlessly about minds that Nature has developed by other processes and for other ends than these.

For my argument is that here again, as in the case of religion, telepathy, as we affirm it in this book, would be the first indication of a possible scientific basis for much that now lacks not only experimental confirmation, but even plausible analogy. We have seen how much support the preliminary theses of religion may acquire from an assured conviction that the human mind is at least *capable* of receiving super-normal influences,—is not closed, by its very structure, as the Materialists would tell us, to any "inbreathings of the spirit" which do not appeal to outward eye or ear. And somewhat similar is the added reality which the discovery of telepathy gives to the higher flights, the subtler shades, of mere earthly emotion.

"Star to star vibrates light; may soul to soul
Strike thro' some finer element of her own?"

The lover, the poet, the enthusiast in any generous cause, has in every age unconsciously answered Lord Tennyson's question for himself. To some men, as to Goethe, the assurance of this subtle intercommunication has come with vivid distinctness in some passion-shaken hour. Others, as Bacon, have seemed to gather it from the imperceptible indicia of a lifelong contemplation of man. But the step which actual experimentation, the actual collection and collation of evidence, has now, as we believe, effected, is a greater one than could have been achieved by any individual intuition of bard or sage. For we have for the first time a firm foothold in this impalpable realm; we know that these unuttered messages do truly travel, that these emotions mix and spread; and though we refrain as yet from further dwelling on the corollaries of this far-reaching law, it is not because such speculations need any longer be *baseless*, but because we desire to set forth the proof of our theorem in full detail before we do more than hint at the new fields which it opens to human thought.

§ 13. Pausing, therefore, on the threshold of these vaguer promises, I may indicate another direction, in which few will deny that a systematic investigation like ours ought to produce results eminently salutary. It ought to be as much our business to check the growth of error as to promote the discovery of truth. And there is plenty of evidence to show that so long as we omit to subject all alleged supernormal phenomena to a thorough comparative scrutiny, we are not merely postponing a possible gain, but permitting an unquestioned evil.

It should surely be needless in the present day to point out that no attempt to discourage inquiry into any given subject which strongly interests mankind, will in reality divert attention from the topic thus tabooed. The *savant* or the preacher may influence the readers of scientific hand-books, or the members of church congregations, but outside that circle the subject will be pursued with the more excited eagerness because regulating knowledge and experienced guidance are withdrawn.

And thus it has been with our supernormal phenomena. The men who claim to have experienced them have not been content to dismiss them as unseasonable or unimportant. They have not relegated them into the background of their lives as readily as the physiologist has relegated them into a few paragraphs at the end of a chapter. On the contrary, they have brooded over them, distorted them, misinterpreted them. Where *savants* have minimised, *they* have magnified, and the perplexing nodes of marvel which the textbooks ignore, have become, as it were, the ganglia from which all kinds of strange opinions ramify and spread.

The number of persons whose minds have been actually upset either by genuine psychical phenomena, or by their fraudulent imitation, is perhaps not large. But the mischief done is by no means confined to these extreme cases. It is mischievous, surely—it clashes roughly with our respect for human reason, and our belief in human progress—that religions should spring up, forms of worship be established, which in effect do but perpetuate a mistake and consecrate a misapprehension, which carry men not forward, but backward in their conception of unseen things.

The time has not yet come for an attempt to trace in detail the per-

version which each branch of these supernormal phenomena has undergone in ardent minds;—the claims to sanctity, revelation, prophecy, which a series of enthusiasts, and of charlatans, have based on each class of marvels in turn. But two forms of creed already mentioned may again be cited as convenient examples—the Irvingite faith of the misinterpretation of *automatism*, the Swedenborgian of the misinterpretation of (so-called) *clairvoyance*. Still more singular have been the resultant beliefs when to the assemblage of purely *psychical* marvels a *physical* ingredient has been added, of a more disputable kind. For linked in various ways with records of automatic cerebration, of apparitions, of vision and revelation, come accounts of objective sounds, of measurable movements, which may well seem an unwarrantable intrusion into the steady order of the ponderable world. And in the year 1848 certain events, whose precise nature is still in dispute, occurred in America, in consequence of which many persons were led to believe that under appropriate circumstances these sounds, these movements, these tangible apparitions, could be evoked or reproduced at will. On this basis the creed of “Modern Spiritualism” has been upbuilt. And here arises the pressing question—notoriously still undecided, difficult and complex beyond any anticipation—as to whether supernormal phenomena of this *physical* kind do in fact occur at all; or whether they are in *all* cases—as they undoubtedly have been in *many* cases—the product of mere fraud or delusion. This question, as it seems to us, is one to which we are bound to give our most careful attention; and if we have as yet failed to attain a decisive view, it is not for want of laborious observation, continued by several of us throughout many years. But we are unwilling to pronounce until we have had ample opportunities—opportunities which so far we have for the most part sought in vain—of investigating phenomena obtained through private sources, and free, at any rate, from the specific suspicion to which the presence of a “paid medium” inevitably gives rise.

I need not add further illustrations of the cautionary, the critical attitude which befits such a Society as ours at the present juncture. This attitude is in one way unavoidably ungracious; for it has sometimes precluded us from availing ourselves of the labours of predecessors whose zeal and industry we should have been glad to praise. The time, we hope, will come when enough of daylight shall shine upon our path to make possible a discriminating survey of the tracks which scattered seekers have struck out for themselves in the confusion and dimness of dawn. At present we have mainly to take heed that our own groping course shall at least avoid the pitfalls into which others have fallen. Anything like a distribution of awards of merit would be obviously premature on the part of men whose best hope must be that they may conduct the inquiry into a road firm enough to enable others rapidly to outstrip them.

II

§ 14. Enough, however, has now been said to indicate the general tenor of the task which the Society for Psychical Research has undertaken. It remains to indicate the place which the present work occupies

in the allotted field, and the reasons for offering it to public consideration at this early stage of our inquiry.

We could not, of course, predict or pre-arrange the order in which opportunities of successful investigation might occur to the searchers in this labyrinth of the unknown. Among the groping experiments which seemed to have only too often led to mere mistake and confusion,—the “thousand pathways”

“qua signa sequendi
Falleret indeprensus et inremeabilis error,”—

it was not easy to choose with confidence our adit of exploration. The approach which proved most quickly productive was one from which it might have seemed that there was little indeed to hope. A kind of drawing-room game sprang up—it is hard to say whence—a method of directing a subject to perform a desired act by a contact so slight that no *conscious* impulsion was either received or given. Careful observers soon ranked the “willing-game” as an illustration of involuntary muscular action on the willer’s part, affording a guidance to which the subject yielded sometimes without being aware of it. But while the *modus operandi* of public exhibitions of this misnamed “thought-reading” was not difficult to detect, Professor [now Sir William] Barrett was one of the first who—while recognising all these sources of error—urged the duty of persistent watching for any residuum of true thought-transference which might from time to time appear. As will be seen from Chap. II. of this book it was not till after some six years of inquiry and experiment (1876–82) that definite proof of thought-transference in the normal state could be placed before the world. This was done in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for June, 1882, signed by Professor Barrett, Mr. Gurney, and myself. The phenomenon of transmission of thought or sensation without the agency of the recognised organs of sense had been previously recorded in connection with the mesmeric state, but, so far as we know, its occasional occurrence in the normal state was now for the first time maintained on the strength of definite experiment. And the four years 1882–1886 have witnessed a great extension of those experiments, which no longer rest on the integrity and capacity of the earliest group of observers alone.

§ 15. The foundation of the Society for Psychical Research in 1882 gave an opportunity to Mr. Gurney and myself, as Hon. Secs. of a Literary Committee, to invite from the general public records of apparitions at or after death, and other abnormal occurrences. On reviewing the evidence thus obtained we were struck with the great predominance of alleged apparitions *at or near the moment of death*. And a new light seemed to be thrown on these phenomena by the unexpected frequency of accounts of apparitions of living persons, coincident with moments of danger or crisis. We were led to infer a strong analogy between our experimental cases of thought-transference and some of these spontaneous cases of what we call telepathy, or transference of a shock or impulse from one living person to another person at such a distance or under such conditions as to negative the possibility of any ordinary mode of transmission. An article, signed by Mr. Gurney and myself, in the *Fortnightly Review* for March, 1883, gave a first expression to the analogy thus suggested. The

task of collection and scrutiny grew on our hands; Mr. Podmore undertook to share our labours; and the Council of the Society for Psychical Research requested us to embody the evidence received in a substantive work.

It will be seen, then, that the theory of Telepathy, experimental and spontaneous, which forms the main topic of this book, was not chosen as our theme by any arbitrary process of selection, but was irresistibly suggested by the abundance and the convergence of evidence tending to prove that special thesis. We were, and are, equally anxious to inquire into many other alleged marvels—clairvoyance, haunted houses, Spiritualistic phenomena, etc.—but telepathy is the subject which has first shown itself capable of investigation appearing to lead to a positive result; and it seemed well to arrange its evidence with sufficient fulness to afford at least a solid groundwork for further inquiry.

And having been led to this choice by the nature of the actual evidence before us, we may recognise that there is some propriety in dealing first with an issue which, complex though it is, is yet simple as compared to other articles of our programme. For the fact, if it be one, of the direct action of mind upon mind has at least a generality which makes it possible that, like the law of atomic combination in chemistry, it may be a generalisation which, though grasped at first in a very simplified and imperfect fashion, may prove to have been the essential pre-requisite of future progress.

§ 16. In a certain sense it may be said that this hidden action of one mind on another comes next in order of psychical discovery to the hidden action of the mind within itself. It will be remembered that the earliest scientific attempts to explain the phenomena of so-called Spiritualism referred them mainly to "unconscious cerebration" (Carpenter), or to what was virtually the same thing, "unconscious muscular action" (Faraday).

Now these theories, in my view, were, so far as they went, not only legitimate, but the most logical which could have been suggested to explain the scanty evidence with which alone Faraday and Carpenter attempted to deal. This unconscious action of the mind was in reality the first thing which it was needful to take into account in approaching supernormal phenomena. I believe, indeed, that our knowledge of those hidden processes of mentation is still in its infancy, and I have elsewhere endeavoured to assign a wider range than orthodox science has yet admitted to the mind's unconscious operation.¹ But the result of this further analysis has been (as I hold) *not* to show that ordinary physiological considerations will suffice (as Dr. Carpenter seems to suppose) to explain all the psychical problems involved, but rather to reveal the fact that these unconscious operations of the mind do not follow the familiar channels alone, but are themselves the facilitation or the starting-point of operations which to science are wholly new.

To state the matter broadly, so as to include in a common formula the unremembered utterances of the hypnotic subject, and the involuntary writings of the waking automatist, I would maintain that when the horizon of consciousness is altered, the opening field of view is not always or wholly

¹ See *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, Vols. ii. and iii.

filled by a mere mirage or refraction of objects already familiar, but does, on rare occasions, include new objects, as real as the old. And amongst the novel energies thus liberated, the power of entering into direct communication with other intelligences seems to stand plainly forth. Among the objects in the new prospect are fragments of the thoughts and feelings of distant minds. It seems, at any rate, that some element of *telepathy* is perpetually meeting us throughout the whole range of these inquiries. In the first place, thought-transference is the only supernatural phenomenon which we have as yet acquired the power of inducing, even occasionally, in the *normal* state. It meets us also in the hypnotic trance, under the various forms of "community of sensation," "silent willing," and the like. Among the alleged cases of "mesmeric clairvoyance" the communication of pictures of places from operator to subject seems the least uncertain ground. And again, among phenomena commonly attributed to "spirits" (but many of which may perhaps be more safely ascribed to the automatic agency of the sensitive himself), communication of thought still furnishes our best clue to "trance-speaking," "clairvoyant vision," answers to mental questions and the like. It need not, therefore, surprise us if, even in a field so apparently remote from all ordinary analogies as that of apparitions and death-wraiths, we still find that telepathy affords our most satisfactory clue.

§ 17. And here would seem to be the fitting place to explain why we have given the title of "Phantasms of the *Living*" to a group of records most of which will present themselves to the ordinary reader as narratives of apparitions of the *dead*.

When we began, in a manner to be presently described, to collect accounts of experiences which our informants regarded as inexplicable by ordinary laws, we were of course ignorant as to what forms these experiences would mainly take. But after printing and considering over two thousand depositions which seemed *prima facie* to deserve attention, we find that more than half of them are narratives of appearances or other impressions coincident either with the death of the person seen or with some critical moment in his life-history.

The value of the accounts of apparitions *after* death is lessened, moreover, by a consideration which is obvious enough as soon as these narratives come to be critically considered. The difficulty in dealing with all these hallucinations—with all appearances to which no persistent three-dimensional reality corresponds—is to determine whether they are *veridical*, or *truth-telling*—whether, that is, they do in fact correspond to some action which is going on in some other place or on some other plane of being;—or whether, on the other hand, they are merely morbid or casual—the random and meaningless fictions of an over-stimulated eye or brain. Now, in the case of apparitions at the moment of death or crisis, we have at any rate an objective fact to look to. If we can prove that a great number of apparitions coincide with the death of the person seen, we may fairly say, as we do say, that chance alone cannot explain this coincidence, and that there is a causal connection between the two events. But if I have a vision of a friend recently dead, and on whom my thoughts have been dwelling, we cannot be sure that this may not

be a merely delusive hallucination—the mere offspring of my own brooding sorrow. In order to get at all nearly the same degree of evidence for a *dead* person's appearance that we can get for a *dying* person's appearance, it seems necessary that the apparition should either communicate some fact known only to the deceased, or should be noted independently by more than one person at once or successively. And our evidence of this kind is at present scarcely sufficient to support any assured conclusion.¹

When, therefore, we are considering whether the phantasms of *dying* persons may most fitly be considered as phantasms of the dead or of the living, we find little support from analogy on the side of *posthumous* apparitions. And on the other hand, as already hinted, we have many cases where the apparition has coincided with violent shocks,—carriage accidents, fainting fits, epileptic fits, etc., which nevertheless left the *agent*—as we call the person whose semblance is seen,—as much alive as before. In some cases the accident is *almost* a fatal one; as when a man's phantom is seen at the moment when he is half-drowned and insensible. In such a case it would seem illogical to allow the mere fact of his restoration or non-restoration to life to rank his phantom as that of a *living* person in the one case, of a *dead* person in the other. It seems simpler to suppose that if two men fall overboard to-day and their respective phantasms are seen by their friends at the moment,—then, though one man should be restored to life and the other not,—yet if the first phantom was that of a living man, so also was the second.

Nay more, even if the apparition be seen some hours later than the moment of apparent death, there are still reasons which prevent us from decisively classing it as the apparition of a dead man. In the first place, the moment of actual death is a very uncertain thing. When the heart's action stops the organism continues for some time in a state very different from that of ordinary inanimate matter. In such an inquiry as ours it is safer to speak, not of death, but of “the process of dissolution,” and to allow for the possible prolongation of some form of psychical energy even when, for instance, the attempt to restore respiration to a drowned man has definitely failed. And in the second place, we find in the case of phantasms corresponding to some accident or crisis which befalls a living friend, that there seems often to be a latent period before the phantasm becomes definite or externalised to the percipient's eye or ear. Sometimes a vague *malaise* seems first to be generated, and then when other stimuli are deadened,—as at night or in some period of repose,—the indefinite grief or uneasiness takes shape in the voice or figure of the friend who in fact passed through his moment of peril some hours before. It is quite possible that a deferment of this kind may sometimes intervene between the moment of death and the phantasmal announcement thereof to a distant friend.

These, then, are reasons, suggested by actual experience, for ascribing our phantasms at death to living rather than to dead men. And there is another consideration, of a more general order, which points in the same direction. We must not rashly multiply the problems involved in this difficult inquiry. Now Science, it is needless to say, offers no assur-

¹ See Mrs. Sidgwick's paper on “The Evidence, collected by the Society, for Phantasms of the Dead,” in *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vol. iii.

ance that man survives the tomb ; and although in Christian countries our survival is an established doctrine, this does not carry with it any dogma as to the possibility that communications should reach us from departed spirits. The hypothesis, then, that apparitions are ever directly caused by dead persons is one which ordinary scientific caution bids us to be very slow in introducing. Should it afterwards be established that departed spirits can communicate with us, the interpretation placed upon various cases contained in this volume may need revision. But for the present it is certainly safer to inquire how far they can be explained by the influences or impressions which, as we know by actual experiment, living persons can under certain circumstances exert or effect on one another, in those obscure supersensory modes which we have provisionally massed together under the title of Telepathy.

§ 18. The main theses of this book, then, are now capable of being stated in a very simple form.

I. Experiment proves that telepathy—the supersensory¹ transference of thoughts and feelings from one mind to another—is a fact in Nature.

II. Testimony proves that phantasms (impressions, voices, or figures) of persons undergoing some crisis,—especially death,—are perceived by their friends and relatives with a frequency which mere chance cannot explain.

III. These phantasms then, whatever else they may be, are instances of the supersensory action of one mind on another. The second thesis therefore confirms, and is confirmed by, the first. For if telepathy exists, we should anticipate that it would exhibit some *spontaneous* manifestations, on a scale more striking than our *experimental* ones. And, on the other hand, apparitions are rendered more credible and comprehensible by an analogy which for the first time links them with the results of actual experiment.

Such are the central theses of this work,—theses on which its authors, and the friends whom they have mainly consulted, are in entire agreement. The first thesis may, of course, be impugned by urging that our experiments are fallacious. The second thesis may be impugned by urging that our testimony is insufficient. The third thesis, as I have here worded it, is hardly open to separate attack ; being a corollary which readily follows if the first two theses are taken as proved.

This, however, is only the case so long as the third thesis, which asserts the analogy between thought-transference and apparitions—between experimental and spontaneous telepathy—is stated in a vague and general form. So soon as we attempt to give more precision to this analogy—to discuss how far the unknown agency at work can be supposed to be the same in both cases—or how far the apparitions may be referable to quite other, though cognate, laws,—we enter on a field where even those who have accepted the analogy in general terms are likely to find the evidence leading them to somewhat divergent conclusions. Of two men independently studying our records of apparitions, the one will almost inevitably press their analogy to simple telepathy further than the other. And each will be able to plead that he has been guided as far

¹ By “supersensory” I mean “independent of the recognised channels of sense” I do not mean to assert that telepathic perception either is or is not analogous to sensory perception of the recognised kinds.

as possible by an instinct of scientific caution in thus judging of matters strange and new. The *first* will say that "causes are not to be multiplied without necessity," and that we have now in telepathy a *vera causa* whose furthest possibilities we ought to exhaust before invoking still stranger, still remoter agencies, whose very existence we are not in a position to prove. He will feel bound therefore to dwell on the points on which our knowledge either of telepathy, or of the mechanism of hallucinations in general, throw some light; and he will set aside as at present inexplicable such peculiarities of our evidence as cannot well be brought within this scheme.

The second inquirer, on the other hand, will perhaps feel strongly that telepathy, as we now know it, is probably little more than a mere preliminary conception, a simplified mode of representing to ourselves a group of phenomena which, as involving relations between *minds*, may probably be more complex than those which involve even the highest known forms of *matter*. He will feel that, while we hold one clue alone, we must be careful not to overrate its efficacy; we must be on the watch for other approaches, for hints of inter-relation between disparate and scattered phenomena.

It is to the first of these two attitudes of mind,—the attitude which deprecates extraneous theorising,—that Mr. Gurney and Mr. Podmore have inclined; and the committal of the bulk of this work to Mr. Gurney's execution indicates not only that he has been able to devote the greatest amount of time and energy to the task, but also that his view is on the whole the most nearly central among the opinions which we have felt it incumbent on us to consult. We have no wish, however, to affect a closer agreement than actually exists; and in a "Note on a Suggested Mode of Psychical Interaction" [omitted in the present edition.—ED.], I shall submit a view which differs from Mr. Gurney's on some theoretical points.

§ 19. The theories contained in this book, however, bear a small proportion to the mass of collected facts. A few words as to our method of collection may here precede Mr. Gurney's full discussion (Chapter IV) of the peculiar difficulties to which our evidence is exposed.

It soon became evident that if our collection was to be satisfactory it must consist mainly of cases collected by ourselves, and of a great number of such cases.¹ The apparitions at death, etc., recorded by previous writers, are enough, indeed, to show that scattered incidents of the kind have obtained credence in many ages and countries. But they have never been collected and sifted with any systematic care; and few of them reach an evidential standard which could justify us in laying them before our readers. And even had the existing stock of testimony been large and well-assured, it would still have been needful for us to collect our own specimens *in situ*,—to see, talk with, and correspond with the persons to whose strange experiences so much weight was to be given. This task of personal inquiry,—whose traces will, we hope, be sufficiently apparent throughout the present work,—has stretched itself out beyond expectation, but has also enabled us to speak with a con-

¹ [The presentation of this "great number" of cases has been impossible in this abridged edition, and those retained must be regarded as typical rather than as impressive by their number.—ED.]

fidence which could not have been otherwise acquired. One of its advantages is the security thus gained as to the *bona fides* of the witnesses concerned. They have practically placed themselves upon their honour ; nor need we doubt that the experiences have been, as a rule, recounted in all sincerity. As to unintentional errors of observation and memory, Mr. Gurney's discussion will at least show that we have had abundant opportunities of learning how wide a margin must be left for human carelessness, forgetfulness, credulity. "God forbid," said the flute-player to Philip of Macedon, "that your Majesty should know these things as well as I!"

It must not, however, be inferred from what has been said that our informants as a body have shown themselves less shrewd or less accurate than the generality of mankind. On the contrary, we have observed with pleasure that our somewhat persistent and probing method of inquiry has usually repelled the sentimental or crazy wonder-mongers who hang about the outskirts of such a subject as this ; while it has met with cordial response from an unexpected number of persons who feel with reason that the very mystery which surrounds these incidents makes it additionally important that they should be recounted with sobriety and care. The straightforward style in which most of our informants have couched their narratives, as well as the honoured names which some of them bear, may enable the reader to share something of the confidence which a closer contact with the facts has inspired in our own minds.

Again, it seemed necessary that the collection offered to the public should be a very large one, even at the cost of including in a Supplement [omitted in the present edition.—ED.] some remote or second-hand cases besides the first-hand cases which alone are admitted into the chapters of this book. If, indeed, our object had been simply to make out a case for the connection of deaths with apparitions, we might have offered a less assailable front, and should certainly have spared ourselves much trouble, had we confined ourselves to giving in detail a few of the best-attested instances. But what we desired was not precisely this. We hope, no doubt, that most of our readers may ultimately be led to conclusions resembling our own. But before our conclusions can expect to gain general acceptance, many other hypotheses will doubtless be advanced, and coincidence, superstition, fraud, hysteria, will be invoked in various combinations to explain the evidence given here. We think, therefore, that it is our duty in so new a subject to afford full material for hypotheses discordant with our own ; to set forth cases drawn from so wide a range of society, and embracing such a variety of circumstances, as to afford scope for every mode of origination or development of these narratives which the critic may suggest.

Furthermore, the whole subject of hallucinations of the sane—which hitherto has received very scanty treatment—seems fairly to belong to our subject, and has been treated by Mr. Gurney in Chapter XI. We have throughout contended that a knowledge of abnormal or merely morbid phenomena is an indispensable pre-requisite for the treating of any supernormal operations which may be found to exist under somewhat similar forms of manifestation.

Once more, it was plainly desirable to inquire whether hypotheses, now admitted to be erroneous, had ever been based in past times on evidence in any way comparable to that which we have adduced. The belief in witchcraft, from its wide extent and its nearness to our own times, is the most plausible instance of such a parallelism. And Mr. Gurney, in his Note on Chapter IV [omitted in the present edition.—Ed.], has given the results of an analysis of witch-literature more laborious than previous authors had thought it worth while to undertake. The result is remarkable; for it appears that the only marvels for which respectable testimony was adduced consist obviously of ignorant descriptions of hypnotic and epileptiform phenomena now becoming familiar to science; while as to the monstrous stories—copied from one uncritical writer into another—which have given to this confused record of hypnotic and hysterical illusions the special aromas (so to say) of witchcraft or lycanthropy,—these prodigies have scarcely ever the slightest claim to be founded on any first-hand evidence at all.

§ 20. But while the material here offered for forming an opinion on all these points is, no doubt, much larger than previous writers have been at the pains to amass, we are anxious, nevertheless, to state explicitly that we regard this present collection of facts as merely preliminary; this present work as merely opening out a novel subject; these researches of a few persons during a few years as the mere first instalment of inquiries which will need repetition and reinforcement to an extent which none of us can as yet foresee.

A change in the scientific outlook so considerable as that to which this volume points must needs take time to accomplish. Time is needed not only to spread the knowledge of new facts, but also to acclimatise new conceptions in the individual mind. Such, at least, has been our own experience; and since the evidence which has come to us slowly and piecemeal is here presented to other minds suddenly and in a mass, we must needs expect that its acceptance by them will be a partial and gradual thing. What we hope for first is an increase in the number of those who are willing to aid us in our labours; we trust that the fellow-workers in many lands to whom we already owe so much may be encouraged to further collection of testimony, renewed experiment, when they see these experiments confirming one another in London, Paris, Berlin,—this testimony vouching for cognate incidents from New York to New Zealand, and from Manchester to Calcutta.

With each year of experiment and registration we may hope that our results will assume a more definite shape—that there will be less of the vagueness and confusion inevitable at the beginning of a novel line of research, but naturally distasteful to the *savant* accustomed to proceed by measurable increments of knowledge from experimental bases already assured. Such an one, if he reads this book, may feel as though he had been called away from an ordnance survey, conducted with a competent staff and familiar instruments, to plough slowly with inexperienced mariners through some strange ocean where beds of entangling seaweed cumber the trackless way. We accept the analogy; but we would remind him that even floating weeds of novel genera may

foreshow a land unknown ; and that it was not without ultimate gain to men that the straining keels of Columbus first pressed through the Sargasso Sea.

§ 21. Yet one word more. This book is not addressed to *savants* alone, and it may repel many readers on quite other than scientific grounds. Attempting as we do to carry the reign of Law into a sanctuary of belief and emotion which has never thus been invaded in detail,—lying in wait, as it were, to catch the last impulse of the dying, and to question the serenity of the dead,—we may seem to be incurring the poet's curse on the man " who would peep and botanize upon his mother's grave,"—to be touching the Ark of sacred mysteries with hands stained with labour in the profane and common field.

How often have men thus feared that Nature's wonders would be degraded by being closelier looked into ! How often, again, have they learnt that the truth was higher than their imagination ; and that it is man's work, but never Nature's, which to be magnificent must remain unknown ! How would a disciple of Aristotle,—fresh from his master's conception of the fixed stars as types of godhead,—of an inhabitation by pure existences of a supernal world of their own,—how would he have scorned the proposal to learn more of those stars by dint of the generation of fetid gases and the sedulous minuteness of spectroscopic analysis ! Yet how poor, how fragmentary were Aristotle's fancies compared with our conception, thus gained, of cosmic unity ! our vibrant message from Sirius and Orion by the heraldry of the kindred flame ! Those imagined gods are gone ; but the spectacle of the starry heavens has become for us so moving in its immensity that philosophers, at a loss for terms of wonder, have ranked it with the Moral Law.

If man, then, shall attempt to sound and fathom the depths that lie not without him, but within, analogy may surely warn him that the first attempts of his rude *psychoscopes* to give precision and actuality to thought will grope among " beggarly elements,"—will be concerned with things grotesque, or trivial, or obscure. Yet here also one hand's-breadth of reality gives better footing than all the castles of our dream ; here also by beginning with the least things we shall best learn how great things may remain to do.

The insentient has awoke, we know not how, into sentiency ; the sentient into the fuller consciousness of human minds. Yet even human self-consciousness remains a recent, a perfunctory, a superficial thing ; and we must first reconstitute our conception of the microcosm, as of the macrocosm, before we can enter on those " high capacious powers " which, I believe, " lie folded up in man."

F. W. H. M.

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY REMARKS: GROUNDS OF CAUTION

§ 1. WHATEVER the advances of science may do for the universe, there is one thing that they have never yet done and show no prospect of doing—namely, to make it less marvellous. Face to face with the facts of Nature, the wonderment of the modern chemist, physicist, zoologist, is far wider and deeper than that of the savage or the child; far wider and deeper even than that of the early workers in the scientific field. True it is that science *explains*; if it did not it would be worthless. But scientific explanation means only the reference of more and more facts to immutable laws; and, as discovery advances in every department, the orderly marvel of the comprehensive laws merely takes the place of the disorderly marvel of arbitrary occurrences. The mystery is pushed back, so to speak, from facts in isolation to facts in the aggregate; but at every stage of the process the mystery itself gathers new force and impressiveness.

What, then, is the specific relation of the man of science to the phenomena which he observes? His explanation of them does not lead him to marvel at them less than the uneducated person: what does it lead him to do for them that the uneducated person cannot do? “To *predict* them with certainty,” it will no doubt be replied; “which further implies, in cases where the conditions are within his control, to produce them at will.” But it is important to observe that this power of prediction, though constantly proclaimed as the authoritative test of scientific achievement, is very far indeed from being an accurate one. For it is a test which is only fulfilled with anything like completeness by a small group of sciences—those which deal with *inorganic* nature. The physicist can proclaim with confidence that gravitation, and heat, and electricity (as long as they act at all) will continue to act as they do now; every discovery that the chemist makes about a substance is a prophecy as to the behaviour of that class of substance for ever. But as soon as vital organisms appear on the scene, there is a change. Not only do the complexities of structure and process, and the mutual reactions of the parts and the whole, exclude all exact quantitative formulæ; not only is there an irreducible element of uncertainty in the behaviour from moment to moment of the simplest living unit; but there appear also developments, and varieties and “sports,” which present themselves to us as arbitrary—which have just to be registered, and cannot be explained. Not, of course, that they are really arbitrary; no scientifically trained mind

entertains the least doubt that they are in every case the inevitable results of prior conditions. But the knowledge of the expert has not approximately penetrated to the secret of those conditions ; here, therefore, his power of prediction largely fails him.

This applies to a great extent even to events of a uniform and familiar order. Biological science may predict that an animal will be of the same species as its parents ; but cannot predict its sex. It may predict the general characteristics of the next generation of men ; but not the special attributes of a single individual. But its power of forecast is limited in a far more striking way—by the perpetual modification of the very material with which it has to deal. It is able to predict that, *given* such and such variations, natural selection will foster and increase them ; that *given* such and such organic taints, heredity will transmit them ; but it is powerless to say what the next spontaneous variation, or the next development of heredity will be. It is at work, not on steadfast substances with immutable qualities, like those of the inorganic world ; but on substances whose very nature is to change. The evolution of animal existence, from protoplasm upwards, involves ever fresh elaborations in the composition of the vital tissues. Science traces the issue of these changes, and learns even to some extent to foresee and so to guide their course ; it can thus lay down laws of scientific breeding, laws of medicine and hygiene. But the unconquerable spontaneity of the organic world is for ever setting previous generalisations at defiance ; in great things and small, from the production of a new type of national physique to the production of a new variety of tulip, it is ever presenting fresh developments, whose necessity no one could divine, and of which no one could say aught until they were actually there. And so, though science follows closely after, and keeps up the game with spirit, its position in its Wonderland is always rather like that of Alice in hers, when the croquet-hoops consisted of soldiers who moved as often as they chose. The game is one on which it will never be safe to bet for very far ahead ; and it is one which will certainly never end.

And if this is true of life in its *physical* manifestations, it is certainly not less true of its *mental* manifestations. It is to the latter, indeed, that we naturally turn for the highest examples of mobility, and the most marked exhibitions of the unexpected. An Athenian of Solon's time, speculating on " the coming race," might well have predicted for his countrymen the physical prowess that won Marathon, but not the peculiar intellectual vitality that culminated in the theatre of Dionysus. At the present moment, it is safer to prophesy that the next generation in Germany will include a good many hundreds of thousands of short-sighted persons than that it will include a Beethoven. Nor will it surprise us to find the " sports " and uncertainties of vital development most conspicuous on the psychical side, if we remember the nature of their physical basis. For mental facts are indissolubly linked with the very class of material facts that science can least penetrate—with the most complex sort of changes occurring in the most subtly woven sort of matter—the molecular activities of brain-tissue.

§ 2. There exists, then, a large department of natural events where

the test of prediction can be applied only in a restricted way. Whether the events be near or distant—whether the question be of intellectual developments a thousand years hence, or of the movements of an amoeba or the success of a “thought-transference” experiment in the next five minutes—there is here no voice that can speak with absolute authority. The expert gets his cosmic prophecies accepted by pointing to the perpetual fulfilment of his minor predictions in the laboratory; or he refutes adverse theories by showing that they conflict with facts that he can at any moment render patent. But as to the implications and possibilities of *life*—the constitution and faculties of *man*—he will do well to predict and refute with caution; for here he may fail even to guess the relation of what will be to what is. If his function as a prophet is not wholly abrogated, he is a prophet ever liable to correction. He is obliged to deal largely in likelihoods and tendencies; and (if I may venture on a prophecy which is perhaps as fallible as the rest) the interest in the laws that he is able to lay down will never supersede the interest in the exceptions to those laws. Indeed it is in emphasising exceptions that his own rôle will largely consist. And above all must he beware of setting up any arbitrary “scientific frontier” between the part of Nature that he knows and the part that he does not know. He can trace the great flood of evolution to the point at which he stands; but a little beyond him it loses itself in the darkness; and though he may realise its general force and direction, and roughly surmise the mode in which its bed will be shaped, he can but dimly picture the scenes through which it will flow.

But if the science of life cannot be final, there is no reason why it should not be accurate and coherent. And if the scope of definite scientific comprehension is here specially restricted, and the unexpected is specially certain to occur, that is no reason for abating one jot of care in the actual work that it remains possible to do—the work of sifting and marshalling evidence, of estimating sources of error, and of strictly adjusting theories to facts. On the contrary, the necessity for such care is only increased. If incaution may be sometimes shown in too peremptorily shutting the door on alleged phenomena which are not in clear continuity with established knowledge, it is far more often and flagrantly shown in the claim for their admission. And it is undeniable that the conditions which have been briefly described expose speculation on the possible developments of vital phenomena to peculiar dangers and difficulties. In proportion as the expert moderates his tone, and makes his forecasts in a tentative and hypothetical manner, it is certain that those who are not experts will wax bold in assertion and theory. The part of the map that science leaves blank, as *terra incognita*, is the very one which amateur geographers will fill in according to their fancy, or on the reports of uncritical and untrustworthy explorers. The confidence of ignorance is always pretty accurately adjusted to the confidence of knowledge. Wherever the expert can put his foot down, and assert or deny with assurance, the uninstructed instinctively bow to him. He fearlessly asserts, for instance, that the law of the conservation of energy cannot be broken; the world believes him, and the inventors of perpetual-motion machines gradually die off. But suppose the question is of possible relations of human beings to inanimate things or to one another, new modes of influence, new forms of

sensitiveness. Here responsible science can give no confident denial ; here, therefore, irresponsible speculation finds its chance. It has, no doubt, modified its language under the influence of half a century of brilliant physical discovery. It takes care to shelter its hypotheses under the name of law : the loosest of philosophers nowadays would hesitate to appeal, as the elder Humboldt appealed sixty years ago, to a " sense of yearning in the human soul," as a proof that the course of nature may suffer exceptions.¹ But the change is often rather in name than in fact ; the " natural " lends itself to free guessing quite as easily as the " supernatural " ; and nowhere in Nature is this freedom so unchartered as in the domain of psychic life. Speculation here is not only easy ; it is, unfortunately, also attractive. The more obscure phenomena and the more doubtful assumptions are just those on which the popular mind most readily fastens ; and the popular tongue rejoices in terms of the biggest and vaguest connotation. Something also must be set down to a natural reaction. Even persons whose interest has been earnest and intelligent have found scientific *moral* hard to preserve, in departments surrendered by a long-standing convention of unscientific treatment. Thus, in their practice, they have come to acquiesce in that surrender, and have dispensed with habits of caution for which no one was likely to give them credit ; while in their polemic they have as much resented the stringent demands for evidence, in which their opponents have been right, as the refusal to look at it when it is there, in which their opponents have been wrong.

§ 3. The above facts, and the peculiar obligations which they involve, should never be lost sight of by the serious student of " psychical " phenomena. His path is one that eminently craves wary walking. On the one hand, he finds new dim vistas of study opening out, in an age whose ideal of scientific studies is formed from the most highly developed specimens of them ; and the twilight which has in every class of knowledge preceded the illuminating dawn of law is made doubly dark and dubious for him by the advanced daylight of scientific conceptions from which he peers into it. He finds, moreover, that the marvellous recent extension of the area of the known through additions to its recognised departments and multiplication of their connections, has inevitably and reasonably produced a certain rigidity of scientific attitude—an increased difficulty in breaking loose from association, and admitting a new department on its own independent evidence. And on the other hand, he finds himself more or less in contact with advocates of new departments who ignore the weight of the presumption against them—who fail to see that it is from the recognised departments that the standard of evidence

¹ *Briefe an eine Freundin*, p. 61.

² The specific sense which we have given to this word needs apology. But we could find no other convenient term, under which to embrace a group of subjects that lie on or outside the boundaries of recognised science, while seeming to present certain points of connection among themselves. For instance, this book will contain evidences of the relation of *telepathy*—its main theme—both to *mesmerism* and to certain phenomena which are often, without adequate evidence, attributed to minds apart from material organisms.

must be drawn, and that if speculation is to make good its right to outrun science, it will certainly not be by impatience of scientific canons. On this side the position of the psychical student is one in which the student of the recognised sciences is never placed. The physicist never finds his observations confronted or confounded with those of persons who claim familiarity with his subject while ignoring his methods: he never sees his statements and his theories classed or compared with theirs. He is marked out from his neighbours by the very fact of dealing with subject-matter which they do not know how even to begin to talk about. The "psychicist" is not so marked out. *His* subject matter is in large measure common property, of which the whole world can talk as glibly as he; and the ground which must be broken for science, if at all, by the application of precise treatment, has already been made trite in connection with quite other treatment.

§ 4. The moral is one which the authors of the present undertaking have every reason to lay to heart. For the endeavour of this book, almost throughout, is to deal with themes that are in a sense familiar, by the aid, partly, of improved evidential methods, but partly also of conceptions which have as yet no place in the recognised psychology. Not, indeed, that the reader is about to be treated to any large amount of speculation; facts will be very much more prominent than theories. Still, the facts to be adduced carry us at least one step beyond the accepted boundaries. What they prove (if we interpret them rightly) is *the ability of one mind to impress or to be impressed by another mind otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense*. We call the owner of the impressing mind the agent, and the owner of the impressed mind the *percipient*; and we describe the fact of impression shortly by the term *telepathy*. We began by restricting that term to cases where the distance through which the transference of impressions took place far exceeded the scope of the recognised senses; but it may be fairly extended to *all* cases of impressions conveyed without any affection of the percipient's recognised senses, whatever may be his actual distance from the agent. I of course do not mean by this merely that the channel of communication is unrecognised by the person impressed—as in the drawing-room pastime where hidden pins are found through indications which the finder receives and acts on without any consciousness of guidance. By the words "otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense," I mean that the cause or condition of the transferred impression is specifically unknown. It may sometimes be necessary or convenient to conceive it as some special supernormal or supersensuous¹ faculty; and in that case we are undoubtedly assuming a faculty which is new—or at any rate is new to science. But we can at least claim that we take this step under compulsion; not in the light-hearted fashion which formerly improvised occult forces and fluids to account for the

¹ It seems impossible to avoid these terms; yet each needs to be guarded from a probable misunderstanding. *Supernormal* is very liable to be confounded with *supernatural*; while *supersensuous* suggests a dogmatic denial of a physical side to the effect.

vagaries of hysteria ; or which in our own day has discovered the dawn of a new sense, or the relic of some primeval instinct, in the ordinary exhibitions of the "willing-game." Our inference of an unrecognised mode of affection has nothing in common with such inferences as these ; for it has been made only after recognised modes have been carefully excluded.

§ 5. It is not, however, with the ultimate conditions of the phenomena that the study of them can begin : our first business is with the reality, rather than with the rationale, of their occurrence. Telepathy as a system of facts is what we have to examine. Discussion of the nature of the novel faculty in itself, and apart from particular results, will be as far as possible avoided. That, if it exists, it has important relations to various very fundamental problems—metaphysical, psychological, possibly even physical—can scarcely be doubted. So far from the scientific study of man being a region whose boundaries are pretty well mapped out, and which only requires to be filled in with further detail by physiologists and psychologists, we may come to perceive that we are standing only on the threshold of a vast *terra incognita*, which must be humbly explored before we can even guess at its true extent, or appreciate its relation to the more familiar realms of knowledge. But such distant visions had better not be lingered over. Before the philosophical aspects of the subject can be profitably discussed, its position as a real department of knowledge must be amply vindicated. This can only be done by a wide survey of evidence ; the character of the present treatise will therefore be mainly evidential.

In demonstrating the reality of impressions communicated otherwise than through the known sensory channels, we rely on two distinct branches of evidence, each of which demands a special sort of caution. The larger portion of this work will deal with cases of *spontaneous* occurrence. Here the evidence will consist of records of experiences which we have received from a variety of sources—for the most part from living persons more or less known to us. Narratives of the same kind have from time to time appeared in other collections. These, however, have not been treated with any reference to a theory of telepathy such as is here set forth ; nor have their editors fulfilled conditions which, for reasons to be subsequently explained (Chapter IV), we have felt bound to observe ; and we have found them of almost no assistance. In scarcely a single instance has a case been brought up to the standard which really commands attention.¹ The prime essentials of testimony in such matters—authorities, names, dates, corroboration, the *ipsissima verba* of the witnesses—have one or all been lacking ; and there seems to have been no appreciation of the strength of the *à priori* objections which the evidence has to overmaster, nor of the possible sources of error in the evidence itself. It is in analysing and estimating these sources of error, and in fixing the evidential standard

¹ An exception should perhaps be made in favour of a few of the late Mr. R. Dale Owen's narratives. The Rev. B. Wrey-Savile's book on *Apparitions* contains some careful work, but it deals chiefly with remote cases. Dr. Mayo, in his *Truths contained in Popular Superstitions*, adduces very inadequate evidence ; but he has given (p. 67) what is perhaps the first suggestion of a psychical explanation.

which may fairly be applied, that the most difficult part of the present task will be seen to consist.

But though the records here presented will be more numerous, and on the whole better attested, than those of previous collections, the majority of them will be of a tolerably well-known type. The peculiarity of the present treatment will come out rather in the connection of this branch of our evidence with the other branch. For our conviction that the supposed faculty of supersensuous impression is a genuine one is greatly fortified by a body of evidence of an *experimental* kind—where the conditions could be arranged in such a way as to exclude the chances of error that beset the spontaneous cases. In considering this experimental branch of our subject, I shall of course, after what has been said, be specially bound to make clear the distinction between what we hold to be genuine cases and the spurious “thought-reading” exhibitions which are so much better known. This will be easy enough, and will be done in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE EXPERIMENTAL BASIS: THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE

§ 1. IT is difficult to get a quite satisfactory name for the experimental branch of our subject. "Thought-reading" was the name that we first adopted; but this had several inconveniences. Oddly enough, the term has got identified with what is not *thought*-reading at all, but *muscle*-reading—of which more anon. But a more serious objection to it is that it suggests a power to *read* anything that may be going on in the mind of another person—to probe characters and discover secrets—which raises a needless prejudice against the whole subject. The idea of such a power has, in fact, been converted into an *ad absurdum* argument against the existence of the faculty for which we contend. To suppose that people's minds can be thus open to one another, it was justly enough said, would be to contradict the assumption on which all human intercourse has been carried on. Our answer, of course, is that we have never supposed people's minds to be thus open to one another; that such a supposition would be as remote as possible from the facts on which we rely; and that the most accomplished "thought-reader's" power is never likely to be a matter of social inconvenience. The mode of experimentation may reassure those who look on the genuine faculty as dangerous or uncanny; for the results, as a rule, have to be tried for by a distinct, and often a very irksome, process of concentration on the part of the person whose "thought" is to be "read." And this being so, it is clearly important to avoid such an expression as "thought-reading," which conveys no hint that his thought is anything else than an open page, or that his mental attitude has anything to do with the phenomenon.

The experiments involve, in fact, the will of *two* persons; and of the two minds, it is rather the one which reads that is *passive* and the one which is *read* that is active. It is for the sake of recognising this that we distinguish the two parties as "agent" and "percipient," and that we have substituted for thought-reading the term *thought-transference*. *Thought* must here be taken as including more than it does in ordinary usage; it must include sensations and volitions as well as mere representations or ideas. This being understood, the name serves its purpose fairly well, as long as we are on experimental ground. It will not be forgotten, however, that our aim is to connect an experimental with a spontaneous class of cases; and according to that view it will often be convenient to describe the former no less than the latter as *telepathic*. We thus get what we need, a single generic term which embraces the whole

range of phenomena and brings out their continuity—the simpler experimental forms being the first step in a graduated series.

§ 2. The history of experimental thought-transference has been a singular one. It was not by direct trial, nor in what we should now account their normal form, that the phenomena first attracted the attention of competent witnesses. Their appearance was connected with the discovery that the *somnambulic* state could be artificially induced. It was after the introduction of “mesmerism” or “magnetism” into France, and in the course of the investigation of that wider subject, that this special feature unexpectedly presented itself. The observations remained, it is true, extremely few and scattered. The greater part of them were made in this country, during the second quarter of the present [nineteenth] century; and took the form of *community of sensation* between the operator and the patient. The transference of impressions here depended on a specific *rappport* previously induced by mesmeric or hypnotic operations—passes, fixation, and the like. To us, now, this mesmeric *rappport* (in some, at any rate, of its manifestations) seems nothing more than the faculty of thought-transference *confined* to a single agent and percipient, and *intensified* in degree by the very conditions which limit its scope. But the course of discovery inverted the logical order of the phenomena. The recognition of the particular case, where the exercise of the faculty was narrowed down to a single channel, preceded by a long interval the recognition of the more general phenomena, as exhibited by persons in a normal state. The transference of impressions was naturally regarded as belonging essentially to mesmerism. As such, it was only one more wonder in a veritable wonderland; and while obtaining on that account the readier acceptance among those who witnessed it, it to some extent shut out the idea of the possibility of similar manifestations where no specific *rappport* had been artificially established.

But there was a further result. The early connection of thought-transference with mesmerism distinctly damaged its chance of scientific recognition. Those who believed in cognate marvels might easily believe in this marvel: but cautious minds rejected the whole posse of marvels together. And one can hardly wonder at this, when one remembers the wild and ignorant manner in which the claims of Mesmer and his followers were thrust upon the world. A man who professed to have magnetised the sun could hardly expect a serious hearing; and even the operators who eschewed such extravagant pretensions still too often advocated their cause in a language that could only cover it with contempt. Theories of “*odylic*” force, and of imponderable fluids pervading the body—as dogmatically set forth as if they ranked in certainty with the doctrine of the circulation of the blood—were not likely to attract scientific inquiry to the facts. And in the later developments of hypnotism—in which many of the old “mesmeric” phenomena have been restudied from a truer point of view, and *rappporti* of a certain sort between the hypnotist and the “subject” has been admitted—there has been so much to absorb observation in the extraordinary range of mental and physical effects which the operator can command by verbal or visible *suggestion*, that the far rarer telepathic phenomena have, so to speak, been crowded

out.¹ The consequence is that after nearly a century of controversy, the most interesting facts of mesmeric history are quite as little recognised as the less specialised kinds of thought-transference, which have only within the last few years been seriously looked for or definitely obtained.

Some of the older cases referred to will be found quoted *in extenso* in the first chapter of the Supplement [not here reproduced]. Though recorded for the most part in a fragmentary and unsatisfactory way, it will be seen that they do not lack good, or even high, scientific authority. The testimony of Mr. Esdaile, for many years Presidency Surgeon in Calcutta, cannot be despised by any instructed physiologist in our day ; inasmuch as his work is now recognised as one of the most important contributions ever made to the rapidly-growing science of hypnotism. No one has denied the ability and integrity of Dr. Elliotson, nor (in spite of his speculative extravagances) of Reichenbach—who both witnessed instances of hypnotic telepathy. And though Professor Gregory, Dr. Mayo, the Rev. C. H. Townsend, and others, may not have been men of acute scientific intelligence, they were probably competent to conduct, and to record with accuracy, experiments the conditions of which involved no more than common care and honesty. We cannot but account it strange that such items of testimony as these men supplied should have been neglected, even by those who were most repelled by the ignorance and fanaticism which infected a large amount of the mesmeric literature. But since such was the fact, the observations will hardly now make their weight felt, except in connection with the fuller testimony of a more recent date. It is characteristic of every subject which depends on questions of fact, and which has yet failed to win a secure place in intelligent opinion, that any further advance must for the most part depend on *contemporary* evidence. I may, therefore, pass at once to the wholly new departure in thought-transference which the last few years have witnessed.

§ 3. The novelty of this departure—as has been already intimated—consists in the fact that successful results have been obtained when the percipient was apparently in a perfectly normal state, and had been subjected to no mesmerising or hypnotising process. The dawn of the discovery must be referred to the years 1875 and 1876. It was in the autumn of the latter year that our colleague, Professor W. F. Barrett [now Sir William Barrett] brought under the notice of the British Association, at Glasgow, a cautious statement of some remarkable facts which he had encountered, and a suggestion of the expediency of ascertaining how far recognised physiological laws would account for them. The facts themselves were connected with mesmerism ;² but the discussion

¹ I refer specially to the eminent group of hypnotists at Nancy—Dr. Liébeault, and Professors Beaunis, Bernheim, and Liégeois. Dr. Liébeault has, however, personally described to us several instances of apparently telepathic transference which he has encountered in the course of his professional experience ; and some observations recorded by Professor Beaunis (in his admirable article on hypnotism in the *Revue Philosophique* for August, 1885, p. 126), at any rate point, as he admits, to a new mode of sensibility. And since the above remarks were written, both these gentlemen have made definite experiments in telepathy, some of the results of which will be found [quoted in the original edition].

² *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychical Research, vol. i., pp. 241–2.

in the Press to which the paper gave rise led to a considerable correspondence, in which Professor Barrett found his first hints of a faculty of thought-transference existing independently of the specific mesmeric *rapport*.

That these hints happened to be forthcoming, just at the right moment, was a piece of great good fortune, and was due primarily to a circumstance quite unconnected with science, and from which serious results would scarcely have been anticipated—the invention of the “willing-game.” In some form or other this pastime is probably familiar to most of my readers, either through personal trials or through the exhibitions of platform performers. The ordinary process is this. A member of the party, who is to act as “thought-reader,” or percipient, leaves the room; the rest determine on some simple action which he, or she, is to perform, or hide some object which he is to find. The would-be percipient is then recalled, and his hand is taken or his shoulders are lightly touched by one or more of the willers. Under these conditions the action is often quickly performed or the object found. Nothing could at first sight look less like a promising starting-point for a new branch of inquiry. The “willer” usually asserts, with perfect good faith, and often perhaps quite correctly, that he did not *push*; but so little is it necessary for the guiding impression to be a push that it may be the very reverse—a slight *release* of tension when the “willed” performer, after various minute indications of a tendency to move in this, that, or the other wrong direction, at last hits on the right one. Even when the utmost care is used to maintain the light contact with absolute neutrality, it is impossible to lay down the limits of any given subject’s sensibility to such slight tactile and muscular hints. The experiments of Drs. Carpenter and Beard, and especially those of a member of our own Society, the Rev. E. H. Sugden, of Bradford,¹ and other unpublished ones on which we can rely, have shown us that the difference between one person and another in this respect is very great, and that with some organisations a variation of pressure so slight that the supposed “willer” may be quite unaware of exercising it, but which he applies according as the movements of the other person are on the right track or not, may afford a kind of *yes* or *no* indication quite sufficient for a clue. This, indeed, is the one direct piece of instruction which the game has supplied. We might perhaps have been to some extent prepared for the result by observing the infinitesimal touches to which a horse will respond, or the extremely slight indications on which we ourselves often act in ordinary life. But till this game was played, probably no one fully realised that muscular hints, so slight as to be quite unconsciously given, could be equally unconsciously taken; and that thus a definite course of action might be produced without the faintest idea of guidance on either side. In some cases it appeared that even contact could be dispensed with, and the guidance was presumably of an auditory kind—the “subject” extracting from the mere footsteps of the “willer,” who was following him about, hints of satisfaction or dissatisfaction at the course he was taking.² But though this remarkable susceptibility to a particular order of impressions was an interesting dis-

¹ *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. i., p. 291; vol. ii., p. 11.

² See the record of Mr. A. E. Outerbridge’s experiments, published by Dr. Beard in the *American Popular Science Monthly* for July, 1877.

covery, the results which could be thus explained clearly involved nothing new in kind. That recognised faculties may exhibit unsuspected degrees of refinement is a common enough conception. The more important point was that there were certain results which, apparently, could not be thus explained, at any rate, in any off-hand way. Occasionally the actions required of the "willed" performer were of so complicated a sort, and so rapidly carried out, as to cast considerable doubt on the adequacy of any muscular hints to evoke and guide them. Here, then, was the first indication of something new—of a hitherto unrecognised faculty; and by good fortune, as I have said, Professor Barrett's appeal for further evidence as to transferred impressions came just at the time when the game had obtained a certain amount of popularity, and when its more delicate and unaccountable phenomena had attracted attention.

Meanwhile similar observations were being made in America. America, indeed, was the original home of the "willing" entertainment; and it is to an American, Dr. McGraw, that the credit belongs of having been the first (as far as I am aware) to detect in it the possible germ of something new to science. In the *Detroit Review of Medicine* for August, 1875, Dr. McGraw gave a clear account of the ordinary physiological process—"the perception by a trained operator of involuntary and unconscious muscular movements"; and then proceeded as follows:—

"It seemed to me that there were features in these exhibitions which could not be satisfactorily explained on the hypothesis of involuntary muscular action, for . . . we are required to believe a man could unwillingly, and in spite of himself, give information by unconscious and involuntary signs that he could not give under the same circumstances by voluntary and conscious action. . . . It seems to me there is a hint towards the possibility of the nervous system of one individual being used by the active will of another to accomplish certain simple motions."

But though there might be enough in the phenomena to justify cautious suggestions of this sort, the ground is at best very uncertain. Even where some nicety of selection is involved, as, for instance, when a particular note is to be struck on the piano, or a particular book to be taken out of a shelf, still, unless the subject's hand moves with extreme rapidity, it will be perfectly possible for an involuntary and unconscious indication to be given by the "willer" at the instant that the right note or book is reached. In reports of such cases it is sometimes stated that there was no tentative process, and that the "subject's" hand seemed to obey the other person's will with almost the same directness as that person's own hand would have done. But this is a question of degree as to which the confidence of an eye-witness cannot easily be imparted to others. It may be worth while, however, to give an instance of a less common type by which the theory of muscular guidance does undoubtedly seem to be somewhat strained.

The case was observed by Mr. Myers on October 31st, 1877. The performers were two sisters.

"I wrote the letters of the alphabet on scraps of paper. I then thought of the word CLARA and showed it to M. behind R.'s back, R.

sitting at the table. M. put her hands on R.'s shoulders, and R. with shut eyes picked out the letters C L A R V—taking the V apparently for a second A, which was not in the pack—and laid them in a heap. She did not know, she said, what letters she had selected. No impulse had consciously passed through her mind, only she had felt her hands impelled to pick up certain bits of paper.

"This was a good case as *apparently* excluding *pushing*. The scraps were in a confused heap in front of R., who kept still further confusing them, picking them up and letting them drop with great rapidity. M.'s hands remained apparently motionless on R.'s shoulders, and one can hardly conceive that indications could be given by *pressure*, from the rapid and snatching manner in which R. collected the right letters, touching several letters in the course of a second. M., however, told me that it was always necessary that she, M., should *see* the letters which R. was to pick up."

Such a case may not suggest thought-transference, but it at any rate tempts one to look deeper than crude sensory signs for the springs of action, and to conceive the governance of one organism by another through some sort of nervous induction. It at any rate differs greatly in its conditions from the famous bank-note trick, where a number is written on a board, so slowly, and in figures of so large a size, that at every point the "willer" may mark his opinion of the direction the lines are taking by involuntary muscular hints.

It would be useless to accumulate further instances. The best of them could never be wholly conclusive, and mere multiplication adds nothing to their weight. By some of them, as I have said, the theory of muscular guidance is undoubtedly strained. But then the theory of muscular guidance *ought* to be strained, and strained to the very utmost, before being declared inadequate; and it would always be a matter of opinion whether the point of "utmost" strain had been overpassed. Dr. McGraw and Professor Barrett surmised that it had; Dr. Beard, of New York, was confident that it had not. The contention between "mind-reading" and "muscle-reading" could never reach a definite issue on this ground. But meanwhile the confident and exclusive adherents of the muscular hypothesis had a position of decided advantage over the doubters, for they could fairly enough represent themselves as the champions of science in its war with popular superstitions. The popular imagination *more suo* had fastened on the phenomena *en bloc*, and had decided that they were what they seemed to be—"thought-reading." To the average sightseer a mysterious word is far more congenial than a physiological explanation; and it was, of course, the interest of the professional exhibitor to adopt and advertise a description which seemed to invest him with novel and magical powers. What more natural, therefore, than that those who saw the absurdity of these pretensions should regard further inquiry or suspension of judgment as a concession to ignorant credulity? "Irving Bishop," it seemed fair to argue, "is a professed 'thought-reader'; Irving Bishop's tricks are, at best, mere feats of muscular and tactile sensibility; *ergo* whoever believes that there is such a thing as 'thought-reading' is on a par with the crowd who are mystified by Irving Bishop."

§ 4. If, then, the ground of experiment had remained unchanged—if the old “willing-game” had merely continued to appear in various forms—no definite advance could have been made. But on the path of the old experiments, a quite new phenomenon now presented itself, which no one could have confidently anticipated, but for which the suggestions drawn from the most advanced phenomena of the “willing-game” had to some extent prepared the way. It was discovered that not only transferences of impression could take place *without contact*, but that there was no necessity for the result aimed at to involve movements; the fact of the transference might be shown, not—as in the “willing-game”—by the subject’s ability to *do* something, but by his ability to discern and describe an object thought of by the “willer.” Both parties could thus remain perfectly still; which was really a more important condition than even the absence of contact. In this form of experiment, muscle-reading and all the subtler forms of unconscious guidance are completely excluded; and the dangers which remain are such as can, with sufficient care, be clearly defined and safely guarded against. Indications of a visual kind—for instance, by the involuntary direction of glances—have no scope if the object which the percipient is to name is not present or visible in the room. There is, of course, an obvious danger in low whispering, or even soundless movements of the lips; while the faintest accent of approval or disapproval in question or comment may give a hint as to whether the effort is tending in the right direction, and thus guide to the mark by successive approximations. Any exhibition of the kind before a promiscuous company is nearly sure to be vitiated by the latter source of error. But when the experiments are carried on in a limited circle of persons known to each other, and amenable to scientific control, it is not hard for those engaged to set a watch on their own and on each other’s lips; and questions and comments can be entirely forbidden.

I have been speaking of the danger of *involuntary* guidance. There is, of course, another danger to be considered—that of *voluntary* guidance—of actual *collusion* between the agent and percipient. Contact being excluded, such guidance would have to be by signals; and it is impossible to lay down any precise limit to the degree of perfection that a plan of signalling may reach. The long and short signs of the Morse code admit of many varieties of application; and though the channels of sight and touch may be cut off, it is difficult entirely to cut off that of hearing. Shufflings of the feet, coughs, irregularities of breathing, all offer available material. But though the precise line of possibilities in this direction cannot be drawn, we are at any rate able to suggest cases where the line would be clearly overpassed. For instance, if the idea to be transferred from the agent to the percipient is inexpressible in less than twenty words; and if hearing is the only sensory channel left open; and if it is carefully observed that there are no coughs or shufflings, and that the agent’s breathing appears regular, then one seems justified in saying that the necessary information could not be conveyed by a code without a very considerable expenditure of time, and a very abnormally acute sense of hearing on the percipient’s part. There is no relation whatever between a private experiment performed under such conditions as these,

and the feats of a conjurer, like Mr. Maskelyne, who commands secret apparatus, and whose every word and gesture may be observed and interpreted by a concealed confederate.

It would be rash, however, to represent as crucial any apparent transferences of thought between persons not absolutely separated, where the good faith of at least one of the two is not accepted as beyond question, and where the genuineness of the result is left to depend on the perfection with which third parties have arranged conditions and guarded against signs. The conditions of a crucial result, for one's own mind, are either (1) that the agent or the percipient shall be oneself; or (2) that the agent or percipient shall be someone whose experience, as recorded by himself, is indistinguishable in certainty from one's own; or (3) that there shall be several agents or percipients, in the case of each of whom the improbability of deceit, or of such imbecility as would take the place of deceit, is so great that the combination of improbabilities amounts to a moral impossibility. The third mode of attaining conviction is the most practically important. For it is not to be expected of most people that, within a short time, they will either themselves be, or have intimate friends who are, successful agents or percipients; and they are justified, therefore, in demanding that the evidence to which they might fairly refuse credence if it depended on the veracity and intelligence of one or two persons, of however unblemished a reputation, shall be multiplied for their benefit. Whatever be the experimenter's assurance as to the perfection of his conditions, it is in the nature of things impossible that strangers, who only read and have not seen, should be infected by it. They cannot be absolutely certain that this, that, or the other stick might not break; then enough sticks must be collected and tied together to make a faggot of a strength which shall defy suspicion.¹ As regards the experiments of which I am about to present a sketch, it is not necessary to my argument that any individual's honesty shall be completely assumed, in the sense of being used as a certain basis for conclusions. The proof must

¹ In reference to the objection that the demand for *quantity* of evidence shows that we know the *quality* of each item to be bad, I may quote the following passage from a presidential address of Professor Sidgwick's: "The quality of much of our evidence—when considered apart from the strangeness of the matters to which it refers—is not bad, but very good: it is such that one or two items of it would be held to establish the occurrence, at any particular time and place, of any phenomenon whose existence was generally accepted. Since, however, on this subject the best single testimony only yields an improbability of the *testimony being false* that is outweighed by the improbability of the *fact being true*, the only way to make the scale fall on the side of the testimony is to increase the quantity. If the testimony were not good, this increase of quantity would be of little value; but if it is such that the hypothesis of its falsity requires us to suppose abnormal motiveless deceit, or abnormal stupidity or carelessness, in a person hitherto reputed honest and intelligent, then an increase in the number of cases in which such a supposition is required adds importantly to the improbability of the general hypothesis. It is sometimes said by loose thinkers that the 'moral factor' ought not to come in at all. But the least reflection shows that the moral factor must come in in all the reasonings of experimental science, except for those who have personally repeated all the experiments on which their conclusions are based. Any one who accepts the report of the experiments of another must rely, not only on his intelligence, but on his honesty: only ordinarily his honesty is so completely assumed that the assumption is not noticed."

depend on the *number* of persons, reputed honest and intelligent, to whom dishonesty or imbecility must be attributed if the conclusions are wrong, *i.e.*, it must be a cumulative proof. Not that my colleagues and I have any doubt as to the *bona fides* of every case here recorded. But even where our grounds of certainty are most obvious, they cannot be made entirely obvious to those to whom we and our more intimate associates are personally unknown ; while outside this inner circle our confidence depends on points that can scarcely even be suggested to others—on views of character gradually built up out of a number of small and often indefinable items of conversation and demeanour. We may venture to say that a candid critic, present during the whole course of the experiments, would have carried away a far more vivid impression of their genuineness than any printed record can convey. But it must be distinctly understood that we discriminate our cases ; and that even where the results are to our own minds crucial—in that they can only be impugned by impugning the honesty or sanity of members of our own investigating Committee—we do not demand their acceptance on this ground alone, or attempt accurately to define the number of reputations which should be staked before a fair mind *ought* to admit the proof as overwhelming. As observations are accumulated, different “ fair minds ” will give in at different points ; and until the most exacting are satisfied, our task will be incomplete.

§ 5. I mentioned above the correspondence which followed Professor Barrett's appeal for evidence. In this correspondence, among many instances of the higher aspects of the “ willing-game,” there was a small residue which pointed to a genuine transference of impression without contact or movement. Of this residue the most important item was that supplied by our friend, the Rev. A. M. Creery, then resident at Buxton, and now working in the diocese of Manchester. He had his attention called to the subject in October, 1880 ; and was early struck by the impossibility of deciding, in cases where contact was employed, how far the powers of unconscious muscular guidance might extend. He, therefore, instituted experiments with his daughters and with a young maid-servant, in which contact was altogether eschewed. He thus describes the early trials :—

“ Each went out of the room in turn, while I and the others fixed on some object which the absent one was to name on returning to the room. After a few trials the successes preponderated so much over the failures that we were all convinced there was something very wonderful coming under our notice. Night after night, for several months, we spent an hour or two each evening in varying the conditions of the experiments, and choosing new subjects for thought-transference. We began by selecting the simplest objects in the room ; then chose names of towns, names of people, dates, cards out of a pack, lines from different poems, &c., in fact any things or series of ideas that those present could keep steadily before their minds ; and when the children were in good humour, and excited by the wonderful nature of their successful guessing, they very seldom made a mistake. I have seen seventeen cards, chosen by myself, named right in succession, without any mistake. We soon found that a

great deal depended on the steadiness with which the ideas were kept before the minds of 'the thinkers,' and upon the energy with which they willed the ideas to pass. Our worst experiments before strangers have invariably been when the company was dull and undemonstrative; and we are all convinced that when mistakes are made, the fault rests, for the most part, with the thinkers, rather than with the thought-readers."

In the course of the years 1881 and 1882, a large number of experiments were made with the Creery family, first by Professor Barrett, then by Mr. and Mrs. Sidgwick, by Professor Balfour Stewart, F.R.S., and Professor Alfred Hopkinson, of Owens College, Manchester, and, after the formation of the Society for Psychical Research, by the Thought-transference Committee of that body, of which Mr. Myers and myself were members. The children in turn acted as "percipients," the other persons present being "agents," *i.e.*, concentrating their minds on the idea of some selected word or thing, with the intention that this idea should be transferred to the percipient's mind. The thing selected was either a card, taken at random from a full pack; or a name chosen also at random; or a number, usually of two figures; or occasionally some domestic implement or other object in the house. The percipient was, of course, absent when the selection was made, and when recalled had no means of discovering through the exercise of the senses what it was, unless by signals, consciously or unconsciously given by one or other of the agents. Strict silence was maintained throughout each experiment, and when the group of agents included any members of the Creery family, the closest watch was kept in order to detect any passage of signals; but in hundreds of trials nothing was observed which suggested any attempt of the sort. Still, such simple objects would not demand an elaborate code for their description; nor were any effective means taken to block the percipient's channels of sense—it being thought expedient in these early trials not to disturb their minds by obtrusive precautions. We could not, therefore, regard the testimony of the investigators present as adding much weight to the experiments in which any members of the family were among the group of agents, unless the percipient was completely isolated from that group. Such a case was the following:—

"Easter, 1881. Present: Mr. and Mrs. Creery and family, and W. F. Barrett, the narrator. One of the children was sent into an adjoining room, the door of which I saw was closed. On returning to the sitting-room and closing its door also, I thought of some object in the house, fixed upon at random; writing the name down, I showed it to the family present, the strictest silence being preserved throughout. We then all silently thought of the name of the thing selected. In a few seconds the door of the adjoining room was heard to open, and after a very short interval the child would enter the sitting-room, generally with the object selected. No one was allowed to leave the sitting-room after the object had been fixed upon; no communication with the child was conceivable, as her place was often changed. Further, the only instructions given to the child were to fetch some object in the house that I would fix upon, and, together with the family, silently keep in mind, to the exclusion, as far as possible, of all other ideas. In this way I wrote down, among other things, a *hair-brush*; it was brought: an *orange*; it was brought:

a wine-glass ; it was brought : an *apple* ; it was brought : a *toasting-fork* ; failed on the first attempt, a pair of tongs being brought, but on a second trial it was brought. With another child (among other trials not here mentioned) a *cup* was written down by me ; it was brought : a *saucer* ; this was a failure, a plate being brought ; no second trial allowed. The child being told it was a saucer, replied, ' That came into my head, but I hesitated as I thought it unlikely you would name saucer after cup, as being too easy.' "

But, of course, the most satisfactory condition was that only the members of the investigating Committee should act as agents, so that signals could not possibly be given unless by one of *them*. This condition clearly makes it idle to represent the means by which the transferences took place as simply a trick which the members of the investigating Committee *failed to detect*. The trick, if trick there was, must have been one in which they, or one of them, *actively shared* ; the only alternative to collusion on their part being some piece of carelessness amounting almost to idiocy—such as uttering the required word aloud, or leaving the selected card exposed on the table. The following series of experiments was made on April 13th, 1882. The agents were Mr. Myers and the present writer, and two ladies of their acquaintance, the Misses Mason, of Morton Hall, Retford, who had become interested in the subject by the remarkable successes which one of them had obtained in experimenting among friends.¹ As neither of these ladies had ever seen any member of the Creery family till just before the experiments began, they had no opportunities for arranging a code of signals with the children ; so that any hypothesis of *collusion* must in this case be confined to Mr. Myers or the present writer. As regards the hypothesis of *want of intelligence*, the degree of intelligent behaviour required of each of the four agents was simply this : (1) To keep silence on a particular subject ; and (2) to avoid unconsciously displaying a particular card or piece of paper to a person situated at some yards' distance. The first condition was realised by keeping silence altogether ; the second by remaining quite still. The four observers were perfectly satisfied that the children had no means at any moment of seeing, either directly or by reflection, the selected card or the name of the selected object. The following is the list of trials :—

Objects to be named. (These objects had been brought, and still remained, in the pocket of one of the visitors. The name of the object selected for trial was secretly written down, not spoken.)

A White Penknife.—Correctly named, with the colour, the first trial.

Box of Almonds.—Correctly named.

Threepenny piece.—Failed.

Box of Chocolate.—Button-box said ; no second trial given.

(A penknife was then hidden ; but the place was not discovered.)

Numbers to be named.

Five.—Rightly given on the first trial.

Fourteen.—Failed.

¹ See Miss Mason's interesting paper on the subject in *Macmillan's Magazine* for October, 1882.

Thirty-three.—54 (No). 34 (No). 33 (Right).
Sixty-eight.—58 (No). 57 (No). 78 (No).

Fictitious names to be guessed.

Martha Billings.—"Biggis" was said.
Catherine Smith.—"Catherine Shaw" was said.
Henry Cowper.—Failed.

Cards to be named.

Two of clubs.—Right first time.
Queen of diamonds.—Right first time.
Four of spades.—Failed.
Four of hearts.—Right first time.
King of hearts.—Right first time.
Two of diamonds.—Right first time.
Ace of hearts.—Right first time.
Nine of spades.—Right first time.
Five of diamonds.—Four of diamonds (No). Four of hearts (No).
 Five of diamonds (Right).
Two of spades.—Right first time.
Eight of diamonds.—Ace of diamonds said ; no second trial given.
Three of hearts.—Right first time.
Five of clubs.—Failed.
Ace of spades.—Failed.

The chances against *accidental* success in the case of any one card are, of course, 51 to 1 ; yet out of *fourteen* successive trials *nine* were successful at the first guess, and only three trials can be said to have been complete failures. The odds against the occurrence of the five successes running, in the card series, are considerably over 1,000,000 to 1. On none of these occasions was it even remotely possible for the child to obtain by any ordinary means a knowledge of the object selected. Our own facial expression was the only index open to her ; and even if we had not purposely looked as neutral as possible, it is difficult to imagine how we could have unconsciously carried, say, the two of diamonds written on our foreheads.

During the ensuing year, the Committee, consisting of Professor Barrett, Mr. Myers, and the present writer, made a number of experiments under similar conditions, which excluded contact and movement, and which confined the knowledge of the selected object—and, therefore, the chance of collusion with the percipient—to their own group. In some of these trials, conducted at Cambridge, Mrs. F. W. H. Myers and Miss Mason also took part. In a long series conducted at Dublin, Professor Barrett was alone with the percipient. Altogether these scrupulously guarded trials amounted to 497 ; and of this number 95 were completely successful at the first guess, and 45 at the second. The results may be clearer if arranged in a tabular form.

TABLE SHOWING THE SUCCESS OBTAINED WHEN THE SELECTED OBJECT WAS KNOWN TO ONE OR MORE OF THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE ONLY.

Place of Trial.	Object Chosen.	No. of Trials.	Probability of success by mere chance at each 1st guess.	Most probable number of successes if 1st guess if chance alone acted.	Number of successes obtained		Number of successes reckoning both 1st and 2nd guesses.	Probability of attaining by mere chance the amount of success which the first guesses gave.
Buxton	Playing Cards ¹	14	$\frac{1}{5.2}$	0	9	0	9	.000,000,000,000,7
"	Numbers, &c.	15	$\frac{1}{9.6}$	0	4	0	4	.000,02
Cambridge	Playing Cards ¹	216	$\frac{1}{5.2}$	4	17	18	35	.000,000,1
"	Numbers	64	$\frac{1}{9.6}$	1	5	6	11	.007
Dublin	Playing Cards ¹	30	$\frac{1}{5.2}$	1	3	0	3	.02
"	Numbers, &c.	108	$\frac{1}{1.2}$	9	32	11	43	.000,000,000,2
"	Words	50	$\frac{1}{4}$	13	25	10	35	.000,1
	Totals	497		27 ²	95	45	140	.000,000,000,000,000,000,01 ³

¹ A full pack was used, from which a card was in each case drawn at random.² This number is obtained by multiplying each figure of the third column by the corresponding figure in the fourth column (e.g. $216 \times \frac{1}{5.2}$), and adding the products.³ This entry is calculated from the first three totals in the last horizontal row, in the same way that each other entry in the last column is calculated from the first three totals in the corresponding horizontal row.

Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth, to whom these results were submitted, and who calculated the final column of the Table, has kindly appended the following remarks :—

“ These observations constitute a chain or rather coil of evidence, which at first sight and upon a general view is seen to be very strong, but of which the full strength cannot be appreciated until the concatenation of the parts is considered.

“ Viewed as a whole the Table presents the following data. There are in all 497 trials. Out of these there are 95 successes at the first guess. The number of successes most probable on the hypothesis of mere chance is 27. The problem is one of the class which I have discussed in the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., Vol. III., p. 190, &c. The approximate formula there given is not well suited to the present case,¹ in which the number of successes is very great, the probability of their being due to mere chance very small, in relation to the total number of trials. It is better to proceed directly according to the method employed in the paper referred to (p. 198) for the appreciation of M. Richet's result E P J Y E I O D [see below, p. 60]. By this method,² with the aid of appropriate tables,³ I find for the probability that the observed total of successes have resulted from some other agency than pure chance

.999, 999, 999, 999, 999, 999, 999, 999, 98

“ Stupendous as is this probability it falls short of that which the complete solution of our problem yields. For, measuring and joining all the links of evidence according to the methods described in the paper referred to, I obtain a row of *thirty-four nines* following a decimal point. *A fortiori*, if we take account of the second guesses.

“ These figures more impressively than any words proclaim the certainty that the recorded observations must have resulted either from *collusion* on the part of those concerned (the hypothesis of illusion being excluded by the simplicity of the experiments), or from *thought-transference* of the sort which the investigators vindicate.”

A large number of trials were also made in which the group of agents included one or more of the Creery family ; and as bearing on the hypothesis of an ingenious family trick, it is worth noting that—except where Mr. Creery himself was thus included—the percentage of successes was, as a rule, not appreciably higher under these conditions than when the Committee alone were in the secret. When Mr. Creery was among the agents, the average of success was far higher ; but his position in the affair was precisely the same as our own ; and the most remarkable results were obtained while he was himself still in a state of doubt as to the genuineness of the phenomena which he was investigating.

One further evidential point should be noted. Supposing such a thing as a genuine faculty of thought-transference to exist, and to be capable, for example, of evoking in one mind the idea of a card on which other minds are concentrated, we might naturally expect that the card-pictures conveyed to the percipient would present various degrees of distinctness,

¹ The formula is adequate to prove that an inferior limit of the sought probability is .9999.

² Owing to the rapid convergency of the series which we have to sum, it will be found sufficient to evaluate two or three terms.

³ Tables of Logarithms, and of the values of $\log 1' (x+1)$.

and that there would be a considerable number of *approximate* guesses, as they might be given by a person who was allowed one fleeting glimpse at a card in an imperfect light. Such a person might often fail to name the card correctly, but his failures would be apt to be far more nearly right than those of another person who was simply guessing without any sort of guidance. This expectation was abundantly confirmed in our experiments. Thus, in a series of 32 trials, where only 5 first guesses were completely right, the *suit* was 14 times running named correctly on the first trial, and reiterated on the second. *Knave* was very frequently guessed as *King*, and *vice versâ*, the suit being given correctly. The number of pips named was in many cases only one off the right number, this sort of failure being specially frequent when the number was over six. Again, the correct answer was often given, as it were, piecemeal—in two partially incorrect guesses—the pips or picture being rightly given at the first attempt, and the suit at the second ; and in the same way with numbers of two figures, one of them would appear in the first guess and the other in the second.

Before we leave these early experiments, one interesting question presents itself, which has an important bearing on the wider subject of this book. In what form was the impression flashed on the percipient's mind ? What were the respective parts in the phenomena played by the mental *eye* and the mental *ear* ? The points just noticed in connection with the partial guessing of cards seem distinctly in favour of the mental eye. A king *looks* like a knave, but the *names* have no similarity. So with numbers. 35 is guessed piecemeal, the answers being 45 and 43 ; so 57 is attempted as 47 and 45. Now the similarity in *sound* between three and thirty in 43 and 35, or between five and fifty in 45 and 57, is not extremely strong ; while the *picture* of the 3 or the 5 is identical in either pair. On the other hand, names of approximate sound were often given instead of the true ones ; as "Chester" for Leicester, "Biggis" for Billings, "Freemore" for Frogmore. Snelgrove was reproduced as "Singrore" ; the last part of the name was soon given as "Grover," and the attempt was then abandoned—the child remarking afterwards that she thought of "Snail" as the first syllable, but it had seemed to her too ridiculous. Professor Barrett, moreover, successfully obtained a German word of which the percipient could have formed no visual image.¹ The children's own account was usually to the effect that they "seemed to see" the thing ; but this, perhaps, does not come to much ; as a known object, however suggested, is likely to be instantly visualised. On the whole, then, the conclusion seems to be that, with these "subjects," both modes of transference were possible ; and that they prevailed in turn, according as this or that was better adapted to the particular case.

§ 6. I have dwelt at some length on our series of trials with the members of the Creery family, as it is to those trials that we owe our own conviction of the possibility of genuine thought-transference between persons in a normal state. I have sufficiently explained that we do not expect the

¹ In an account of some experiments with words, which we have received from a correspondent, it is stated that success was decidedly more marked in cases where there was a broad vowel sound.

results to be as crucial for persons who were not present, and to whom we are ourselves unknown, as they were for us; and that it cannot be "in the mouth of two or three witnesses" only that such a stupendous fact as the transmission of ideas otherwise than through the recognised sensory channels will be established. The testimony must be multiplied; the responsibility must be spread; and I shall immediately proceed to describe further results obtained with other agents and other percipients. But first it may perhaps be asked of us why we did not *exploiter* this remarkable family further. It was certainly our intention to do what we could in this direction, and by degrees to procure for our friends an opportunity of judging for themselves. This point, however, was one which could only be cautiously pressed. Mr. Creery was certainly justified in regarding his daughters as something more than mere subjects of experiments, and in hesitating to make a show of them to persons who might, or rather who reasonably must, begin by entertaining grave doubts as to their good faith. It must be remembered that we were dealing, not with chemical substances, but with youthful minds, liable to be reduced to confusion by anything in the demeanour of visitors which inspired distaste or alarm; and even with the best intentions, "a childly way with children" is not easy to adopt where the children concerned are objects of suspicious curiosity. More especially might these considerations have weight, when failure was anticipated for the first attempts made under new conditions. And this suggests another difficulty; which has more than once recurred in the experimental branches of our work. The would-be spectators themselves may be unable or unwilling to fulfil the necessary conditions. Before introducing them, it is indispensable to obtain some guarantee that they on their part will exercise patience, make repeated trials, and give the "subjects" a fair opportunity of getting used to their presence. Questions of mood, of goodwill, of familiarity, may hold the same place in psychical investigation as questions of temperature in a physical laboratory; and till this is fully realised, it will not be easy to multiply testimony to the extent that we should desire.

In the case of the Creery family, however, we met with a difficulty of another kind. Had the faculty of whose existence we assured ourselves continued in full force, it would doubtless have been possible in time to bring the phenomena under the notice of a sufficient number of painstaking and impartial observers. But the faculty did not continue in full force; on the contrary, the average of successes gradually declined, and the children regretfully acknowledged that their capacity and confidence were deserting them. The decline was equally observed even in the trials which they held amongst themselves; and it had nothing whatever to do with any increased stringency in the precautions adopted. No precautions, indeed, could be stricter than that confinement to our own investigating group of the knowledge of the idea to be transferred, which was, from the very first, a condition of the experiments on which we absolutely relied. The fact has just to be accepted, as an illustration of the fleeting character which seems to attach to this and other forms of abnormal sensitiveness. It seems probable that the telepathic faculty, if I may so name it, is not an inborn, or lifelong possession; or, at any rate, that very slight disturbances may suffice to paralyse it. The Creerys

had their most startling successes at first, when the affair was a surprise and an amusement, or later, at short and seemingly casual trials; the decline set in with their sense that the experiments had become matters of weighty importance to us, and of somewhat prolonged strain and tediousness to them.¹ So, on a minor scale, in trials among our own friends, we have seen a fortunate evening, when the spectators were interested and the percipient excited and confident, succeeded by a series of failures when the results were more anxiously awaited. It is almost inevitable that a percipient who has aroused interest by a marked success on several occasions, should feel in a way *responsible* for further results; and yet any real preoccupation with such an idea seems likely to be fatal. The conditions are clearly unstable. But of course the first question for science is not whether the phenomena can be produced to order, but whether in a sufficient number of series the proportion of success to failure is markedly above the result of chance.

§ 7. Before leaving this class of experiments, I may mention an interesting development which it has lately received. In the *Revue Philosophique* for December, 1884, M. Ch. Richet, the well-known *savant* and editor of the *Revue Scientifique*, published a paper, entitled "La Suggestion Mentale et le Calcul des Probabilités," in the first part of which an account is given of some experiments with cards precisely similar in plan to those above described. A card being drawn at random out of a pack, the "agent" fixed his attention on it, and the "percipient" endeavoured to name it. But M. Richet's method contained this important novelty—that though the success, as judged by the results of any particular series of trials, seemed slight (showing that he was not experimenting with what we should consider "good subjects"), he made the trials on a sufficiently extended scale to bring out the fact that the right guesses were *on the whole*, though not *strikingly*, above the number that pure accident would account for, and that their total was considerably above that number.

This observation involves a new and striking application of the calculus of probabilities. Advantage is taken of the fact that the larger the number of trials made under conditions where success is purely accidental, the more nearly will the total number of successes attained conform to the figure which the formula of probabilities gives. For instance, if some one draws a card at random out of a full pack, and before it has been looked at by anyone present I make a guess at its suit, my chance of being right is, of course, 1 in 4. Similarly, if the process is repeated 52 times, the most probable number of successes, according to the strict calculus of prob-

¹ [Subsequently to the publication of *Phantasms of the Living*, in a series of experiments with cards, two of the sisters acting as "agent" and "percipient" were detected in the use of a code of signals, and a third confessed to a certain amount of signalling in earlier series. An account of this discovery will be found in *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. v., pp. 269-270. It of course makes it impossible to rely on experiments with this family in which signalling can have been made use of, but it is difficult to see how it can have operated when, as in the cases quoted above, "agency" was confined to the investigating committee. Still, these experiments would not, I think, have been given a place in the book had the discovery been made before publication. See below p. 61.—ED.]

abilities, is 13 ; in 520 trials the most probable number of successes is $\frac{1}{2}130$. Now, if we consider only a short series of 52 guesses, I may be accidentally right many more times than 13 or many less times. But if the series be prolonged—if 520 guesses be allowed instead of 52—the actual number of successes will vary from the probable number within much smaller limits ; and if we suppose an indefinite prolongation, the proportional divergence between the actual and the probable number will become infinitely small. This being so, it is clear that if, in a very short series of trials, we find a considerable difference between the actual number of successes and the probable number, there is no reason for regarding this difference as anything but purely accidental ; but if we find a similar difference in a very long series, we are justified in surmising that some condition beyond mere accident has been at work. If cards be drawn in succession from a pack, and I guess the suit rightly in 3 out of 4 trials, I shall be foolish to be surprised ; but if I guess the suit rightly in 3,000 out of 4,000 trials, I shall be equally foolish *not* to be surprised.

Now M. Richet continued his trials until he had obtained a considerable total ; and the results were such as at any rate to suggest that accident had not ruled undisturbed—that a guiding condition had been introduced, which affected in the right direction a certain small percentage of the guesses made. That condition, if it existed, could be nothing else than the fact that, prior to the guess being made, a person in the neighbourhood of the guesser had concentrated his attention on the card drawn. Hence the results, so far as they go, make for the reality of the faculty of “ mental suggestion.” The faculty, if present, was clearly only slightly developed ; whence the necessity of experimenting on a very large scale before its genuine influence on the numbers could be even surmised.

Out of 2,927 trials at guessing the suit of a card, drawn at random, and steadily looked at by another person, the actual number of successes was 789 ; the most probable number, had pure accident ruled, was 732. The total was made up of thirty-nine series of different lengths, in which eleven persons took part, M. Richet himself being in some cases the guesser, and in others the person who looked at the card. He observed that when a large number of trials were made at one sitting, the aptitude of both persons concerned seemed to be affected ; it became harder for the “ agent ” to visualise, and the proportion of successes on the guesser's part decreased. If we agree to reject from the above total all the series in which over 100 trials were consecutively made, the numbers become more striking.¹ Out of 1,833 trials, he then got 510 successes, the most probable number being only 458 ; that is to say, the actual number exceeds the most probable number by about $\frac{1}{10}$.

Clearly no definite conclusion could be based on such figures as the above. They at most contained a hint for more extended trials, but a hint, fortunately, which can be easily followed up. We are often asked by acquaintances what they can do to aid the progress of psychical research. These experiments suggest a most convenient answer ; for they

¹ It should be remarked, however, that the introduction of any principle of selection, *after* one experiment, is always objectionable. For some more or less plausible reason could probably always be found for setting aside the less favourable results.

can be repeated, and a valuable contribution made to the great aggregate, by any two persons who have a pack of cards and a little perseverance.¹

Up to the time that I write, we have received, in all, the results of 17 batches of trials in the guessing of suits. In 11 of the batches one person acted as agent and another as percipient throughout: the other 6 batches are the collective results of trials made by as many groups of friends. The total number of trials was 17,653, and the total number of successes was 4,760; which exceeds by 347 the number which was the most probable if chance alone acted. The probability afforded by this result for the action of a cause other than chance is '999,999,999,1—or practical certainty.² I need hardly say that there has been here no selection of results; all who undertook the trials were specially requested to send in their report, whatever the degree of success or unsuccess; and we have no reason to suppose that this direction has been ignored. It is thus an additional point of interest that in *only one* of the batches did the result fall *below* the number which was the most probable one for mere chance to give. And if we take only those batches, 10 in number, in which a couple of experimenters made as many as 1,000 trials and over, the probability of a cause other than chance which the group of results yields is estimated by one method to be '999,999,999,96, and by another to be '999,999,999,999,2.

To this record must be added another, not less striking, of experiments which (though part of the same effort to obtain large collective results) differed in form from the above, and could not, therefore, figure in the aggregate. Thus, in a set of 976 trials, carried out by Miss B. Lindsay (late of Girton College), and a group of friends, where the choice was between 6 *uncoloured forms*—9 specimens of each being combined in a pack from which the agent drew at random—the total of right guesses was 198, the odds against obtaining that degree of success by chance being about 500 to 1. In another case, the choice lay between 4 things, but these were not suits, but simple *colours*—red, blue, green, and yellow. The percipient throughout was Mr. A. J. Shilton, of 40, Paradise Street, Birmingham; the agent (except in one small group, when Professor Poynting, of Mason College, acted) was Mr. G. T. Cashmore, of Albert Road, Handsworth. Out of 505 trials, 261 were successes. The probability here afforded of a cause other than chance is considerably more than a trillion trillions to 1. And still more remarkable is the result obtained by the Misses Wingfield, of The Redings, Totteridge, in some trials where the object to be guessed was a number of two digits—*i.e.*, one

¹ The rules to observe are these: (1) The number of trials contemplated (1,000, 2,000, or whatever it may be) should be specified beforehand. (2) Not more than 50 trials should be made on any one occasion. (3) The agent should draw the card at random, and cut the pack between each draw. (4) The success or failure of each guess should be silently recorded, and the percipient should be kept in ignorance of the results until the whole series is completed. [The results should be sent to the Secretary of the Society for Psychical Research, 20 Hanover Square, W.]

² For these calculations we have again to thank Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth. For an explanation of the methods employed, see his article in vol. iii. of the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., already referred to, and also his paper on "Methods of Statistics" (*sub fin.*) in the *Journal of the Statistical Society* for 1885.

of the 90 numbers included in the series from 10 to 99—chosen at random by the agent. Out of 2,624 trials, where the most probable number of successes was 29, the actual number obtained was no less than 275—to say nothing of 78 other cases in which the right digits were guessed in the reverse order. In the last 506 trials the agent (who sat some 6 feet behind the percipient) drew the numbers at random out of a bowl; the odds against the accidental occurrence of the degree of success—21 right guesses—obtained in this batch are over 2,000,000 to 1. The argument for thought-transference afforded by the total of 275 cannot be expressed here in figures, as it requires 167 nines—that is, the probability is far more than the ninth power of a trillion to 1.

Card-experiments of the above type offer special conveniences for the very extended trials which we wish to see carried out: they are easily made and rapidly recorded. At the same time it must not be assumed that the limitation of the field of choice to a very small number of known objects is a favourable condition; it is probably the reverse. For from the descriptions which intelligent percipients have given it would seem that the best condition is a sort of inward blankness, on which the image of the object, sometimes suddenly but often only gradually, takes shape. And this inward blankness is hard to ensure when the objects for choice are both few and known. For their images are then apt to importune the mind, and to lead to guessing; the little procession of them marches so readily across the mental stage that it is difficult to drive it off, and wait for a single image to present itself independently. Moreover idiosyncrasies on the guessers' part have the opportunity of obtruding themselves—as an inclination, or a disinclination, to repeat the same guess several times in succession. These objections of course reach their maximum if the field of choice be narrowed down to *two* things—as where not the suit but the *colour* of the cards is to be guessed. And in fact some French trials of this type, and an aggregate of 5,500 carried out by the American Society for Psychical Research,¹ give a result only very slightly in excess of the most probable number.

§ 8. I may now pass to another class of experiments, in which the impression transferred was almost certainly of the visual sort, inasmuch as any verbal description of the object would require a group of words too numerous to present any clear and compact auditory character. An object of this kind is supplied by any irregular figure or arrangement of lines which suggests nothing in particular. We have had two remarkably successful series of experiments, extending over many days, in which

¹ Report by Professors J. M. Peirce and E. C. Pickering, in the *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research*, vol. i., p. 19. This Society has also carried out 12,130 trials with the 10 digits—which similarly gave a result only slightly in excess of theoretic probability. But here the digits to be thought of by the agent were not taken throughout in a purely accidental order, but in regularly recurring decads, in each of which each digit occurred once; and consequently the later guesses (both within the same decad and in successive decads) might easily be biased by the earlier ones. This system may lead to interesting statistics in other ways; but to give thought-transference fair play in experiments with a limited number of objects, it seems essential that the order of selection shall be entirely haphazard, and that the guesser's mind shall be quite unembarrassed by the notion of a scheme.

the idea of such a figure has been telepathically transferred from one mind to another. A rough diagram being first drawn by one of the investigating Committee, the agent proceeded to concentrate his attention on it, or on the memory which he retained of it ; and in a period varying from a few seconds to a few minutes the percipient was able to reproduce the diagram, or a close approximation to it, on paper. No contact was permitted, except on a few occasions, which, on that very account, we should not present as crucial ; and in order to preclude the agent from giving unconscious hints—*e.g.*, by drawing with his finger on the table or making movements suggestive of the figure in the air—he was kept out of the percipient's sight.

Of the two series mentioned, the second is evidentially to be preferred. For in the first series the agent, as well as the percipient, was always the same person ; and we recognise this as *pro tanto* an objection. Not indeed that the simple hypothesis of collusion would at all meet the difficulties of the case. Faith in the power of a secret code must be carried to the verge of superstition, before it will be easy to believe that auditory signals, the material for which (as I pointed out above) is limited to the faintest variations in the signaller's method of breathing, can fully and faithfully describe a complicated diagram ; especially when the variations, imperceptible to the closest observation of the bystanders, would have to penetrate to the intelligence of a percipient whose head was enveloped in bandage, bolster-case, and blanket. But in spite of all, suspicion will, reasonably or unreasonably, attach to results which are, so to speak, a monopoly of two particular performers. In our second series of experiments this objection was obviated. There were two percipients, and a considerable group of agents, each of whom, when alone with one or other of the percipients, was successful in transferring his impression. It is this series, therefore, that I select for fuller description.

We owe these remarkable experiments to the sagacity and energy of Mr. Malcolm Guthrie, J.P., of Liverpool. At the beginning of 1883, Mr. Guthrie happened to read an article on thought-transference in a magazine, and though completely sceptical, he determined to make some trials on his own account. He was then at the head of an establishment which gives employment to many hundreds of persons ; and he was informed by a relative who occupied a position of responsibility in this establishment that she had witnessed remarkable results in some casual trials made by a group of his *employées* after business hours. He at once took the matter into his own hands, and went steadily, but cautiously, to work. He restricted the practice of the novel accomplishment to weekly meetings ; and he arranged with his friend, Mr. James Birchall, the hon. secretary of the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society, that the latter should make a full and complete record of every experiment made. Mr. Guthrie thus describes the proceedings :—

“ I have had the advantage of studying a series of experiments *ab ovo*. I have witnessed the genuine surprise which the operators and the ‘ subjects ’ have alike exhibited at their increasing successes, and at the results of our excursions into novel lines of experiment. The affair has not been the discovery of the possession of special powers, first made and

then worked up by the parties themselves for gain or glory. The experimenters in this case were disposed to pass the matter over altogether as one of no moment, and only put themselves at my disposal in regard to experiments in order to oblige me. The experiments have all been devised and conducted by myself and Mr. Birchall, without any previous intimation of their nature, and could not possibly have been foreseen. In fact they have been to the young ladies a succession of surprises. No set of experiments of a similar nature has ever been more completely known from its origin, or more completely under the control of the scientific observer."

I must pass over the record of the earlier experiments, where the ideas transferred were of colours, geometrical figures, cards, and visible objects of all sorts, which the percipient was to name—these being similar in kind, though on the whole superior in the proportion of successes, to those already described.¹ The reproduction of diagrams was introduced in October, 1883, and in that and the following month about 150 trials were made. The whole series has been carefully mounted and preserved by Mr. Guthrie. No one could look through them without perceiving that the hypothesis of chance or guess-work is out of the question; that in most instances some idea, and in many a complete idea, of the original must, by whatever means, have been present in the mind of the person who made the reproduction. In Mr. Guthrie's words:—

"It is difficult to classify them. A great number of them are decided successes; another large number give part of the drawing; others exhibit the general idea, and others again manifest a kind of composition of form. Others, such as the drawings of flowers, have been described and named, but have been too difficult to draw. A good many are perfect failures. The drawings generally run in lots. A number of successful copies will be produced very quickly, and again a number of failures—indicating, I think, faultiness on the part of the agent, or growing fatigue on the part of the 'subject.' Every experiment, whether successful or a failure, is given in the order of trial, with the conditions, name of 'subject' and agent, and any remarks made by the 'subject' specified at the bottom. Some of the reproductions exhibit the curious phenomenon of inversion. These drawings must speak for themselves. The principal facts to be borne in mind regarding them are that they have been executed through the instrumentality, as agents, of persons of unquestioned probity, and that the responsibility for them is spread over a considerable group of such persons; while the conditions to be observed were so simple—for they amounted really to nothing more than taking


¹ The full record of the experiments will be found in the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vol. i., p. 264, &c., and vol. ii., p. 24, &c. There is one point of novelty which is thus described by Mr. Guthrie: "We tried also the perception of *motion*, and found that the movements of objects exhibited could be discerned. The idea was suggested by an experiment tried with a card, which in order that all present should see, I moved about, and was informed by the percipient that it was a card, but she could not tell which one because it seemed to be moving about. On a subsequent occasion, in order to test this perception of motion, I bought a toy monkey, which worked up and down on a stick by means of a string drawing the arms and legs together. The answer was: 'I see red and yellow, and it is darker at one end than the other. It is like a flag moving about—it is moving. . . . Now it is opening and shutting like a pair of scissors.'"

care that the original should not be seen by the 'subject'—that it is extremely difficult to suppose them to have been eluded."

I give a few specimens—not unduly favourable ones, but illustrating the "spreading of responsibility" to which Mr. Guthrie refers. The agents concerned were Mr. Guthrie; Mr. Steel, the President of the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society; Mr. Birchall, mentioned above; Mr. Hughes, B.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge; and myself. The names of the percipients were Miss Relph and Miss Edwards. The conditions which I shall describe were those of the experiments in which I myself took part; and I have Mr. Guthrie's authority for stating that they were uniformly observed in the other cases. The originals were for the most part drawn in another room from that in which the percipient was placed. The few executed in the same room were drawn while the percipient was blindfolded, at a distance from her, and in such a way that the process would have been wholly invisible to her or anyone else, even had an attempt been made to observe it. During the process of transference, the agent looked steadily and in perfect silence at the original drawing, which was placed upon an intervening wooden stand; the percipient sitting opposite to him, and behind the stand, blindfolded and quite still. The agent ceased looking at the drawing, and the blindfolding was removed, only when the percipient professed herself ready to make the reproduction, which happened usually in times varying from half-a-minute to two or three minutes. Her position rendered it absolutely impossible that she should obtain a glimpse of the original. Apart from the blindfolding, she could not have done so without rising from her seat and advancing her head several feet; and as she was very nearly in the same line of sight as the drawing, and so very nearly in the centre of the agent's field of vision, the slightest approach to such a movement must have been instantly detected. The reproductions were made in perfect silence, the agent forbearing to follow the actual process of the drawing with his eyes, though he was, of course, able to keep the percipient under the closest observation.

In the case of all the diagrams, except those numbered 7 and 8, the agent and the percipient were the only two persons in the room during the experiment. In the case of numbers 7 and 8, the agent and Miss Relph were sitting quite apart in a corner of the room, while Mr. Guthrie and Miss Edwards were talking in another part of it. Numbers 1-6 are specially interesting as being the complete and consecutive series of a single sitting.

No. 1. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




No. 1. REPRODUCTION.




Mr. Guthrie and Miss Edwards No contact.

No. 2. ORIGINAL DRAWING.



No. 2. REPRODUCTION.




Mr, Guthrie and Miss Edwards. No contact


No. 3. ORIGINAL DRAWING.

Mr. Guthrie and Miss Edwards
No contact.


No. 3. REPRODUCTION.



No. 4. ORIGINAL DRAWING.

Mr. Guthrie and Miss Edwards.
No contact.

No. 4. REPRODUCTION.



No. 5. ORIGINAL DRAWING.

Mr. Guthrie and Miss Edwards.
No contact.

No 5 REPRODUCTION.



No. 6. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




Mr Guthrie and Miss Edwards. No contact

No. 6. REPRODUCTION




Miss Edwards almost directly said, "Are you thinking of the bottom of the sea, with shells and fishes?" and then, "Is it a snail or a fish?"—then drew as above.

No. 7 ORIGINAL DRAWING.



Mr. Gurney and Miss Relph. Contact for half-a-minute before the reproduction was drawn.

No. 7. REPRODUCTION.



No. 8. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




No. 8. REPRODUCTION.



Mr Gurney and Miss Relph. No contact.

No. 9. ORIGINAL DRAWING.



Mr. Birchall and Miss Relph. No contact.

No. 9. REPRODUCTION.



Miss Relph said she seemed to see a lot of rings, as if they were moving, and she could not get them steadily before her eyes.

No. 10. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




No. 10. REPRODUCTION.




Mr. Birchall and Miss Relph. No contact.

No. 11. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




No. 11. REPRODUCTION.



Mr. Birchall and Miss Edwards. No contact.

NO. 12. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




Mr Steel and Miss Relph. No contact.

NO. 12. REPRODUCTION.




No. 13. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




Mr. Steel and Miss Edwards. Contact before the reproduction was made

No. 13. REPRODUCTION.




No. 14 ORIGINAL DRAWING.



Mr. Hughes and Miss Edwards. Contact before the reproduction was made.

No. 14 REPRODUCTION.




Miss Edwards said, "A box or chair badly shaped"—then drew as above.

No. 13. ORIGINAL DRAWING.




Mr. Hughes and Miss Edwards. No contact

No. 15. REPRODUCTION.




Miss Edwards said, "It is like a mask at a pantomime," and immediately drew as above

No. 16. ORIGINAL DRAWING.



Mr. Hughes and Miss Edwards No contact.

No. 16. REPRODUCTION.



§ 9. Soon after the publication of these results, Mr. Guthrie was fortunate enough to obtain the active co-operation of Dr. Oliver J. Lodge [now Sir Oliver Lodge], Professor of Physics in University College, Liverpool, who carried out a long and independent series of experiments with the same two percipients, and completely convinced himself of the genuineness of the phenomena. In his report (*Proc. S.P.R.*, vol. ii. p. 189) he says:—

“As regards collusion and trickery, no one who has witnessed the absolutely genuine and artless manner in which the impressions are described, but has been perfectly convinced of the transparent honesty of purpose of all concerned. This, however, is not evidence to persons who have not been present, and to them I can only say that to the best of my scientific belief no collusion or trickery was possible under the varied circumstances of the experiments. . . . When one has the control of the circumstances, can change them at will and arrange one's own experiments, one gradually acquires a belief in the phenomena observed quite comparable to that induced by the repetition of ordinary physical experiments. . . . We have many times succeeded with agents quite disconnected from the percipient in ordinary life, and sometimes complete strangers to them. Mr. Birchall, the headmaster of the Birkdale Industrial School, frequently acted; and the house physician at the Eye and Ear Hospital, Dr. Shears, had a successful experiment, acting alone, on his first and only visit. All suspicion of a prearranged code is thus rendered impossible even to outsiders who are unable to witness the obvious fairness of all the experiments.”

The objects of which the idea was transferred were sometimes things with names (cards, key, teapot, flag, locket, picture of donkey, and so on), sometimes irregular drawings with no name. Professor Lodge satisfied himself that auditory as well as visual impressions played a part—that in some cases the idea transferred was that of the object itself, and in others, that of its name; thus confirming the conclusion which we had come to in the experiments with the Creery family. Of the two percipients one seemed more susceptible to the visual, and the other to the auditory impressions. A case where the auditory element seems clearly to have come in is the following. The object was a tetrahedron rudely drawn in projection, thus—



The percipient said: “Is it another triangle?” No answer was given, but Professor Lodge silently passed round to the agents a scribbled message, “Think of a pyramid.” The percipient then said, “I only see a triangle”—then hastily, “Pyramids of Egypt. No, I shan't do this.” Asked to draw, she only drew a triangle.

I will only give one other case from this series, which is important as showing that the percipient may be simultaneously influenced by two minds, which are concentrated on two different things. The two agents being seated opposite to one another, Professor Lodge placed between them a piece of paper, on one side of which was drawn a square, and on the other a cross. They thus had different objects to contemplate,

ORIGINALS.



REPRODUCTION.



and neither knew what the other was looking at ; nor did the percipient know that anything unusual was being tried. There was no contact. Very soon the percipient said, " I see things moving about . . . I seem to see two things . . . I see first one up there and then one down there . . . I don't know which to draw . . . I can't see either distinctly." Professor Lodge said : " Well, anyhow, draw what you have seen." She took off the bandage and drew first a square, and then said, " Then there was the other thing as well . . . afterwards they seemed to go into one,"—and she drew a cross inside the square from corner to corner, adding afterwards, " I don't know what made me put it inside." The significance of this experimental proof of *joint agency* will be more fully realised in connection with some of the spontaneous cases.

The following passage from the close of Professor Lodge's report has a special interest for us, confirming, as it does, the accounts which we had received from our own former " subjects," and the views above expressed as to the conditions of success and failure :—

" With regard to the feelings of the percipients when receiving an impression, they seem to have some sort of consciousness of the action of other minds on them ; and once or twice, when not so conscious, have complained that there seemed to be ' no power ' or anything acting, and that they not only received no impression, but did not feel as if they were going to.

" I asked one of them what she felt when impressions were coming freely, and she said she felt a sort of influence or thrill. They both say that several objects appear to them sometimes, but that one among them persistently recurs and they have a feeling when they fix upon one that it is the right one.

" One serious failure rather depresses them, and after a success others often follow. It is because of these rather delicate psychological conditions that one cannot press the variations of an experiment as far as one would do if dealing with inert and more dependable matter. Usually the presence of a stranger spoils the phenomena, though in some cases a stranger has proved a good agent straight off.

" The percipients complain of no fatigue as induced by the experiments, and I have no reason to suppose that any harm is done them."

It is the " delicate psychological conditions " of which Professor Lodge here speaks that are in danger of being ignored, just because they cannot be measured and handled. The man who first hears of thought-transference very naturally imagines that, if it is a reality, it ought to be demonstrated to him at a moment's notice. He forgets that the experiment being essentially a mental one, his own presence—so far as he has a mind—may be a factor in it ; that he is demanding that a delicate weighing operation shall be carried out, while he himself, a person of unknown weight, sits judicially in one of the scales. After a time he will learn to allow for the conditions of his instruments, and will not expect in the operations of an obscure vital influence the rigorous certainty of a chemical reaction.

I cannot conclude this division of the subject without a reference to a remarkable set of diagrams which appeared in *Science* for July, 1885—

the first-fruits of the investigation of thought-transference set on foot by the American Society for Psychical Research. Most of the trials were carried out by Mr. W. H. Pickering (brother of the eminent astronomer at Harvard) and his sister-in-law. Though the success is far less striking to the eye than in the several English series, the evidence for some agency beyond chance seems on examination irresistible.

§ 10. So far the present sketch has included transference of impressions of the visual and auditory sorts only—impressions, moreover, which for the most part represented formed objects or definite *groups* of sensations, not sensations pure and simple. These are not only by far the most important forms of the phenomenon, in relation to the wider spontaneous operations of telepathy which we shall consider in the sequel ; but are also the most convenient forms for experiment. Moreover, I have been tracing the development of the subject historically ; and it was in connection with ideas belonging to the higher forms of sense that the transferences to percipients who were in a normal state were first obtained. But the existence of such cases would prepare us for transferences of a more elementary type—transferences of a simple formless sensation and nothing more, which should impress the percipient not as an idea, but in its direct sensational character ; and if the phenomena be arranged in a logical scale from the less to the more complex, such cases would have the priority. For their exhibition, it is naturally to the lower senses that we should look—taste, smell, and touch—which last (since a certain *intensity* of experience seems necessary) we should hardly expect to prove effective till it reached the degree of pain. These lower forms are, in fact, those which preponderate in the earlier observations of mesmeric *rapport* in this country ; and our own experiments in mesmerism have included several instances of this sort.¹ Thus the discovery that a similar “community of sensation” might exist between persons in a normal state, and without any resort to mesmeric or hypnotic processes, not only filled up an obvious *lacuna*, but gave a fresh proof of the fundamental unity of our many-sided subject.

In the case of *taste*, we owe the discovery to Mr. Guthrie—the phenomenon having been, we believe, first observed by him on August 30th, 1883, and first fully examined in the course of a visit which Mr. Myers and the present writer paid to him in the following week. Failing to obtain very marked success in other lines of experiment, it occurred to us to introduce this novel form ; but the superiority of the results was probably due simply to the fact that they were obtained on the later days of our visit, when the “subjects” had become accustomed to our presence.

I will quote the report made at the time :—

“The taste to be discerned was known only to one or more of the three actual experimenters ; and the sensations experienced were verbally described by the ‘subjects’ (not written down), so that all danger of involuntary muscular guidance was eliminated.

“A selection of about twenty strongly-tasting substances was made.

¹ It is impossible here to give more than a selection of cases. I must refer the reader to chap. i. of the Supplement [original edition], and to the *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychical Research, vol. i., p. 225, etc., vol. ii., p. 17, etc., and p. 205, etc. ; and Mr. Guthrie’s “Further Report” in vol. iii.

These substances were enclosed in small bottles and small parcels, precisely similar to one another, and kept carefully out of the range of vision of the 'subjects,' who were, moreover, blindfolded, so that no grimaces made by the tasters could be seen. The 'subjects,' in fact, had no means whatever of knowing, through the sense of sight, what was the substance tasted.

"*Smell* had to be guarded against with still greater care. When the substance was odoriferous the packet or bottle was opened outside the room, or at such a distance, and so cautiously as to prevent any sensible smell from escaping. The experiments, moreover, were conducted in the close vicinity of a very large kitchen, from whence a strong odour of beefsteak and onions proceeded during almost all the time occupied. The tasters took pains to keep their heads high above the 'subjects,' and to avoid breathing with open mouth. One substance (coffee) tried was found to give off a slight smell, in spite of all precautions, and an experiment made with this has been omitted.

"The tasters were Mr. Guthrie (M. G.), Mr. Gurney (E. G.), and Mr. Myers (M.). The percipients may be called R. and E. The tasters lightly placed a hand on one of the shoulders or hands of the percipients—there not being the same objection to contact in trials of this type as where lines and figures are concerned, and the 'subjects' themselves seeming to have some faith in it. During the first experiments (September 3rd and 4th) there were one or two other persons in the room, who, however, were kept entirely ignorant of the substance tasted. During the experiments silence was preserved. The last fifteen of them (September 5th) were made when only M. G., E. G., and M., with the two percipients, were present. On this evening E. was, unfortunately, suffering from sore throat, which seemed to blunt her susceptibility. On this occasion none of the substances were allowed even to enter the room where the percipients were. They were kept in a dark lobby outside, and taken by the investigators at random, so that often one investigator did not even know what the other took. Still less could any spy have discerned what was chosen, had such spy been there, which he certainly was *not*.

"A very small portion of each substance used was found to be enough. The difficulty lies in keeping the mean between the *massive* impression of a large quantity of a salt, spice, bitter, or acid, which confounds the specific differences under each general head, and the *fading* impression which is apt to give merely a residual pungency, from which the characteristic flavour has escaped. It is necessary to allow some minutes to elapse between each experiment, as the imaginary taste seems to be fully as persistent as the real one.

September 3rd, 1883.

TASTER.	PERCIPIENT.	SUBSTANCE.	ANSWERS GIVEN.
1.—M.	E.	Vinegar	"A sharp and nasty taste."
2.—M.	E.	Mustard	"Mustard."
3.—M.	R.	Do.	"Ammonia."
4.—M.	E.	Sugar	"I still taste the hot taste of the mustard."

September 4th.

5.—E. G. & M. .	E.	Worcestershire sauce	"Worcestershire sauce."
6.—M. G.	E.	Do.	"Vinegar."
7.—E. G. & M. .	E.	Port wine	"Between eau de Cologne and beer."
8.—M. G.	R.	Do.	"Raspberry vinegar."
9.—E. G. & M. .	E.	Bitter aloes	"Horrible and bitter."
10.—M. G.	R. ...	Alum	"A taste of ink—of iron—of vinegar. I feel it on my lips—it is as if I had been eating alum."

TASTER.	PERCIPIENT.	SUBSTANCE.	ANSWERS GIVEN.
11.—M. G.	E....	Alum	(E. perceived that M. G. was <i>not</i> tasting bitter aloes, as E. G. and M. supposed, but something different. No distinct perception on account of the persistence of the bitter taste.)
12.—E. G. & M.	E....	Nutmeg.....	"Peppermint—no—what you put in puddings—nutmeg."
13.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Nutmeg." ¹
14.—E. G. & M.	E....	Sugar.....	Nothing perceived.
15.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	Nothing perceived. (Sugar should be tried at an earlier stage in the series, as after the aloes, we could scarcely taste it ourselves.)
16.—E. G. & M.	E....	Cayenne pepper ...	"Mustard."
17.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Cayenne pepper." (After the cayenne we were unable to taste anything further that evening.)
<i>September 5th.</i>			
18.—E. G. & M.	E....	Carbonate of soda .	Nothing perceived.
19.—M. G.	R. ...	Caraway seeds	"It feels like meal—like a seed loaf—caraway seeds." (The <i>substance</i> of the seeds seemed to be perceived before their <i>taste</i> .)
20.—E. G. & M.	E....	Cloves	"Cloves."
21.—E. G. & M.	E....	Citric acid.....	Nothing perceived.
22.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Salt."
23.—E. G. & M.	E....	Liquorice	"Cloves."
24.—M. G.	R. ...	Cloves	"Cinnamon."
25.—E. G. & M.	E....	Acid jujube	"Pear drop."
26.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Something hard, which is giving way—acid jujube."
27.—E. G. & M.	E....	Candied ginger....	"Something sweet and hot."
28.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Almond toffy." (M. G. took his ginger in the dark, and was some time before he realised that it was ginger.)
29.—E. G. & M.	E....	Home-made Noyau .	"Salt."
30.—M. G.	R. ...	Do.	"Port wine." (This was by far the most strongly smelling of the substances tried, the scent of kernels being hard to conceal. Yet it was named by E. assalt.)
31.—E. G. & M.	E....	Bitter aloes	"Bitter."
32.—M. G.	R....	Do.	Nothing perceived.

¹ In some cases *two* experiments were carried on simultaneously with the same substance; and when this was done, the first percipient was of course not told whether her answer was right or wrong. But it will perhaps be suggested that, when her answer was right, the agent who was touching her unconsciously gave her an intimation of the fact by the pressure of his hand; and that she then coughed or made some audible signal to her companion, who followed suit. Whatever the theory may be worth, it will, we think, be seen that the success of the second percipient with the nutmeg was the only occasion, throughout the series, to which it can be applied.

"We should have preferred in these experiments to use only substances which were wholly inodorous. But in order to get any description of tastes from the percipients, it was necessary that the tastes should be either very decided or very familiar. It would be desirable, before entering on a series of experiments of this kind, to educate the palates of the percipients by accustoming them to a variety of chemical substances, and also by training them to distinguish, with shut eyes, between the more ordinary flavours. It is well known how much taste is helped by sight and determined by expectation ; and when it is considered that the percipients in these cases were judging blindfold of the mere shadow of a savour, it will perhaps be thought that even some of their mistakes are not much wider of the mark than they might have been had a trace of the substance been actually placed upon their tongues."

In later experiments, Mr. Guthrie endeavoured to meet the difficulty caused by odorous substances, and even succeeded in obtaining what appeared to be transferences of smell-impressions. The "subjects" and the agents were placed in different rooms. An opening, $10\frac{1}{2}$ inches square, had been made in the wooden partition between the two rooms ; and this had been filled in with a frame, covered with india-rubber and fitting tightly. Through a slit in this frame the agent (Mr. Guthrie or his relative, Miss Redmond) passed a hand, which both the "subjects" could then touch. Under these conditions, as far as could be judged, it was impossible for any scent to pass ; and, certainly, if any did pass, it would have needed extreme hyperæsthesia to detect it. The following results were obtained on December 5th, 1883 :—

- 1.—Miss Redmond tasted powdered nutmeg.
E. said "Ginger."
R. said "Nutmeg."
- 2.—Mr. G. tasted powder of dry celery.
E. : "A bitter herb."
R. : "Something like camomile."
- 3.—Miss Redmond tasted coffee.
At the same time, without any previous intimation, Mr. G., with two pins, pricked the front of the right wrist of Miss Redmond.
E. said : "Is it a taste at all?" Mr. G. : "Why do you ask?"
"Because I feel a sort of pricking in the left wrist." She was told it was the right wrist, but said she felt it in the left.
R. : "Is it cocoa or chocolate?" Answer given in the negative.
E. : "Is it coffee?"
- 4.—Mr. G. tasted Worcestershire sauce.
R. : "Something sweet . . . also acid . . . a curious taste."
E. : "Is it vinegar?"
- 5.—Miss Redmond smelt eau de Cologne.
R. : "Is it eau de Cologne?"
- 6.—Miss Redmond smelt camphor.
E. : "Don't taste anything."
R. : Nothing perceived.
- 7.—Mr. G. smelt carbolic acid.
R. : "What you use for toothache . . . creosote."
E. afterwards said she thought of pitch.

8.—Mr. G. Right instep pricked with pins.

E. guessed first the face, then the left shoulder ; then R. localised the pain on the right foot.

The pain was then silently transferred to the left foot. E. localised it on the left foot. Both maintained their opinions.

I will quote one more taste-series, for the sake of illustrating a special point—namely, the *deferment* of the percipient's consciousness of the sensation until a time when the agent had himself ceased to feel it. This fact is of great interest, on account of the marked analogy to it which we shall encounter in many of the *spontaneous* telepathic cases. The instances below are too few to be conclusive ; but we used to notice the same thing in our experiments with the Creery family—the object on which the attention of the agents had been concentrated being sometimes correctly named after the experiment had been completely abandoned as a failure.

June 11th, 1885.

Dr. Hyla Greves was in contact with Miss Relph, having tasted salad oil.

Miss Relph said : " I feel a cool sensation in my mouth, something like that produced by sal prunelle."

Mr. R. C. Johnson in contact, having tasted Worcestershire sauce in another room.

" I taste something oily ; it is very like salad oil." Then, a few minutes after contact with Mr. Johnson had ceased, " My mouth seems getting hot after the oil." (N.B.—Nothing at all had been said about the substances tasted either by Dr. Greves or Mr. Johnson.)

Dr. Greves in contact, having tasted bitter aloes.

" I taste something frightfully hot . . . something like vinegar and pepper. . . . Is it Worcestershire sauce ? "

Mr. Guthrie in contact, also having tasted bitter aloes.

" I taste something extremely bitter, but don't know what it is, and do not remember tasting it before. . . . It is a very horrid taste."

The possibility of the transference of *pain*, to a percipient in the normal state, is also a recent discovery. In December, 1882, we obtained some results which—with our well-tried knowledge of the percipient's character—we regard as completely satisfactory ; but our more striking successes in this line happen to have been with hypnotic subjects.¹ The form of experiment has difficulties of its own. For, in mercy to the agent, the pain which it is hoped to transfer cannot be very severely inflicted ; and, moreover, in such circumstances of investigation as Mr. Guthrie's, it is only a very limited amount of the area of the body that can practically be used—a fact which of course increases the percipient's chances of accidental success. Still, the amount of success obtained with Mr. Guthrie's " subjects," in a normal state, is such as certainly excludes the hypothesis of accident. In some of the most remarkable series, contact has been permitted, it being difficult to suppose that unconscious pressure of the hand could convey information as to the exact

¹ See *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vol. i., pp. 225–6 ; vol. ii., p. 250.

locality of a pain.¹ But complete isolation of the percipient is, no doubt, a more satisfactory condition ; and at seven of the Liverpool meetings, which took place at intervals from November, 1884, to July, 1885, the experiment was arranged in the following way. The percipient being seated blindfolded, and with her back to the rest of the party, all the other persons present inflicted on themselves the same pain on the same part of the body. Those who took part in this collective agency were three or more of the following : Mr. Guthrie, Professor Herdman, Dr. Hicks, Dr. Hyla Greves, Mr. R. C. Johnson, F.R.A.S., Mr. Birchall, Miss Redmond, and on one occasion another lady. The percipient throughout was Miss Relph.

In all, 20 trials were made. The parts pained were :—

- 1.—Back of left hand pricked. Rightly localised.
- 2.—Lobe of left ear pricked. Rightly localised.
- 3.—Left wrist pricked. "Is it in the left hand?"—pointing to the back near the little finger.
- 4.—Third finger of left hand tightly bound round with wire. A lower joint of that finger was guessed.
- 5.—Left wrist scratched with pins. "It is in the left wrist, like being scratched."
- 6.—Left ankle pricked. Rightly localised.
- 7.—Spot behind left ear pricked. No result.
- 8.—Right knee pricked. Rightly localised.
- 9.—Right shoulder pricked. Rightly localised.
- 10.—Hands burned over gas. "Like a pulling pain . . . then tingling, like cold and hot alternately"—localised by gesture only.
- 11.—End of tongue bitten. "It is in the lip or the tongue."
- 12.—Palm of left hand pricked. "Is it a tingling pain in the hand, here?"—placing her finger on the palm of the left hand.
- 13.—Back of neck pricked. "Is it a pricking of the neck?"
- 14.—Front of left arm above elbow pricked. Rightly localised.
- 15.—Spot just above left ankle pricked. Rightly localised.
- 16.—Spot just above right wrist pricked. "I am not quite sure, but I feel a pain in the right arm, from the thumb upwards, to above the wrist."
- 17.—Inside of left ankle pricked. Outside of left ankle guessed.
- 18.—Spot beneath right collarbone pricked. The exactly corresponding spot on the left side was guessed.
- 19.—Back hair pulled. No result.
- 20.—Inside of right wrist pricked. Right foot guessed.

Thus in 10 out of the 20 cases, the percipient localised the pain with great precision ; in 6 the localisation was nearly exact, and with these we may include No. 10, where the pain was probably not confined to a single well-defined area in the hands of all the agents ; in 2 no local impression was produced ; and in 1, the last, the answer was wholly wrong.

§ 11. We may pass now to a totally new division of experimental cases. So far the effect of thought-transference on the receiving mind has been an effect *in consciousness*—the actual emergence of an image

¹ See, for instance, the record of Mr. Hughes's series in Mr. Guthrie's "Further Report," above referred to.

or sensation which the percipient has recognised and described. But it is not necessary that the effect should be thus recognised by the percipient; his witness to it may be unconscious, instead of conscious, and yet may be quite unmistakable. The simplest example of this is when some effect is produced on his *motor* system—when the impression received causes him to perform some action which proves to have distinct reference to the thought in the agent's mind.

The cases fall into two classes. In one class the actions are purely automatic: in the other some conscious idea of what was to be done has preceded and accompanied the muscular effect; so that that effect would be at most semi-automatic. To begin with this semi-automatic class; it might be thought that examples would be found in those rarer cases of the "willing-game" where contact, and movement on the agent's part, are avoided. But we have received no records of such cases where it is certain that the precautions necessary to exclude the barest possibility of slight unconscious physical signs were rigidly enforced; and it will be preferable to describe some experiments made by members of our own group, where this point was kept steadily in view. We have had several interesting series in which the "subject's" power of utterance has been *inhibited* by the silent determination of the operator. Our first experiments of this sort were made in January, 1883. The "subject" was our friend, Mr. Sidney Beard, who had been thrown into a light hypnotic trance by Mr. G. A. Smith. A list of twelve *Yeses* and *Noes* in arbitrary order was written by one of ourselves and put into Mr. Smith's hand, with directions that he should successively "will" the "subject" to respond or not to respond, in accordance with the order of the list. Mr. Beard was lying back with closed eyes; and a tuning-fork was struck and held at his ear, with the question, "Do you hear?" asked by one of ourselves. This was done twelve times with a completely successful result, the answer or the failure to answer corresponding in each case with the "yes" or "no" of the written list—that is to say, with the silently concentrated will of the agent.¹

A much more prolonged series of trials was made in November, 1883, by Professor Barrett, at his house in Dublin. The hypnotist was again Mr. G. A. Smith. The "subject" was an entire stranger to Mr. Smith, a youth named Fearnley, to whom nothing whatever was said as to the nature of the experiment about to be tried, until he was thrown into the hypnotic state. [The results, obtained at different distances, were

¹ Similar trials on other occasions were equally successful; as also were trials where the tuning-fork was dispensed with, and the only sound was the question, "Do you hear?" asked by one of the observers. On these latter occasions, however, Mr. Smith was holding Mr. Beard's hand; and it might be maintained that "yes" and "no" indications were given by unconscious variations of pressure. How completely unconscious the supposed "reader" was of any sensible guidance will be evident from Mr. Beard's own account. "During the experiments of January 1st, when Mr. Smith mesmerised me, I did not entirely lose consciousness at any time, but only experienced a sensation of total numbness in my limbs. When the trial as to whether I could hear sounds was made, I heard the sounds distinctly each time, but in a large number of instances I felt totally unable to acknowledge that I heard them. I seemed to know each time whether Mr. Smith wished me to say that I heard them; and as I had surrendered my will to his at the commencement of the experiment, I was unable to reassert my power of volition whilst under his influence."

almost completely successful. For the sake of brevity they are omitted here ; as are also two other short but successful series with different " subjects," and in one a different hypnotist, in which Mr. Gurney was the experimenter.—Ed.]

§ 12. But in experiments of this class it is clearly difficult to be sure that the *conscious idea* of the evoked or the inhibited action does not precede or accompany the muscular effects. Indeed, as we have seen, the percipient's own account has sometimes shown that it did so. I proceed, then, to our second class of cases. There is, fortunately, one sort of act where the verdict of the performer that it was automatically performed may be taken as conclusive ; the act of *writing*. If words are written down which the writer is obliged to read over, and even to puzzle over, just as anyone else might do, in order to learn what they are, his unconsciousness of them in the act of writing may be taken as established. Now written words are of course as good as spoken ones, as evidence that a particular idea has been in some way communicated. If, then, one person's automatic writing corresponds unmistakably to the idea on which another person's mind was concentrated at the time, and if the possibility of sensory indications has been excluded, we have a clear example of some novel influence acting, not only without the participation of the recognised organs of sense, but without the participation of the percipient's conscious intelligence. Here again we find the advantage of the generic word "telepathy"—for it would clearly be inaccurate to call a phenomenon "thought-transference" where what is transferred does not make its appearance, on the percipient's side, as thought or any other form of conscious perception.

We have in our collection several examples of this *motor* form of experimental telepathy ; where a mental question on the part of some one present has been answered in writing, with a planchette¹ or a simple pencil, without any consciousness of either the question or the answer on the part of the person whose hand was automatically acting. But the following group of cases is decidedly the most remarkable that has come under our notice.

The Rev. P. H. Newnham, Vicar of Maker, Devonport, has had many indications of spontaneous transference of thought from himself to his wife ;² and at one period of his life, in 1871, he carried out a long and systematic series of experiments, which were of the motor type that we are now considering—he writing down a question, and the planchette under his wife's hands replying to it. He recorded the results, day by day, in a private diary, which he has kindly placed at our disposal. From this diary I quote the following extracts :—

My wife always sat at a small low table, in a low chair, leaning backwards. I sat about eight feet distant, at a rather high table, and with my back towards her while writing down the questions. It was absolutely

¹ A planchette has two advantages over a simple pencil. It is very much more easily moved to write ; and it is very much easier to make with it the movements necessary for the formation of letters without realising what the letters are.

² See e.g., the cases quoted in chap. v., §§ 2 and 8.

impossible that any gesture or play of features, on my part, could have been visible or intelligible to her. As a rule she kept her eyes shut ; but never became in the slightest degree hypnotic, or even naturally drowsy.

Under these conditions we carried on experiments for about eight months, and I have 309 questions and answers recorded in my note-book, spread over this time. But the experiments were found very exhaustive of nerve power, and as my wife's health was delicate, and the fact of thought-transmission had been abundantly proved, we thought it best to abandon the pursuit.

I may mention that the planchette began to move instantly, with my wife. The answer was often half written before I had completed the question.

On first finding that it would write easily, I asked three simple questions which were known to the operator ;¹ then three others, unknown to her, relating to my own private concerns. All six having been instantly answered in a manner to show complete intelligence, I proceeded to ask :—

- 7.² Write down the lowest temperature here this winter.
A. 8.

Now, this reply at once arrested my interest. The actual lowest temperature had been $7^{\circ}6'$, so that 8 was the nearest whole degree ; but my wife said at once that, if she had been asked the question, she would have written 7 and not 8 ; as she had forgotten the decimal, but remembered my having said that the temperature had been down to 7 *something*.

I simply quote this, as a good instance, at the very outset, of perfect transmission of thought, coupled with a perfectly independent reply ; the answer being correct in itself, but different from the impression on the *conscious intelligence* of both parties.³

Naturally our first desire was to see if we could obtain any information concerning the nature of the intelligence which was operating through the planchette, and of the method by which it produced the written results. We repeated questions on this subject again and again, and I will copy down the principal questions and answers in the connection.

January 29th.

13. Is it the operator's brain, or some external force, that moves the planchette ? Answer " brain " or " force."
A. Will.
14. Is it the will of a living person, or of an immaterial spirit, distinct from that person ? Answer " person " or " spirit."
A. Wife.
15. Give first the wife's Christian name ; then, my favourite name for her. (This was accurately done.)
27. What is your own name ?
A. Only you.
28. We are not quite sure of the meaning of the answer. Explain.
A. Wife.

¹ Mr. Newnham uses this word where we should use " subject " or " percipient."

² The numbers prefixed to the questions are those in the note-book.

³ It will be borne in mind throughout that Mrs. Newnham had, at the time when the answer was produced, no conscious knowledge of the question which her husband had written down.

Failing to get more than this, at the outset, we turned to the same thought after question 114 ; when, having been closely pressed on another subject, we received the curt reply—"Told all I know."

February 18th.

- 117. Who are you that writes, and has told all you know ?
A. Wife.
- 118. But does no one tell wife what to write ? If so, who ?
A. Spirit.
- 119. Whose spirit ?
A. Wife's brain.
- 120. But how does wife's brain know (certain) secrets ?
A. Wife's spirit unconsciously guides.
- 121. But how does wife's spirit know things it has never been told ?
A. No external influence.
- 122. But by what *internal* influence does it know (these) secrets ?
A. You cannot know.

March 15th.

- 132. Who, then, makes the impressions upon her ?
A. Many strange things.
- 133. What sort of strange things ?
A. Things beyond your knowledge.
- 134. Do, then, things beyond our knowledge make impressions upon wife ?
A. Influences which no man understands or knows.
- 136. Are these influences which we cannot understand external to wife ?
A. External—invisible.
- 137. Does a spirit, or do spirits, exercise those influences ?
A. No, never (written very large and emphatically).
- 138. Then from whom, or from whence, do the external influences come ?
A. Yes ; you will never know.
- 139. What do you mean by writing "yes" in the last answer ?
A. That I really meant never.

April 10th.

- 192. But by what means are my thoughts conveyed to her brain ?
A. Electro-biology.
- 193. What is electro-biology ?
A. No one knows.
- 194. But do not you know ?
A. No. Wife does not know.

My object in quoting this large number of questions and replies [N.B. those here given are mere samples] has not been merely to show the instantaneous and unfailing transmission of thought from questioner to operator ; but, more especially, to call attention to a remarkable characteristic of the answers given. These answers, consistent and invariable in their tenor from first to last, *did not correspond with the opinions or expectations of either myself or my wife*. Neither myself nor my wife had ever taken part in any form of (so-called) "spiritual" manifestations before this time ; nor had we any decided opinion as to the agency by which phenomena of this kind were brought about. But for such answers

as those numbered 14, 27, 137, 192, and 194, we were both of us totally unprepared ; and I may add that, so far as we were prepossessed by any opinions whatever, these replies were distinctly opposed to such opinions. In a word, it is simply impossible that these replies should have been either suggested or composed by the *conscious* intelligence of either of us.

I had a young man reading with me as a private pupil at this time. On February 12th he returned from his vacation ; and, on being told of our experiments, expressed his incredulity very strongly. I offered any proof that he liked to insist upon, only stipulating that I should see the question asked. Accordingly, Mrs. Newnham took her accustomed chair in my study, while we went out into the hall, *and shut the door behind us*. He then wrote down on a piece of paper :—

87. What is the Christian name of my eldest sister ?

We at once returned to the study, and found the answer already waiting for us :—

A. Mina.

(This name was the family abbreviation of Wilhelmina ; and I should add that it was unknown to myself.)

I must now go on to speak of a series of other experiments, of a very remarkable kind.

We soon found that my wife was perfectly unable to follow the motions of the planchette. Often she only touched it with a single finger ; but even with all her fingers resting on the board, she never had the slightest idea of what words were being traced out. It struck me that it would be a good thing to take advantage of this peculiarity on her part, to ask questions upon subjects that it was impossible for her to know anything about. I had taken a deep interest in Masonic archæology, and I now questioned planchette on some subjects connected therewith.

February 14th.

92. What is the English of the great word of the R.A. ?

After an interruption, of which I shall speak hereafter, one great word of the degree, but not the one I meant, was written, very slowly and clearly.

February 18th.

112. What is the translation of the Great Triple Word ?

A. (The first syllable of the word in question was written correctly, and then it proceeded.) The end unknown. Three languages. Greece. Egypt. Syriac.

115. Who are you that know ?

(Answer scrawled and illegible.)

116. Please repeat same answer legibly.

A. Manifestation triune person.

March 26th.

166. Of what language is the first syllable of the Great Triple R.A. Word ?

A. Don't know.

167. Yes, you do. What are the three languages of which the word is composed ?

A. Greek, Egypt, Syriac first syllable (*correctly given*), rest unknown.

168. Write the syllable which is Syriac.

A. (First syllable correctly written.)

169. Write the syllable which is Egyptian.
A. Second.
170. Can you not write the syllable itself ?
A. Third Greek.
174. Write down the word itself.
A. First three and last two letters were written correctly, but four incorrect letters, *partly borrowed from another word of the same degree*, came in the middle.
176. Why do you write a word of which I know nothing ?
A. Wife tried hard to tell the word, but could not quite catch it.
177. Catch it from whom ?
A. Not quite sure.
178. Not quite sure of what ?
A. I know nothing. Wife doesn't quite know.

In the above series of answers we have, it seems to me, a very remarkable combination of knowledge and ignorance. There is a perfect appreciation of my thoughts, in the queries ; but a strange, persistent, almost dogged, incapability of seeing my thoughts, in the replies. Especially in the answer to 116, and in some other answers [not here quoted], there is a reference to an opinion which was published by Dr. Oliver, whose works I had been carefully reading about four months before, but with whose theory, in this case, I most strongly disagreed. So that here was an opinion intimated which it was impossible that the operator could have been aware of, and which the questioner had absolutely rejected as untenable !

182. Write out the prayer used at the advancement of a Mark Master Mason.

A. Almighty Ruler of the Universe and Architect of all worlds, we beseech Thee to accept this, our brother, whom we have this day received into our most honourable Company of Mark Master Masons. Grant him to be a worthy member of our brotherhood ; and may he be in his own person a perfect mirror of all Masonic virtues. Grant that all our doings may be to Thy honour and glory, and to the welfare of all mankind.

This prayer was written off instantaneously and very rapidly. It is a very remarkable production indeed. For the benefit of those who are not members of the craft, I may say that no prayer in the slightest degree resembling it is made use of in the Ritual of any Masonic degree ; and yet it contains more than one strictly accurate technicality connected with the degree of Mark Mason. My wife has never seen any Masonic prayers, whether in " Carlile," or any other real or spurious Ritual of the Masonic Order.

Here, then, assuredly was a formula composed by some intelligence totally distinct from the conscious intelligence of either of the persons engaged in the experiment.

I proceeded to inquire as follows :—

183. I do not know this prayer. Where is it to be found ?
A. Old American Ritual.
184. Where can I get one ?
A. Most likely none in England.
185. Can you not write the prayer that I made use of in my own Lodge ?
A. No, I don't know it.

In these last answers we see a new moral element introduced. There is evasion, or subterfuge, of a more or less ingenious kind ; and totally foreign to the whole character and natural disposition of the operator. A similar attempt at deliberate invention, rather than plead guilty to total ignorance, is contained in the following answers :—

May 7th.

255. In what Masonic degree was the Triple Word first used ?
 A. Wife does not know.
256. Cannot you tell her ?
 A. How can wife know what no one else does ?
257. Does *no* one, then, know the answer to this ?
 A. No one knows now.
258. What do you mean by " now " ? Did anyone once know ?
 A. The last one who knew died at least twenty years ago.
259. What was his name ?
 A. In America ; don't know name.

[Many more instances of these evasive replies occur.]

May 10th.

Planchette again gave us an example of its sense of the humorous.

I had been obliged to engage a clergyman who was not a favourable specimen of his profession, as I could procure no one else in time to get the Sunday's work done. He was much amused with planchette, and desired to ask :—

277. How should a bachelor live in this neighbourhood ?
 (The answer was illegible.)
278. Please repeat answer.
 A. Three months.

(Planchette evidently did not catch the exact query.)

279. I did not ask *how long* but *how* ?
 A. Eating and drinking and sleeping and smoking.
 That clergyman never consulted planchette again.

I will conclude with a very pretty instance of a mistake instantly corrected. It was on the same evening, May 10th ; I had to preach on the following Whit-Monday, on the occasion of laying a foundation-stone with Masonic ceremonial, so I asked :—

275. Give me a text for Whit-Monday's sermon.
 A. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you.

The selection of a subject suitable for *Whitsuntide* is plainly the first idea caught by the intelligence ; so I proceeded :—

276. That will not do for my subject. I want a text for the *Monday's* sermon.
 A. Let brotherly love continue.

I will add one example where, contrary to the usual rule, the idea of the answer, though not that of the question, reached the level of consciousness in Mrs. Newnham's mind.

59. What name shall we give to our new dog ?
 A. Nipen.

The name of Nipen, from *Feats on the Fiord*, shot into the operator's brain just as the question was asked.

The above quotations form a fair sample of Mr. Newnham's 309 experiments of the same type, and no one who admits the *bona fides* of the record, and believes that Mrs. Newnham, sitting with closed eyes eight feet behind her husband, did not obtain through her senses an unconscious knowledge of what he wrote, will deny that some sort of telepathic influence was at work, acting below the level of the percipient's consciousness. The experiments are further interesting as suggesting, in the character of many of the replies, an unconscious intelligence—a second self quite other than Mrs. Newnham's conscious self. "Unconscious intelligence" is no doubt a somewhat equivocal phrase, and it is necessary to know in every case exactly what is meant by it. It may be used in a purely *physical* sense—to describe the unconscious cerebral processes whereby actions are produced which as a rule are held to imply conscious intelligence; as, for instance, when complicated movements, once performed with thought and effort, gradually become mechanical. But it may be used also to describe *psychical* processes which are severed from the main conscious current of an individual's life. Unconsciousness in any further sense it would be rash to assert; for intelligent psychic process without consciousness of *some* sort, if not a contradiction in terms, is at any rate something as impossible to imagine as a fourth dimension in space. The events in question are outside the individual's consciousness, as the events in another person's consciousness are; but they differ from these last in not revealing themselves as part of *any* continuous stream of conscious life; and no one, therefore, can give an account of them as belonging to a self. What their range and conditions of emergence may be we cannot tell; since, in general, their very existence can only be inferred from certain sensible effects to which they lead.¹ I may recall the undoubted phenomena of what has been termed "double consciousness," where a *double* psychical life is found connected with a *single* organism. In those cases the two selves, one of which knows nothing of the other, appear as *successive*; but if we can regard such segregated existences as united or unified by bonds of reference and association which, for the partial view of one of them at least, remain

¹ It may be asked what right I have to make any such inference; since *à la rigueur*, the effects, being sensible and physical, do not require us to suppose that they had any other than *physical* antecedents. It is true that it is impossible to *demonstrate* that the physical antecedents, which undoubtedly exist, have any psychical correlative. But the results in question have often no analogy to the automatic actions which we are accustomed to attribute to "unconscious cerebration." They are not the effects of habit and practice; they are *new* results, of a sort which has in all our experience been preceded by intention and reflection, and referable to a self. But perhaps the simplest illustration of what is here meant by "unconscious intelligence" is to be found in occasional facts of *dreaming*. Thus, it has occurred to me at least once, in a dream, to be asked a riddle, to give it up, and then to be told the answer—which, on waking, I found quite sufficiently pertinent to show that the question could not have been framed without distinct reference to it. Yet for the consciousness which I call *mine*, that reference had remained wholly concealed: so little had I known myself as the composer of the riddle that the answer came to me as a complete surprise. The philosophical problem of *partial selves* cannot be here enlarged on. For a discussion of the subject from the point of view of cerebral localisation, as well as for further quotations from Mr. Newnham's record, I may refer the reader to Mr. Myer's paper on "Automatic Writing," in vol. iii. of the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R.

permanently out of sight, then I do not see what new or fundamental difficulty is introduced by conceiving them as *simultaneous*; and simultaneity of the sort is what seems to be shown, in a fragmentary way, by cases like the present. I shall have to recur to this conception in connection with some of the facts of spontaneous telepathy (see pp. 171-2).

A further noteworthy point is that so often the questions and not the answers in the agent's mind should have been telepathically discerned; but we may perhaps conceive that the impulse first conveyed set the percipient's independent activity to work, and so put an end for the moment to the receptive condition. The power to reproduce the actual word thought of is sufficiently shown in the cases where names were given (15 and 87), and in some of the Masonic answers; and the following examples belong to the same class.

48. What name shall we give to our new dog?

A. Yesterday was not a fair trial.

49. Why was not yesterday a fair trial?

A. Dog.

And again:—

108. What do I mean by chaffing C. about a lilac tree?

A. Temper and imagination.

109. You are thinking of somebody else. Please reply to my question.

A. Lilacs.

Here a single image or word seems to have made its mark on the percipient's mind, without calling any originitive activity into play; and we thus get the naked reproduction. In these last examples we again notice the feature of *deferred* impression. The influence only gradually became effective, the immediate answer being irrelevant to the question. We may suppose, therefore, that the first effect took place below the threshold of consciousness.

§ 13. I may now proceed to some further results which were obtained with percipients of less abnormal sensibility, and which demand, therefore, a careful application of the theory of probabilities. For the development of the motor form of experiment in this direction, we have again to thank M. Richet; who here, as in the case of the card-guessing, has brought the calculus to bear effectively on various sets of results many of which, if looked at in separation, would have no significance.¹ The fact that the "subjects" of his trials were persons who had betrayed no special aptitude for "mental suggestion," made it clearly desirable that the bodily action required should be of the very simplest sort. The formation of words by a planchette-writer requires, of course, a very complex set of muscular co-ordinations: all that M. Richet sought to obtain was a single movement or twitch. In the earlier trials an object was hidden, and the percipient endeavoured to discover it by means of a sort of divining-rod—the idea being that he involuntarily twitched

¹ I have given a fuller description and criticism of M. Richet's investigations in vol. ii. of the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R.

the rod at the right moment under the influence of "mental suggestion" from the agent, who was watching his movements. But where the subject of communication is of such an extremely simple kind, very elaborate precautions would be needed to guard against unconscious hints. Indications from the expression or attitude of the "agent" may be prevented by blindfolding the "percipient," and in other ways; but if the two are in close proximity, it is harder to exclude such signs as may be given by involuntary movements, or by changes of breathing. M. Richet's later experiments were ingeniously contrived so as to obviate this objection.

The place of a planchette was taken by a table, and M. Richet prefaces his account by a succinct statement of the orthodox view as to "table-turning." Rejecting altogether the three theories which attribute the phenomena to wholesale fraud, to spirits, and to an unknown force, he regards the gyrations and oscillations of séance-tables as due wholly to the unconscious muscular contractions of the sitters. It thus occurred to him to employ a table as an indicator of the movements that might be produced, by "mental suggestion." The plan of the experiments was as follows. Three persons (C, D, and E) took their seats in a semi-circle, at a little table on which their hands rested. One of these three was always a "medium"—a term used by M. Richet to denote a person liable to exhibit intelligent movements in which consciousness and will apparently take no part. Attached to the table was a simple electrical apparatus, the effect of which was to ring a bell whenever the current was broken by the tilting of the table. Behind the backs of the sitters at the table was another table, on which was a large alphabet, completely screened from the view of C, D, and E, even had they turned round and endeavoured to see it. In front of this alphabet sat A, whose duty was to follow the letters slowly and steadily with a pen, returning at once to the beginning as soon as he arrived at the end. At A's side sat B, with a note-book; his duty was to write down the letter at which A's pen happened to be pointing whenever the bell rang. This happened whenever one of the sitters at the table made the simple movement necessary to tilt it. Under these conditions, A and B are apparently mere automata. C, D, and E are little more, being unconscious of tilting the table, which appears to them to tilt itself; but even if they tilted it consciously, and with a conscious desire to dictate words, they have no means of ascertaining at what letter A's pen is pointing at any particular moment; and they might tilt for ever without producing more than an endless series of incoherent letters. Things being arranged thus, a sixth operator, F, stationed himself apart both from the tilting table and from the alphabet, and concentrated his thought on some word of his own choosing, which he had not communicated to the others. The three sitters at the first table engaged in conversation, sang, or told stories; but at intervals the table tilted, the bell rang, and B wrote down the letter which A's pen was opposite to at that moment. Now, to the astonishment of all concerned, these letters, when arranged in a series, turned out to produce a more or less close approximation to the word of which F was thinking.

For the sake of comparing the results with those which pure accident

would give, M. Richet first considers some cases of the latter sort. He writes the word NAPOLEON; he then takes a box containing a number of letters, and makes eight draws; the eight letters, in the order of drawing, turn out to be U P M T D E Y V. He then places this set below the other, thus:—

N A P O L E O N
U P M T D E Y V

Taking the number of letters in the French alphabet to be 24, the probability of the correspondence of any letter in the lower line with the letter immediately above it is, of course $\frac{1}{24}$; and in the series of 8 letters it is more probable than not that there will not be a single correspondence. If we reckon as a success any case where the letter in the lower line corresponds not only with the letter above it, but with either of the neighbours of that letter in the alphabet¹ (e.g., where L has above it either K, L, or M), then a single correspondence represents the most probable amount of success. In the actual result, it will be seen, there is just one correspondence, which happens to be a complete one—the letter E in the sixth place. It will not be necessary to quote other instances. Suffice it to say that the total result, of trials involving the use of 64 letters, gives 3 exact correspondences, while the expression indicating the most probable number was 2·7; and 7 correspondences of the other type, while the most probable number was 8. Thus even in this short set of trials, the accidental result very nearly coincided with the strict theoretic number.

We are now in a position to appreciate the results obtained when the factor of “mental suggestion” was introduced. In the first experiment made, M. Richet, standing apart both from the table and from the alphabet, selected from Littré’s dictionary a line of poetry which was unknown to his friends, and asked the name of the author. The letters obtained by the process above described were J F A R D; and there the tilting stopped. After M. Richet’s friends had puzzled in vain over this answer, he informed them that the author of the line was Racine; and juxtaposition of the letters thus—

J F A R D
J E A N R

shows that the number of complete successes was 2, which is about 10 times the fraction representing the most probable number; and that the number of successes of the type where neighbouring letters are reckoned was 3, which is about 5 times the fraction representing the most probable number. M. Richet tells us, however, that he was not actually concentrating his thought on the author’s Christian name. Even so,

¹ This procedure of counting neighbouring letters seems to require some justification. It might be justified by the difficulty, on the theory of mental suggestion, of obtaining an *exact* coincidence of time between the tilting and the pointing. But I think that M. Richet does justify it (*Rev. Phil.*, p. 654), by reference to some other experiments—not yet published, but of which he has shown us the record—where intelligible words were produced of which no one in the room was, or had been, thinking. For here also neighbouring letters appeared, but in such a way as left no room for doubt, in the reader’s mind, as to what the letter should have been.

it probably had a subconscious place in his mind, which might sufficiently account for its appearance. At the same time accident has of course a wider scope when there is more than one result that would be allowed as successful ; and the amount of success was here not nearly striking enough to have any independent weight.

It is clearly desirable—with the view of making sure that F's mind, if any, is the operative one—not to ask a question of which the answer might possibly at some time have been within the knowledge of the sitters at the table ; and in the subsequent experiments the name was silently fixed on by F. The most striking success was this :—

Name thought of : CHEVALON

Letters produced : CHEVAL

Here the most probable number of exact successes was 0, and the actual number was 6.

Taking the sum of eight trials, we find that the most probable number of exact successes was 2, and the actual number 14 ; and that the most probable number of successes of the other type was 7, and the actual number 24. It was observed, moreover, that the correspondences were much more numerous in the *earlier* letters of each set than in the later ones. The first three letters of each set were as follows :—

JFA—NEF—FOQ—HEN—CHE—EPJ—CHE—ALL

JEA—LEG—EST—HIG—DIE—DOR—CHE—ZKO

Here, out of 24 trials, the most probable number of exact successes being 1, the actual number is 8 ; the most probable number of successes of the other type being 3, the actual number is 17. The figures become still more striking if we regard certain consecutive series in the results. Thus the probability of obtaining by chance the three consecutive correspondences in the first experiment here quoted was $\frac{1}{512}$; and that of obtaining the 6 consecutive correspondences in the CHEVALON experiment was about $\frac{1}{100.000.000}$.

The experiment was repeated four times in another form. A line of poetry was secretly and silently written down by the agent, with the omission of a single letter. He then asked what the omitted letter was ; it was correctly produced in every one of the four trials. The probability of such a result was less than $\frac{1}{300.000}$.

And now follows a very interesting observation. In some cases, after the result was obtained, subsequent trials were made *with the same word*, which of course the agent did not reveal in the meantime ; and the amount of successes was sometimes markedly increased on these subsequent trials. Thus, when the name thought of was D'ORMONT, the first three letters produced on the first trial were EPJ

“	“	“	second	“	EPF
“	“	“	third	“	EPS
“	“	“	fourth	“	DOR

Summing up these four trials, the most probable number of exact successes was 0, and the actual number was 3 ; the most probable number of successes of the other type was 1 or at most 2 ; and the actual number was 10. The probability of the 3 consecutive successes in the last trial was about $\frac{3}{10.000}$.

In respect of this name d'Ormont, there was a further very peculiar

result. On the fourth trial, the letters produced in the manner described stood thus :—

DOREMIOD.

Thus, if the name thought of were spelt

DOREMOND,

the approximation would be extraordinarily close, the probability of the accidental occurrence of the 5 consecutive successes being something infinitesimal.¹ Now, as long as we are merely aiming at an unassailable mathematical estimate of probabilities for each particular case, it does not seem justifiable to take *ifs* of any sort into consideration. M. Richet, who was the agent, expressly tells us that he *was* imagining the name spelt as d'Ormont; and on the strict account, therefore, the success reached a point against which the odds, though still enormous, were decidedly less enormous than if he had been imagining the other spelling. But when we are endeavouring to form a correct view of what really takes place, it would be unintelligent not to take a somewhat wider view of the phenomena. And such a view seems to show that in those underground mental regions where M. Richet's results (if more than accidental) must have had their preparation, a mistake or a piece of independence in spelling is by no means an unusual occurrence. The records of automatism, quite apart from telepathy, afford many instances of such independence. Thus a gentleman, writing automatically, was puzzled by the mention of a friend at *Frontunac*—a place he had never heard of; weeks afterwards his own writing gave him the correct name—*Fond du Lac*. Mr. Myers' paper, above referred to, contains one case where a planchette wrote, "My name is *Norman*," presumably meaning *Norval*; and another, witnessed by Professor Sidgwick, where the Greek letter χ was automatically written as K H, with the result that for a time the word completely puzzled the writer. And while engaged on this very point I have received a letter from Mr. Julian Hawthorne, in which he tells me that the spelling of the planchette-writing obtained through the automatism of a young child of his own was "much better than in her own letters and journals."

I will insert here an incident to which, since it occurred in connection with a person who has been detected in the production of spurious phenomena, I wish to attribute no evidential importance. Throughout this book care has been taken to rest our case exclusively on phenomena and records of phenomena derived from (as we believe) quite untainted sources; but there are two reasons which seem to me to make the following experience worth describing. First, those who already believe in thought-transference will feel little doubt that we have here an instance of it, which is in itself independent of the character and pretensions of the percipient; and this being so, they will find, in the close parallelism that the case presents in some points to M. Richet's experiments, an interesting confirmation of these. And secondly, it may be useful to suggest that thought-transference is probably the true explanation of certain results professedly produced by "spiritualistic mediumship"; for till telepathic percipience is allowed for, as a natural human faculty, the occasional manifestations of it in dubious circumstances are certain to be a source of confusion and error.

¹ Moreover the E in the 4th place had appeared in two of the preceding trials and the final O D in one of them.

On September 2, 1885, Mr. F. W. H. Myers, Dr. A. T. Myers, and the present writer paid an *impromptu* visit to a professional "medium" in a foreign town, who had no clue whatever to our names and identity. We had decided beforehand on a name on which to concentrate our thoughts, with a view to getting it reproduced. There was no opportunity for employing M. Richet's precautions and checks. The "medium," her daughter, and the three visitors sat round a table on which their hands were placed, and the present writer pointed to the successive letters of a printed alphabet; at intervals the sound of a rap was heard, and the letter thus indicated was written down. Now these conditions could not have been considered adequate, had the result been that the name in our minds was correctly given; for though our two companions were not apparently looking at us and not in contact with us, it might have been supposed that some involuntary and unconscious movement on our part revealed to one of them at what points to make the raps. But as the result turned out, it will be seen, I think, that this objection does not apply. The name that had been selected was John Henry Pratt. The result obtained in the way described was J O N H N Y E S R O S A T. From the N in the fifth place to the end, Dr. Myers and myself regarded the letters that were being given as purely fortuitous, and as forming gibberish; and though Mr. F. W. H. Myers detected a method in them, he was as far as we were from expecting the successive letters before they appeared. On inspection, the method becomes apparent. If in three places an approximation (of the sort so often met with by M. Richet) be allowed, and a contiguous letter be substituted, the complete name will be found to be given, thus :—

R P T
J O N H N Y E S R O S A T

the first word being phonetically spelt, and the other two being correct anagrams. It is highly improbable that such an amount of resemblance was accidental; and it is difficult to suppose that it was due to muscular indications unconsciously given by us in accordance with an *unconscious* arrangement of the letters in our minds in phonetic and anagrammatic order. If these suppositions be excluded, the only alternative will be thought-transference—the letters whose image or sound was transferred being modified by the percipient herself, in a way which seems, from some experiments unconnected with thought-transference, to be quite within the scope of the mind's unconscious operations.¹ But in whatever way the knowledge of the letters or syllables reached the "medium's" mind, I see no reason to think that the expression of it by raps was other than a conscious act. The sounds were such as would be made by gently tapping the foot against the wooden frame of the table; and at a subsequent trial with one of these so-called "mediums"—the daughter—I managed by very gradually advancing my own foot to receive on it first a part and ultimately the whole of the impact. The movement required to make the raps may have become semi-automatic from long habit,

¹ For a curious case of the automatic production of anagrams, see *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. iii., pp. 226–31.

but can hardly have been unconscious. I may add that, out of a good many words and sentences which were spelt out in the same way at several different sittings, the case recorded was (with a single doubtful exception) the only one that contained the slightest indication of any abnormal faculty.

To return to M. Richet's experiments—a result of a different kind was the following, which is especially noteworthy as due to the agency of an idea that was itself on the verge of the unconscious. M. Richet chose a quotation at random from Littré's dictionary, and asked for the name of the author, which was Legouvé. The letters produced were JOSEPH CHD, which looked like a complete failure. But the quotation in the dictionary was adjacent to another from the works of Joseph Chénier; and M. Richet's eye, in running over the page, had certainly encountered the latter name, which had probably retained a certain low place in his consciousness. Another very interesting case of a result unintended by the agent, though probably due to something in his mind, was this. The name thought of was Victor; the letters produced on three trials were—

D A L E N
D A M E S
D A N D S

—seemingly complete failures. But it appeared that while the agent had been concentrating his thoughts on "Victor," the name of a friend, Danet, had spontaneously recurred to his memory. We should, of course, be greatly extending the chances of *accidental* success, if we reckoned collocations of letters as successful on the ground of their resemblance to any one of the names or words which may have momentarily found their way into the agent's mind while the experiment was in progress. Here, however, the name seems to have suggested itself with considerable persistence, and the resemblance is very close. And if the result may fairly be attributed to "mental suggestion," then, of the two names which had a certain lodgment in the agent's mind, the one intended to be effective was ineffective, and *vice-versâ*.

It is a remarkable fact that in the few hitherto recorded cases of experimental telepathy, where words have been indicated by writing or by other movements on the percipient's part, the idea or word transferred seems as often as not to have been one which was not at the moment occupying the agent's consciousness; that is to say, the influence has proceeded from some part of the agent's mind which is below the threshold of conscious attention. (See p. 67–8 below.) This conception of *unconscious agency*—of an "unconscious intelligence" in the agent as well as in the percipient—will present itself again very prominently when we come to consider the cases of spontaneous telepathy. But the experimental instances have a theoretic importance of another sort. They seem to exhibit telepathic production of movements by what is at most an idea, and not a volition, on the agent's part. This, indeed, is a hypothesis which seems justified even by M. Richet's less exceptional results. For we must remember that in a sense A is throughout more immediately the agent than F; it is what A's mind contributes, not what F's mind

contributes, that produces the tilts at the right moments.¹ But this is of course through no *will* of A's ; he is ignorant of the required word, and has absolutely no opportunity of bringing his volition into play. His "agency" is of a wholly passive sort ; and his mind, as it follows the course of his pen, is a mere conduit-pipe, whereby knowledge of a certain kind obtains access to the "unconscious intelligence" which evokes the tilts. If, then, the knowledge manifests itself as impulse, can we avoid the conclusion that in this particular mode of access—in "mental suggestion" or telepathy as such—a certain *impulsive* quality is involved. We shall encounter further signs of such an impulsive quality among the spontaneous cases.² (See pp. 204, 350-1.)

But of course the relation between F and the "medium" plays also a necessary part in the result ; the impulse to tilt when a particular letter is reached only takes effect when it falls (so to speak) on ground prepared by "mental suggestion" from F—on a mind in which the word imagined by him has obtained an unconscious lodgment. The unconscious part of the percipient's mind would thus be the scene of confluence of two separate telepathic streams, which proceed to combine there in an intelligent way—one proceeding from F's mind, which produces unconscious

¹ When A, in pointing, began at the beginning of the alphabet, the sense of time might conceivably have led to an unconscious judgment as to the point arrived at. This idea had occurred to M. Richet. It seems, however, an unnecessary multiplication of hypothesis ; for we learn from him that in some trials A began at uncertain places, and that under these conditions coherent words were obtained. The fact that so often the approximate letter was given, instead of the exact one, might seem at first sight to favour the hypothesis of unconscious reckoning ; but it will be observed that exactly the same approximations took place in our own experiment (p. 62), where the alphabet was in the "medium's" sight.

² The impulse might no doubt be otherwise accounted for if we supposed that a close connection was established in F's mind between the idea of the *object*—i.e., the successive letters—and the idea of the *movement*, and that this complex idea was what was transferred and what ultimately took effect. But it is hard to apply this hypothesis to cases where a word is produced which, though latent in F's mind, has no resemblance to the word whose production he is willing. The transference of the idea of the latent word, even to the exclusion of the right word, can be quite conceived ; but can we suppose that, subconsciously or unconsciously, an idea of *movement* was combined with the idea of its letters in the agent's mind, at the very moment when that on which his attention was fixed, and with which *ex hypothesi* the conscious idea of movement was connected, was a quite different set of letters ? Can we suppose that the idea of movement overflowed into the unconscious region of his mind, and there on its own account formed an alliance with alien elements, the effect of which on the percipient would prevent the effect intended ? It must be remembered that where a word which is not the one intended gets transferred from F to the "medium," there is no knowledge, conscious or unconscious, on F's part, as to what that word will be. A number of words are latent in his mind ; one of these finds an echo in another mind. But how should the idea of movement find out which particular one, out of all the words, is destined thus to find an echo, so as to associate itself with *its* letters and no others ? And if we suppose the association to be between the unconscious idea of movement and the unconscious idea of *letters in general*, this is no less dissimilar and opposed to anything that the conscious part of F's mind has conceived. For it is not in letters as such, but in the exclusive constituents of a particular word, that he is interested ; if indeed he is interested in anything beyond the word as a whole. The difficulty here seems to justify the suggestion—with which I imagine that M. Richet would agree—that the physiological impulse does not depend on any idea of *movement*, or any special direction of the agent's will to that result. This might be tested, if F were a person ignorant of the form of the experiment, and out of sight of the table,

knowledge of the word, and the other proceeding from A's mind, which produces an unconscious image of the successive letters.¹ Another possible supposition would be that F's thought affects, not the "medium," but A; or conversely, that A's thought affects not the "medium," but F;—that A obtains unconscious knowledge of the word, or that F obtains unconscious knowledge of the letter, and so is enabled to communicate an impulse to the "medium" at the right moment. And we should then have to suppose a secret understanding between two parts of A's or F's mind, the part which takes account of the letters of the alphabet, and the part which takes account of the letters of the word—the former being conscious and the latter unconscious, or *vice versâ*, according as A or F is the party affected.

One hesitates to launch oneself on the conceptions which these experiments open up; but the only alternative would be to question the facts from an evidential point of view. So regarded, they are of an extremely simple kind; and if their genuineness be granted, we are left once and for all from our old psychological moorings. The whole question of the psychical constitution of man is opened to its furthest depths; and our central conception—telepathy—the interest of which, even in its simpler phases, seemed almost unsurpassable, takes on an interest of a wholly unlooked-for kind. For it now appears as an all-important method or instrument for testing the mind in its hidden parts, and for measuring its unconscious operations.

§ 14. The above sketch (for it is little more) may give an idea of the chief experimental results so far obtained in the course of serious and systematic research. But though the investigation may be laboriously and consecutively pursued by those who make a special study of the subject, it is one which admits also of being prosecuted in a more haphazard and sporadic manner. A group of friends may take it up for a few evenings, and then get tired of it; and it is quite possible for valuable results to be obtained without any recognition of their value. One or two specimens of these casual successes that we so frequently hear of may be worth citing, if only because the knowledge that such results are obtainable may stimulate further trials. Our own satisfaction in such fragments of evidence is often more than counterbalanced by the impossibility of getting our friends to devote time and trouble to the work.

The following case, received in September, 1885, from Mrs. Wilson, of Westal, Cheltenham, is interesting as an apparent victory of "thought-reading" over "muscle-reading." A group of five "willers," one of

¹ It will be seen that the results of such "unconscious intelligence" go considerably beyond the received results of mere "unconscious cerebration." Unconscious cerebration is amply competent to produce such seemingly intelligent actions as ordinary writing; but what is now done more resembles the formation of a word by picking letters from a heap, or type-writing by a person who is unused to his instrument. The process is not one in which every item is connected by long-standing association with the one before and after it; every item is independent, and implies the recognition, at an uncertain moment, of a particular relation—that between the next letter required for the word and the same letter in its place in a quite distinct series.

whom was in contact with the would-be percipient, were to concentrate their minds on the desire that the latter should sit down to the piano and strike the middle C. Had she done so, the result would have been worth little ; but this was what happened :—

“ When A. I. entered blindfolded—her hand in the hand of B., held over the forehead—M. A. W. was possessed with the desire to will her, without bodily contact, to come to her and give her a kiss on the forehead, and she at once exerted (unknown to the others) all her will to achieve this object. A. I. came slowly up to M. A. W., till she stood quite close, touching her, and commenced bending down towards her, when M. A. W., thinking it was hardly fair to succeed against the other ‘ willers,’ tried to reverse her will, and with intense effort willed A. I. to turn away and not give the intended kiss. Slowly A. I. raised her head, stood a moment still, then turned in another direction towards the piano, but not near it, and sat down in an armchair. A few seconds after she said : ‘ I can’t feel any impression now, nor any wish to do anything.’ She was released from her bandage and questioned as to her feelings. ‘ Did you get any impression of what you had to do ? What did you feel ? ’ She replied : ‘ I had a distinct feeling that I had to go and kiss M. A. W. on the forehead ; but when I came up to someone and bent down to do it, I was sensible of a strong feeling that I was *not* to do it—and could not do it ; and after that I could get no impression whatever.’

“ MARY A. WILSON.

“ ALICE M. W. INGRAM.”

The percipient in both the following cases was our friend, the Hon. Alexander Yorke. In the summer of 1884 he mentioned to two nieces, as a joke, that some one had suggested to him the possibility of discerning the contents of letters pressed to the forehead ; and this quack suggestion led by accident to an apparently genuine experiment in thought-transference.

The account is from the Misses Adeane, of 19, Ennismore Gardens, S.W.

“ June, 1884.

“ Taking a letter from a heap on my mother’s table, I glanced at the contents, and then placed it on my uncle’s head, where he held it. A minute had hardly elapsed before he said, quite quietly, ‘ This letter is not addressed to your mother.’ He then paused, as if waiting for another impression. ‘ It is written to Charlie ’ (my brother), and another pause, ‘ by an uncle—not a real uncle—a sort of uncle.’ Another pause, ‘ It must be about business.’ At this point I was so much astonished that I could not help telling him how true and correct all his impressions had been, which practically put an end to the experiment by giving a clue as to what the business was, &c. My younger sister was the only other person in the room at the time. The letter was addressed to my brother at Oxford by his trustee, and uncle by marriage, and related to business ; he had forwarded it to my mother to read, and I selected it partly by chance, and partly because I thought, if there was only guessing in the case, it would have been a puzzler. My uncle, Mr. Yorke, does not know the writer of the letter or his handwriting.

“ MARIE C. ADEANE.

“ MAUDE ADEANE.”

Again, the mother of these informants, Lady Elizabeth Biddulph, writes to us, on June 12, 1884:—

“My girls came down to the drawing-room with my brother, Mr. Alexander Yorke, about 3.30 on Sunday afternoon, May 18th. I was sitting with one of Mr. Biddulph’s brothers, and his sister, Mrs. L. They had just brought me a letter sent by mistake to 31, Eaton Place. Presently Captain and Lady Edith Adeane came in, and then my two girls began telling us of what had happened upstairs. I immediately rushed at the letter I had just received, and laughing, held it to Mr. Yorke’s forehead: he objected, saying, ‘I shall probably fail, and then you will only laugh at the whole thing.’ He thrust my hand away, and I left the matter alone and went on talking to my relations. Presently my brother rose to go, and hesitating rather, said, ‘Well, my dear, the impression about that letter is so strong that I must tell you the Duchess of St. Albans wrote it.’ It *was* so. She does not correspond with me; the letter, too, having been addressed by mistake to 31, Eaton Place, made it more unlikely there should be any clue, and its contents were purely of a business-like character.

“ELIZABETH P. BIDDULPH.”

On another similar occasion, the present writer saw a letter taken up casually from a writing-table, and held to Mr. Yorke’s forehead, in such a way that he could not possibly catch a glimpse of the writing. He correctly described the writer as an elderly man, formerly connected with himself, but could not name him. The writer had, in fact, been his tutor at one time. It need hardly be said that no importance is to be attributed to the holding of the letters to the forehead. In every case the writer and the contents of the letter were known to some person in the percipient’s immediate vicinity, and that being so, any other hypothesis than that of thought-transference is gratuitous.

The following incident is an excellent casual illustration of the motor form of experiment to which the cases described on p. 63 belonged. It presents, indeed, a point which would lead some to place it in a separate category: the names unexpectedly produced were those of *dead* persons. But where the “communication” contains nothing beyond the content, or the possible manufacture, of the minds of the living persons present, it seems reasonable to refer it to those minds—at any rate until the power of the dead to communicate with the living be established by accumulated and irrefragable evidence.

One evening in August, 1885, some friends were assembled in a house at Rustington; and the younger members of the party suggested “table-turning” as an amusement. Three ladies—Mrs. W. B. Richmond, Mrs. Perceval Clark, and another—were seated apart from the larger group; and a small table on which they laid their hands, and which was light enough to be easily moved by unconscious pressure, soon became lively. The alphabet being repeated, the sentence “Harriet knew me years ago,” was tilted out. The name of *me* was asked for. “Kate Gardiner” was the answer. These names conveyed nothing to the three ladies at the table, but they caught the attention of a member of the other group, Mr. R. L. Morant. This gentleman was acting as holiday-

tutor to Mrs. Richmond's boys, and had not before that been acquainted with any of the party; nor had Mrs. Richmond herself the slightest knowledge of his family history. On hearing the names, he asked that "Harriet's" surname should be given. The name "Morant" was tilted out. In reply to further questions, put of course in such a way as not to suggest the answers, and while Mr. Morant remained at the further end of the room, the tilts produced the information that Harriet and Kate met at Kingstown, and that Harriet was Mr. Morant's great-aunt, his father "Robin" Morant being her nephew.

We have received in writing three independent and concordant accounts of this occurrence—from Mrs. Richmond, from the third lady at the table (who is hostile to the subject, but who was probably the unconscious percipient), and from Mr. Morant, who adds:—

"I felt distinctly and always rightly, when it would answer, and *what* it would answer. I found that it always answered the questions of which *I knew* the answer; and was silent when I did not: *e.g.*, it would not say how many years ago [the meeting was]. I was quite ignorant of where they met; that was the only answer beyond my knowledge. [It is not known if this answer was correct.] All the names given are correct: my father's name was Robert, but he was always called *Robin*. Kate Gardiner was a friend of my father; I believe she helped to arrange his marriage. Harriet Morant was his aunt. I am ignorant of much about this aunt; and from reading some old correspondence in June, I was particularly anxious to learn more about these names. No one at the table can possibly have known *anything whatever* about any one of the names given."

It is, of course, a matter of interest to know what indications of genuine telepathy may be afforded by these less systematic trials. For experiments with a comparatively small number of "subjects" (like those before described), however conclusive we may consider them as to the existence of a special faculty, afford no means of judging how common that faculty may be. If it exists, we have no reason to expect it to be extremely uncommon; on the contrary, we should rather expect to find an appreciable degree of it tolerably widely diffused. But (putting aside the results of § 7, above), our only means, at present, for judging how far this is the case is by considering the evidence of persons who were, so to speak, amateur observers, and who in some cases were not even aware that the matter had any scientific importance. Such evidence must, of course, be received with due allowances, and, if it stood alone, might be wholly inadequate to establish the case for telepathic phenomena; but if these be otherwise established, it would be illogical to shut our eyes to alleged results which fall readily into the same class, provided the trials appear to have been conducted with intelligence and care.

It is unnecessary to say that this last proviso at once excludes the vast majority of the cases which one reads about in the newspapers, or hears discussed in private circles. We have already seen that the subject of "thought-reading" has obtained its vogue by dint of exhibitions which, however clever and interesting, have no sort of claim to the name. The prime requisite is that the conditions shall preclude the possibility of unconscious guidance; that contact between the agent and the percipient shall be avoided; or that the form of experiment shall not require

movements, but the percipient shall give his notion of the transferred impression—card, number, taste, or whatever it may be—by word of mouth. That these conditions have been observed is itself an indication that experiments have been intelligently conducted; and the cases of this sort of which we have received records are at any rate numerous enough to dispel the disquieting sense that the possibility of accumulating evidence for our hypothesis depends on the transient endowment of a few most exceptional individuals. I have spoken above of the urgent importance of spreading the responsibility for the evidence as widely as possible—in other words, of largely increasing the number of persons, reputed honest and intelligent, who must be either knaves or idiots if the alleged transference of thought took place through any hitherto recognised channels. And our hopes in this direction are, of course, the better founded, in so far as the necessary material for experimentation is not of extreme rarity. If what has been here said induces a wider and more systematic search for this material, and increased perseverance in following up all indications of its existence, a very distinct step will have been taken towards the general acceptance of the facts.

CHAPTER III

THE TRANSITION FROM EXPERIMENTAL TO SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

§ 1. IN all the cases of the action of one mind on another that were considered in the last chapter, both the parties concerned—percipient as well as agent—were consciously and voluntarily taking part in the experiment with a definite idea of certain results in view. Spontaneous telepathy, as its name implies, differs from experimental in precisely this particular—that neither agent nor percipient has consciously or voluntarily formed an idea of any result whatever. Something happens for which both alike are completely unprepared. But between these two great classes of cases there is a sort of transitional class, which is akin to each of the others in one marked feature. In this class the *agent* acts consciously and voluntarily; he exercises a concentration of mind with a certain object, as in experimental thought-transference; he is in this way truly experimenting.¹ But the *percipient* is not consciously or voluntarily a party to the experiment; as in spontaneous telepathy, his mind has not been in any way adjusted to the result; he finds himself affected in a certain manner, he knows not by what means.

In another way, also, this class of cases serves as a connecting link between the other two. For it introduces us to results produced at a much greater *distance* than any of those that have been so far described. Not that greater distance between the agent and percipient is in any way a distinguishing mark of the spontaneous, as opposed to the experimental, effects; the former no less than the latter—as we shall see reason to think—may take place between persons in the same room. But in the large majority of the spontaneous cases that we shall have to notice, the distance was considerable. And in the transitional class we meet with specimens of both kinds—effects produced in the same room, and effects produced at a distance of many miles.

§ 2. In these transitional cases—as in those of the last chapter—the effect may show itself either in ideas and sensations which the percipient describes, or in actions of a more or less automatic sort. The *motor* cases have been by far the most heard of, and are, indeed, popularly supposed to be tolerably common; but this idea has no real foundation. The allegations of certain persons that, *e.g.*, they can make strangers in church or in the theatre turn their heads, by “willing” that they should do so,

¹ It should be observed, however, that unless he records his experiment at the time, the case will stand on a different footing from those of the last chapter.

cannot be accepted as establishing even a *prima facie* case. Till accurate records are kept, such cases must clearly be reckoned as mere illusions of *post hoc propter hoc*—of successes noted and failures forgotten. Authentic instances of the kind seem, as it happens, always to be more or less closely connected with mesmerism. And even as regards mesmeric cases where a definite action or course of action is produced by silent or distant control, the first thing to remark is that many phenomena are popularly referred to this category which have not the slightest claim to a place in it. The common platform exhibition, where a profession is made of "willing" a particular person to attend, and he rushes into the room at the appointed moment, is not to be attributed to any influence then and there exercised, but is the effect of the command or the threat impressed on his mind when in its wax-like condition of trance on a previous evening. Nor, as a rule, do the cases where "subjects" are said to be drawn by their controller from house to house, or even to a distant town, prove any specific power of his will, or anything beyond the *general* influence and attraction which he has established, and which is liable every now and then to recrudescence in his absence, and to manifest itself in this startling form.¹

Very much rarer are the really crucial cases where the intended effect—the origination or inhibition of a motor-impulse—is brought about at the moment by a deliberate exercise of volition. In some of the more striking instances, the inhibition has been of that specific sort which temporarily alters the whole condition of the "subject," and induces the mesmeric trance. In the *Zoist* for April, 1849, Mr. Adams, a surgeon of Lymington, writing four months after the event, describes how a guest of his own twice succeeded in mesmerising the man-servant of a common friend at a distance of nearly fifty miles, the time when the attempt was to be made having in each case been privately arranged with the man's master. On the first occasion, the unwitting "subject" fell at the time named, 7.30 p.m., into a state of profound coma not at all resembling natural sleep, from which he was with difficulty aroused. He said that "before he fell asleep he had lost the use of his legs; he had endeavoured to kick the cat away, and could not do so." On the second occasion a similar fit was induced at 9.30 a.m., when the man was in the act of walking across a meadow to feed the pigs. But the following case is more striking, as resting on the testimony of a man whose name must perforce be treated with respect. Dr. Esdaile says:—²

(1) "I had been looking for a blind man on whom to test the imagination theory, and one at last presented himself. This man became so susceptible that, by making him the object of my attention, I could entrance him in whatever occupation he was engaged, and at any distance within the hospital enclosure. . . . My *first attempt* to influence the blind man was made by gazing at him silently over a wall, while he was engaged

¹ Signs of this general mesmeric influence occur occasionally in the records of witchcraft. (See, e.g., *The Discovery of Sorcery and Witchcraft practised by Jane Wenham*, London, 1712.)

² *Natural and Mesmeric Clairvoyance*, pp. 227-8. See also Mr. Cattell's case in the *Zoist*, vol. viii., p. 143; where the special circumstances seem sufficiently to exclude the hypothesis of expectancy.

in the act of eating his solitary dinner, at the distance of twenty yards. He gradually ceased to eat, and in a quarter of an hour was profoundly entranced and cataleptic. This was repeated at the most untimely hours, when he could not possibly know of my being in his neighbourhood, and always with like results."

Cases of *waking* a hypnotic "subject" by the silent exercise of the will have been recorded by Reichenbach,¹ and by the Committee appointed by the French Royal Academy of Medicine to investigate "animal magnetism." In their Report, published in 1831, this Committee say that they "could entertain no doubt as to the very decided effects which magnetism produced upon the 'subject,' even without his knowledge, and at a certain distance." [A more recent case will be found in case No. 690 in the original edition not here reproduced.]

§ 3. But, besides such examples of the induction of trance, the records of mesmerism contain a good many cases of the induction or inhibition of particular actions; and where persons who appeared to be in a perfectly normal state have had their will similarly dominated, or their actions dominated against their will, it has almost always, I think, been through the agency of some person who has given indications of considerable mesmeric power. The Rev. J. Lawson Sisson, Rector of Edington, North Walsham (whose interest in mesmerism, like that of so many others, began with the discovery of his own power to alleviate pain), describes the following experiment as having been performed on an incredulous lady, whose first experience of his influence had been a few moments' subjection to the slightest possible hypnotic process in the course of the evening.

(2) "Conversation went on on other topics, and then followed a light supper. Several of the gentlemen, myself among the number, were obliged to stand. I stood talking to a friend, against the wall, and at the back of Miss Cooke, some three or four feet off her. Her wine-glass was filled, and I made up my mind that she should not drink without my 'willing.' I kept on talking and watching her many futile attempts to get the glass to her mouth. Sometimes she got it a few inches from the level of the table, sometimes she got it a little higher, but she evidently felt that it was not for some reason to be done. At last I said, 'Miss Cooke, why don't you drink your wine?' and her answer was at once, 'I will when you let me.' "

The *Zoist* contains several cases of apparently the same kind; though, unfortunately, the narrators have seldom recognised the need of making it clear that the possibility of physical indications was completely excluded. [Nos. 3 and 4 here omitted.]

Most remarkable of all are the cases of acts performed under the silent control of the late Mr. H. S. Thompson, of Moorfields, York, though here again we have to regret that the signed corroboration of the persons affected was not obtained at the time. Mr. Thompson's interest in mesmerism lay almost entirely in the opportunities which his power gave

¹ *Der Sensitive Mensch* (Stuttgart, 1855), vol. ii., pp. 665-6.

him of alleviating suffering ; and having succeeded in giving relief to a patient, it is to him a comparatively small matter to be able to say (*Zoist*, vol. v., p. 257) :—

“ I have often, by the will, made her perform a series of trifling acts, though, when asked why she did them, she has answered that she did them without observing them, and had no distinct wish to do them as far as she was aware.”

Some of his descriptions, however, are more explicit. He gave us permission to publish, for the first time on his authority, an account of an after-dinner incident which made much sensation in Yorkshire society when it occurred, and which even twenty years afterwards was still alluded to with bated breath, as a manifest proof of the alliance of mesmerists with the devil. The account was sent to us in November, 1883.

(5) “ In 1837, I first became acquainted with mesmerism through Baron Dupotet. The first experiment I tried was upon a Mrs. Thornton, who was staying with some friends of mine, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Harland, of Sutton. She told me that no one had ever succeeded in mesmerising her, though she soon submitted to being mesmerised by me. She went to sleep at once, and was very strongly influenced by my will. One night when I was dining with Mr. Harland, after the ladies had left the room, some gentleman proposed that I should will her to come back again, which I did. She came directly, and after this I could not go to the house without her going to sleep, even if she did not know that I was there.”

In the same letter Mr. Thompson continues :—

“ I have met with many cases of thought-reading, but none so distinct as in a little girl named Crowther. She had had brain fever, which had caused a protrusion of the eyes. Of this ill effect I soon relieved her, and found that she was naturally a thought-reader. I practised on her a good deal, and at length there was no need for me to utter what I wished to say, as she always knew my thoughts. I was showing some experiments to a Dr. Simpson, and he asked me to will her to go and pick a piece of white heather out of a large vase full of flowers there was in the room, and bring it to me. She did this as quickly as if I had spoken to her. All these experiments were performed when the girl was awake, and not in a mesmeric sleep.”

The next account (received in 1883) is none the less interesting that it is of a partial *failure* ; and in this case we have the advantage of the percipient's own testimony. The lady who sent it to us is a cousin of Mr. Thompson's and has had other similar experiences ; but at this distance of time can only recollect the following, whose absurdity vividly impressed her mind.

(6) “ I was sitting one day in the library. No one else was in the room except my cousin, Henry Thompson, who was reading at the other end of the room. Gradually I felt an unaccountable impulse stealing over me, an impulse to go up to him and kiss him. I had been in the habit of kissing him from childhood upwards at intervals, when I left the sitting-room

before going to bed, or when he came to say good-bye at the termination of a visit, &c., as a matter of course, not of pleasure. In this instance the inclination to kiss him struck me as being so extraordinary and ridiculous as to make it an impossibility. I have no recollection of leaving the room, though I *may* have done so, but in the evening when he said to me at dinner, 'I tried to will you to-day and failed,' I answered at once, 'I knew perfectly *when* you were willing me, and what you wanted me to do, though I did not suspect it at the time. But you were willing me to kiss you in the library, and I had the greatest inclination to do so!' 'And why would you not?' he asked, and laughed immoderately at my answering that I was so astonished at myself for feeling an inclination to kiss him that I resisted it at once. I had never been mesmerised by him, and my will was not subservient to his. L. F. C."

And here a word may be in place as to the relation of the *will* to telepathic experiments in general. That the will of the agent or operator is usually in active play, admits, of course, of no doubt; but the nature and extent of its operation are sometimes misconceived. In ordinary thought-transference, it is probably effective only so far as it implies strong concentration of the agent's own attention on the sensation or image which he seeks to convey. As a rule he will naturally desire that the experiment should succeed; but, provided only that the necessary concentration be given, there is nothing to show, or even to suggest that, if for some special reason he desired failure, his desire would ensure that result. It is somewhat different with cases like the above, where a distinct set of visible actions—as that the performer shall walk to a particular spot or select a particular object—is the thing aimed at; in so far as there the desire is likely to be keener and more persistent. When we are picturing a series of movements to be performed by a person in our sight, we easily come to regard that person's physique under a half-illusion that we can direct it from moment to moment, as though it were our own; and we are more on edge, so to speak, than when we are merely imagining (say) a word or a number, and waiting for the "subject" to name it, or write it down. But even here there is little foundation for the idea that the operator's will in any way *dominates* the other will, or that he succeeds by superior "strength of will" in any ordinary sense. It is still primarily an *image*, not any form of force, that is conveyed—but an image of *movement*, i.e., an image whose nervous correlate in the brain is in intimate connection with motor-centres; and the muscular effect is thus evoked while the "subject" remains a sort of spectator of his own conduct. The last example of Mr. Thompson's powers goes as near as any I know to the actual production of an effect on the *self-determining* faculty of a person in a normal state; but even here, it will be observed, the action suggested was of a simple sort, and one which the "subject" had often voluntarily performed. And in mesmeric cases—as in the experiments on inhibition of utterance in the last chapter—where, no doubt, the self-determining faculty is often to a great extent abrogated, we must still beware of concluding that the "subject's" will is dominated and directed this way or that by a series of special jets of energy. It is rather that his instinct of choice, his free-will as a whole, has lapsed, as one of the general features of the trance-condition.

It is worth noting, moreover, that in none of the cases quoted have the "willer" or the "willed" been further removed from one another than two neighbouring rooms. The liability to have definite acts compelled from a distance, which figures in romance and in popular imagination as the natural and terrible result of mesmeric influence, is precisely the result for which we can find least evidence.

We have, however, in our own collection, two first-hand instances where the distance between the agent and the percipient was greater, and where the action to be performed was of a rather more complicated sort. We received the following case in 1883 from the agent, Mr. S. H. B., a friend of our own. The first part of the account was copied by us from a MS. book, in which Mr. B. has recorded this and other experiments.

(7) "On Wednesday, 26th July, 1882, at 10.30 p.m., I willed very strongly that Miss V., who was living at Clarence Road, Kew, should leave any part of that house in which she might happen to be at the time, and that she should go into her bedroom, and remove a portrait from her dressing-table.

"When I next saw her she told me that at this particular time and on this day, she felt strongly impelled to go up to her room and remove something from her dressing-table, but she was not sure which article to misplace. She did so and removed an article, but not the framed portrait which I had thought of.

"Between the time of the occurrence of this fact and that of our next meeting, I received one or two letters, in which the matter is alluded to and any questions concerning it answered. S. H. B."¹

Mr. B. was himself at Southall on the evening in question. He has shown the letters of which he speaks to the present writer, and has allowed him to copy extracts.

On Thursday, July 27th, without having seen or had any communication with Mr. B., Miss Verity (now residing in Castellain Road, W., who allows the publication of her name) wrote to him as follows:—

"What were you doing between ten and eleven o'clock on Wednesday evening? If you make me so restless, I shall begin to be afraid of you. I positively *could not* stay in the dining-room, and I believe you meant me to be upstairs, and to move something on my dressing-table. I want to see if you know what it was. At any rate, I am *sure* you were thinking about me."

Mr. B. then wrote and told Miss Verity that the object he had thought of was Mr. G.'s photograph. She answered:—

"I must tell you it was not G.'s photo, but something on my table which perhaps you would never think of. However, it was really wonderful how impossible I found it to *think* or do anything until I came upstairs, and I *knew* for *certain* that your thoughts were *here*; in fact, it seemed as if you were very near."

[More than a year after these letters were written, an absolutely concordant account was given *viva voce* to the present writer by Miss Verity, whom he believes to be a thoroughly careful and conscientious witness.]

¹ This entry is undated; but Mr. B. assures us that it was written very soon after the event.

We have a parallel instance to this on equally trustworthy authority ; but the person impressed has a dread of the subject, and will not give his testimony for publication.

§ 4. I now turn to the second class of transitional cases ; that where *ideas* and *sensations* unconnected with movement are excited, in a person who is not a conscious party to the experiment, by the concentrated but unexpressed will of another. And here, even more than before, I have to admit how scanty in every sense are the accounts which former observers have published. Of *ideational* cases, one of the most striking, if correctly reported, is that given by the Rev. L. Lewis in the *Zoist*, vol. v., p. 324 [No. (8) not reproduced here.—ED.].

The following instance, however, has more weight with us, who know the observer, and have had ample proof of his accuracy. Mr. G. A. Smith, of 2, Elms Road, Dulwich (who has assisted us in most of our mesmeric work), narrated the incident to us within two months of its occurrence ; and has now supplied a written account.

(9) " One evening in September, 1882, at Brighton, I was trying some experiments with a Mrs. W., a ' subject ' whom I had frequently hypnotised. I found that she could give surprisingly minute descriptions of spots which she knew—with details which her normal recollection could never have furnished. I did not for a moment regard these descriptions as implying anything more than intensified memory, but resolved to see what would happen when she was requested to examine a place where she had *never been to*. I therefore requested her to look into the manager's room at the Aquarium, and to tell me all about it. Much to my surprise, she immediately began to describe the apartment with great exactness, and in perfect conformity with my own knowledge of it. I was fairly astonished ; but it occurred to me that although my subject's memory could not be at work, my own mind might be acting on hers. To test this, I imagined strongly that I saw a large open umbrella on the table, and in a minute or so the lady said, in great wonder : ' Well ! how odd, there's a large open umbrella on the table,' and then began to laugh. It, therefore, seemed clear that her apparent knowledge of the room had been derived somehow from my own mental picture of it ; but I may add I was never able to produce the same effect again."

This may be fairly reckoned among transitional cases, inasmuch as the lady was quite unaware at the time that any person's influence was being brought to bear upon her.

[Cases 687, 688, 689, 690, belonging to this and the previous section, which include important recent examples of telepathic results obtained by French men of science in connection with hypnotism, were given by Gurney in his " additional chapter," but are not reproduced here.—ED.]

§ 5. It will be seen that in both these last examples the agent and percipient were close together, and the latter was in the hypnotic state. And among transitional cases, we have absolutely no specimens of the deliberate transference of a perfectly unexciting idea—as of a card or a name—to a *distant* and *normal* percipient. This may appear an un-

fortunate *lacuna* in the transition that I am attempting to make; but the fact itself can hardly surprise us. It must be remembered that in most of our experimental cases there was a true analogy to the passivity of hypnotism, in the adjustment of the percipient's mind, the sort of inward blankness and receptivity which he or she established by a deliberate effort; that even where this was absent, the *rapport* involved in the mere sense of personal proximity to the agent probably went for something in the results; and also that (with few exceptions) the *sort* of image to be expected was known—that the percipient realised whether it was a card, a name, or a taste. That an impression should flash across a mind in this state of preparation is clearly no guarantee that anything similar will occur when the percipient is occupied with wholly different things, while the agent is secretly concentrating his thoughts on a card or a taste in another place. And indeed the supposed conditions—a purely unemotional idea on the part of the would-be agent, and a state of complete unpreparedness on the part of the person whom it is attempted to influence—seem the most unfavourable possible: where the percipient mind is unprepared—that is, where the condition on one side is unfavourable—we should naturally expect that a stronger impulsive force must be supplied from the other side. But we have further to note that, even if the trial succeeded, the success would be hard to establish. For to the percipient the impression would only be a fleeting and uninteresting item in the swarm of faint ideas that pass every minute through the mind; and as he is *ex hypothesi* ignorant that the trial is being made, there would be nothing to fix this particular faint item in his memory. It would come and go unmarked, like a thousand others. And this same possibility must be equally borne in mind in respect of *spontaneous* telepathy. For though in most of the cases to be quoted in the sequel, a special impulsive force will be inferred from the fact that the agent was at the time in a state psychically or physically abnormal, we must not be too positive that the telepathic action is confined to the well-marked or ostensive instances on which the *proof* of it has to depend. The abnormality of the agent's state, though needed to make the coincidence striking enough to be included in this book, may not for all that be an indispensable condition; genuine transferences of idea, of which we can take no account, may occur in the more ordinary conditions of life; and the continuity of the experimental and the spontaneous cases may thus conceivably be complete. Meanwhile, however, a certain gap in the evidence has to be admitted; and there is nothing for it but to pass on to the more extreme cases where the *senses* begin to be effected—the percipients having been for the most part in a normal state, and at various distances from the agents.

§ 6. The sensory cases to be found in the *Zoist* are a trifle less fragmentary than some that I have quoted, but depend again on the uncorroborated statement of a single observer. Mr. H. S. Thompson (vol. iv., p. 263) says:—

(10) “I have tried an amusing experiment two or three times very successfully. I have taken a party (without informing them of my

intentions) to witness some galvanic experiments, and whilst submitting myself to continued slight galvanic shocks, have fixed my attention on some one of the party. The first time I tried this I was much amused by the person soon exclaiming, 'Well, it is very strange, but I could fancy that I feel a sensation in my hands and arms as though I were subject to the action of the battery.' I found that out of seven persons, *four* experienced similar sensations more or less. None of them showed any symptom of being affected before I directed my attention towards them. After that [*sic*] they were made acquainted with the experiment, I found their imagination sometimes supplied the place of my will, and they fancied I was experimenting upon them when I was not so. This we so often see in other cases."

Muscular and tactile hallucinations are, of course, eminently of a sort which may be produced by expectancy; and all that can be said is that Mr. Thompson seems to have been alive to this danger. I may perhaps be allowed to state of this gentleman that, as far as we are aware (and we have questioned both a near relative of his and a bitter detractor), it was never alleged that he was an untrustworthy witness, or prone to exaggerate his powers.

The impression in the next example seems to have been on the borderland between sensation and idea. It is given by the Rev. L. Lewis in the paper referred to above (*Zoist*, vol. v.). His son had resolved to test the statement that in a mesmeric state a "subject" might, by the operator's unexpressed will, be impressed with delusions such as are usually only produced by direct suggestion.

(11) "The girl [one whom he had often hypnotised] being gone into the sleep, the first thing that occurred to him was that she should imagine herself a camphine lamp, which was then burning on the table. He wrote down the words, which were not uttered by anyone, and were handed to the company. Then, without speaking, he strongly willed that she should be a lamp, making over her head the usual magnetic passes. E. C. was in a few minutes perfectly immovable, and not a word could be elicited from her. When she had continued in this strange state for some time, he dissipated the illusion by his *will*, without awaking her, when she immediately found her tongue again, and on being asked how she had felt when she would not speak, she replied, 'Very hot, and full of naphtha.'"

The next case (contained in a letter from Mr. H. S. Thompson to Dr. Elliotson, *Zoist*, vol. v., p. 257) takes us a little further, for the agent and percipient were at a considerable distance from one another; and though the experience was of a vague sort, very much more was produced than a mere idea—namely, a physical impression of the agent's presence, strong enough to be described as *felt*.

(12) "I have tried several experiments on persons not in the mesmeric state, and some who had never been mesmerised. I have repeatedly found that I had been able, by will, to suggest a series of ideas to some persons, which ideas have induced corresponding actions; and again, by fixing my attention upon others, and thinking on some particular subject, I have often found them able most accurately to penetrate my thoughts. Neither have I observed that it was always necessary to be near them, or to be in

the same room with them, to produce these effects. . . . Some months ago I was staying at a friend's house, and this subject came under discussion. Two friends had left the house the day before.¹ Neither of them, that I am aware of, had ever been in the mesmeric state; but I knew that to some extent they had this faculty. I proposed to make trial whether I could will them to think I was coming to see them at that moment. I accordingly fixed my attention upon them for some little time. Six weeks elapsed before I saw either of them again; and when we met I had forgotten the circumstance, but one of them soon reminded me of it by saying, 'I have something curious to tell you, and want also to know whether you have ever tried to practise your power of volition upon either of us; for on the evening of the day I left the house where you were staying, I was sitting reading a book in the same room with Mr. ——. My attention was withdrawn from my book, and for some moments I felt as though a third person was in the room, and that feeling shortly after became connected with an idea that you were coming or even then present. This seemed so very absurd that I tried to banish the idea from my mind. I then observed that Mr. ———'s attention was also drawn from the book which he was reading, and he exclaimed, 'It is positively very ridiculous, but I could have sworn some third person was in the room, and that impression is connected with an idea of Henry Thompson.' "

§ 7. But the most pronounced cases are of course those where an actual affection of *vision* is produced. Here previous observations of an authentic sort almost wholly fail us. I have no wish to extenuate the negative importance of this fact. At the same time, it must be remembered how very exceptional, probably, are the occasions on which the experiment has been attempted. When the two persons concerned in a "willing" experiment have been together, the object, as a rule, has been to produce the effect which shall present the most obvious test for spectators or for the agent himself—namely, *motor* effects. And when some one of the few persons who possess an appreciable degree of the abnormal power has attempted to exercise it at a distance, it is still the production of *actions* that he would most naturally aim at; for it is in this direction that such a power has been popularly expected to show itself. Thus it is reasonable to conclude that deliberate attempts to produce a visual hallucination in another person, by the exercise of the will, have been very few and far between. Still this is, of course, no complete explanation of the rarity of the phenomenon; for no definable line separates these rare attempts from the ordinary experiments in thought-transference, when the agent concentrates his attention on a visible object. In those experiments there is, so to speak, an opportunity for a visual hallucination, if the agent is able to produce one. But the percipient has never (as far as I know) received more than a vivid idea, or at most a picture of the object in the mind's eye. And this fact sufficiently indicates that the more pronounced sensory result is one requiring most special conditions—one which would remain extremely rare however much it were sought for, and the proof of which will rightly be regarded with all the more jealous scrutiny.

¹ It seems practically certain, from what follows, that by "the day before" Mr. Thompson meant "earlier in the day." Otherwise the case would have had no relation to what he is speaking of.

The previous records of the phenomenon to which I can point are really only four in number ; and these are [for the most part] so far from conclusive, that they would hardly even be worth mentioning, if stronger examples could not be added from our own collection. The first case is thus meagrely described by Dr. Elliotson (*Zoist*, vol. viii., p. 69) :—

“ I have a friend, who can, by his will, make certain patients think of any others he chooses, and fancy he sees those persons : he silently thinking of certain persons, the brain of the patient sympathises with his brain. Nay, by silently willing that these persons shall say and do certain things which he chooses, he makes the patients believe they see these imaginary appearances doing and uttering those very things.”

That a man of indisputable ability should have thought such a statement of such a fact adequate is truly extraordinary. The same may be said of the following sentence of Dr. Charpignon's *Physiologie du Magnétisme* (Paris, 1848), p. 325 :—

“ Nous avons maintes fois formé dans notre pensée des images fictives, et les somnambules que nous questionnions voyaient ces images comme des réalités.”

Even if these descriptions be accurate in the main, we are unable to judge how far the vision was really *externalised* by the patients. In the next case this point is clear ; but the distinct assurance is still lacking that the agent was on his guard against the slightest approach to a suggestive movement. The incident is cited in the *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 6th series, vol. v., p. 379, by Dr. Dagonet, doctor at the Saint Anne Asylum.

“ Un interne [house-physician] lui dit : ‘ Regardez donc, Didier, voilà une jolie femme.’ Il n’y avait personne. Didier reprit : ‘ Mais non, elle est laide,’ et il ajoute : ‘ Qu’a-t-elle dans les bras ? ’ Ces questions se rapportaient exactement à ce que pensait son interlocuteur. A un certain moment Didier se précipita même pour empêcher de tomber l’enfant qu’il croyait voir dans les bras de la femme imaginaire dont on lui parlait.”

This is a specimen of the stray indications of thought-transference that may be found even in strictly scientific literature ; but the significance of the phenomenon seems to have been altogether missed. It is described among a number of observations of an ordinary kind, made on an habitual somnambulist, and as though it were quite on a par with the rest.

The next account, though like Dr. Charpignon's first-hand from the agent, is more remote, and [as Gurney knew it, was equally uncorroborated. He quotes it from an article by H. M. Wesermann in the *Archiv für den Thierischen Magnetismus*, vol. vi., pp. 136–9, dated Düsseldorf, June 15, 1819 ; but it seems better to substitute here what is practically the same account of the experiments with the addition of first-hand testimony by one of the percipients. It is translated from pp. 26–30 of a book, which Gurney had apparently not seen, entitled *Der Magne-*

tismus und die Allgemeine Weltsprache, published in 1822 by the same author, H. M. Wesermann, Government Assessor, and Chief Inspector of Roads at Düsseldorf, and a member of the Batavian Society for Experimental Philosophy at Rotterdam and of scientific societies at Jena, Bonn, and Düsseldorf. Wesermann was trying to transfer mental images to sleeping friends at a distance, and the first four items are of this nature, but the fifth is a waking and completely externalised hallucination.

*"First Experiment at a Distance of Five Miles (Meilen).—*I endeavoured to acquaint my friend, the Hofkammerrath G., whom I had not seen nor written to for thirteen years, with the fact of my intended visit, by presenting my form to him in his sleep, through the force of my will. When I unexpectedly went to him on the following evening, he evinced his astonishment at having seen me in a dream on the preceding night.

*"Second Experiment at a Distance of Three Miles.—*Madame W., in her sleep, was to hear a conversation between me and two other persons, relating to a certain secret; and when I visited her on the third day she told me all that had been said, and showed her astonishment at this remarkable dream.

*"Third Experiment at a Distance of One Mile.—*An aged person in G. was to see in a dream the funeral procession of my deceased friend S., and when I visited her on the next day her first words were that she had in her sleep seen a funeral procession, and on inquiry had learned that I was the corpse. Here then was a slight error.

*"Fourth Experiment at a Distance of One-Eighth of a Mile.—*Herr Doctor B. desired a trial to convince him, whereupon I represented to him a nocturnal street-brawl. He saw it in a dream, to his great astonishment. [This means, presumably, that he was astonished when he found that the actual subject of his dream was what Wesermann had been endeavouring to impress on him.]

*"Fifth Experiment at a Distance of Nine Miles.—*A lady, who had been dead five years, was to appear to Lieutenant —— in a dream at 10.30 p.m. and incite him to a good deed. At half-past ten, however, contrary to expectation, Herr —— had not gone to bed, but was discussing the French campaign with his friend Lieutenant S—— in the ante-room. Suddenly the door of the room opened, the lady entered dressed in white, with a black kerchief and uncovered head, greeted S—— with her hand three times in a friendly manner; then turned to ——, nodded to him, and returned again through the doorway.

"As this story, related to me by Lieutenant ——, seemed to be too remarkable from a psychological point of view for the truth of it not to be duly established, I wrote to Lieutenant S——, who was living six miles away, and asked him to give me his account of it. He sent me the following reply: ' . . . On the 13th of March, 1817, Herr —— came to pay me a visit at my lodgings about a league from A——. He stayed the night with me. After supper, and when we were both undressed, I was sitting on my bed and Herr —— was standing by the door of the next room on the point also of going to bed. This was about half-past ten. We were speaking partly about indifferent subjects and partly about the events of the French campaign. Suddenly the door out of the kitchen opened without a sound, and a lady entered, very pale, taller than Herr ——, about five feet four inches in height, strong and broad of figure, dressed in white, but with a large black kerchief which reached to below the waist. She entered with bare head, greeted me with

the hand three times in complimentary fashion, turned round to the left towards Herr ——n, and waved her hand to him three times ; after which the figure quietly, and again without any creaking of the door, went out. We followed at once in order to discover whether there was any deception, but found nothing. The strangest thing was this, that our night watch of two men whom I had shortly before found on the watch were now asleep, though at my first call they were on the alert, and that the door of the room, which always opens with a good deal of noise, did not make the slightest sound when opened by the figure. S.

“ ‘ D——n, January 11th, 1818.’ ”¹]

There is, fortunately, no necessity for dwelling on these [old] cases, as the possibility of the alleged phenomenon will certainly not be admitted except on the strength of *contemporary* and *corroborated* instances.

§ 8. In the examples that I am about to quote, one grave defect must at once be admitted. Though in all of them testimony is given by both agent and percipient [in all either agent or percipient], withhold their names from publication. We, of course, regret this restriction exceedingly ; but it can hardly be deemed unnatural or unreasonable. It must be remembered that these cases of apparitions intentionally produced stand in a most peculiar position, as compared even with the other remarkable incidents with which we are concerned in the present work. In the case of the more normal telepathic phantasm, neither party is in the least responsible for what occurs. A dies or breaks his leg ; B thinks that he sees A's form or hears his voice ; neither can help it ; if their experiences coincide, that is not their business ; perhaps it is a chance. But in the present class of cases, the agent *determines* to do something that to most of his educated fellow-creatures will appear a miracle ; and however little he himself may share that view, he may still have good grounds for shrinking from the reputation either of a miracle-worker or of a miracle-monger. The percipient's position is somewhat different ; but modern miracles are by no means tempting things to get publicly mixed up with, even for a person whose share in them has been passive. And the extreme rarity of the phenomenon is another daunting fact. For a single specimen of this deliberate type of phantasm, we have a hundred specimens of the wholly spontaneous type : and the witness who is willing to give his name for publication, where he is assured that he will find himself in numerous and respectable company, may fairly hesitate when aware that the incident he records is almost unexampled.

However, it may be hoped that this difficulty, like others, will gradually be removed by a modification of public opinion on the whole subject. Meanwhile, I can but give the evidence under the conditions imposed. In the first case, the agent is slightly known to us. The percipient is our friend, the Rev. W. Stainton Moses, who believes that he has kept a written memorandum of the incident, but has been prevented by a long illness, and by pressure of work, from hunting for it among a large mass of stored-away papers. The agent's account was written

¹ Other cases of the hallucination of a door opening or shutting are Nos. 15, 30, 190, etc.

in February, 1879, and includes a few purely verbal alterations made in 1883, when Mr. Moses pronounced it correct.

(13) "One evening early last year, I resolved to try to appear to Z, at some miles distance. I did not inform him beforehand of the intended experiment; but retired to rest shortly before midnight with thoughts intently fixed on Z, with whose room and surroundings, however, I was quite unacquainted. I soon fell asleep, and awoke next morning unconscious of anything having taken place. On seeing Z a few days afterwards, I inquired, 'Did anything happen at your rooms on Saturday night?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'a great deal happened. I had been sitting over the fire with M, smoking and chatting. About 12.30 he rose to leave, and I let him out myself. I returned to the fire to finish my pipe, when I saw you sitting in the chair just vacated by him. I looked intently at you, and then took up a newspaper to assure myself I was not dreaming, but on laying it down I saw you still there. While I gazed without speaking, you faded away. Though I imagined you must be fast asleep in bed at that hour, yet you appeared dressed in your ordinary garments, such as you usually wear every day.' 'Then my experiment seems to have succeeded,' said I. 'The next time I come, ask me what I want, as I had fixed on my mind certain questions I intended to ask you, but I was probably waiting for an invitation to speak.'

"A few weeks later the experiment was repeated with equal success. I, as before, not informing Z when it was made. On this occasion he not only questioned me on the subject which was at that time under very warm discussion between us, but detained me by the exercise of his will some time after I had intimated a desire to leave.¹ This fact, when it came to be communicated to me, seemed to account for the violent and somewhat peculiar headache which marked the morning following the experiment; at least I remarked at the time that there was no apparent cause for the unusual headache; and, as on the former occasion, no recollection remained of the event, or seeming event, of the preceding night."

Mr. Moses writes:—

"21, Birchington Road, N.W.

"September 27th, 1885.

"This account is, as far as my memory serves, exact; and, without notes before me, I cannot supplement it. W. STANTON MOSES."

Mr. Moses tells us that he has never on any other occasion seen the figure of a living person in a place where it was not.

The next case, otherwise similar, was more remarkable in that there were two percipients. The narrative has been copied by the present writer from a MS. book of Mr. S. H. B.'s, to which he transferred it from an almanack diary, since lost.

(14) "On a certain Sunday evening in November, 1881, having been reading of the great power which the human will is capable of exercising, I determined with the whole force of my being that I would be present

¹ As regards the interchange of remarks with a hallucinatory figure, see below, p. 476. But it is possible, of course, that this detail as to the prolonging of the interview has become magnified in memory; or that the second vision partook more of the nature of a dream than the first.

in spirit in the front bedroom on the second floor of a house situated at 22, Hogarth Road, Kensington, in which room slept two ladies of my acquaintance, viz., Miss L. S. V. and Miss E. C. V., aged respectively 25 and 11 years. I was living at this time at 23, Kildare Gardens, a distance of about 3 miles from Hogarth Road, and I had not mentioned in any way my intention of trying this experiment to either of the above ladies, for the simple reason that it was only on retiring to rest upon this Sunday night that I made up my mind to do so. The time at which I determined I would be there was 1 o'clock in the morning, and I also had a strong intention of making my presence perceptible.

"On the following Thursday I went to see the ladies in question, and, in the course of conversation (without any allusion to the subject on my part), the elder one told me, that, on the previous Sunday night, she had been much terrified by perceiving me standing by her bedside, and that she screamed when the apparition advanced towards her, and awoke her little sister, who saw me also.

"I asked her if she was awake at the time, and she replied most decidedly in the affirmative, and upon my inquiring the time of the occurrence, she replied, about 1 o'clock in the morning.

"This lady, at my request, wrote down a statement of the event and signed it.

"This was the first occasion upon which I tried an experiment of this kind, and its complete success startled me very much.

"Besides exercising my power of volition very strongly, I put forth an effort which I cannot find words to describe. I was conscious of a mysterious influence of some sort permeating in my body, and had a distinct impression that I was exercising some force with which I had been hitherto unacquainted, but which I can now at certain times set in motion at will.

S. H. B."

[Of the original entry in the almanack diary, Mr. B. says: "I recollect having made it within a week or so of the occurrence of the experiment, and whilst it was perfectly fresh in my memory."]

Miss Verity's account is as follows:—

"January 18th, 1883.

"On a certain Sunday evening, about twelve months since, at our house in Hogarth Road, Kensington, I distinctly saw Mr. B. in my room, about 1 o'clock. I was perfectly awake and was much terrified. I awoke my sister by screaming, and she saw the apparition herself. Three days after, when I saw Mr. B., I told him what had happened; but it was some time before I could recover from the shock I had received, and the remembrance is too vivid to be ever erased from my memory.

L. S. VERITY."

In answer to inquiries Miss Verity adds:—

"I had never had any hallucination of the senses of any sort whatever."

Miss E. C. Verity says:—

"I remember the occurrence of the event described by my sister in the annexed paragraph, and her description is quite correct. I saw the apparition which she saw, at the same time and under the same circumstances.

E. C. VERITY."

Miss A. S. Verity says:—

“ I remember quite clearly the evening my eldest sister awoke me by calling to me from an adjoining room ; and upon my going to her bedside, where she slept with my youngest sister, they both told me they had seen S. H. B. standing in the room. The time was about 1 o'clock. S. H. B. was in evening dress, they told me.¹ A. S. VERITY.”

[Miss E. C. Verity was asleep when her sister caught sight of the figure, and was awoke by her sister's exclaiming, “ There is S.” The name had therefore met her ear before she herself saw the figure ; and the hallucination on her part might thus be attributed to suggestion. But it is against this view that she has never had any other hallucination, and cannot therefore be considered as predisposed to such experiences. The sisters are both equally certain that the figure was in evening dress, and that it stood in one particular spot in the room. The gas was burning low, and the phantasmal figure was seen with far more clearness than a real figure would have been.

The witnesses have been very carefully cross-examined by the present writer. There is not the slightest doubt that their mention of the occurrence to S. H. B. was spontaneous. They had not at first intended to mention it ; but when they saw him, their sense of its oddness overcame their resolution. I have already said that I regard Miss Verity as a careful and conscientious witness ; I may add that she has no love of marvels, and has a considerable dread and dislike of this particular form of marvel.]

The next case of Mr. S. H. B.'s is different in this respect, that the percipient was not consciously present to the agent's mind on the night that he made his attempt. The account is copied from the MS. book mentioned above.

(15) “ On Friday, December 1st, 1882, at 9.30 p.m., I went into a room alone and sat by the fireside, and endeavoured so strongly to fix my mind upon the interior of a house at Kew (viz., Clarence Road), in which resided Miss V. and her two sisters, that I seemed to be actually in the house. During this experiment I must have fallen into a mesmeric sleep, for although I was conscious I could not move my limbs. I did not seem to have lost the power of moving them, but I could not make the effort to do so, and my hands, which lay loosely on my knees, about 6 inches apart, felt involuntarily drawn together and seemed to meet, although I was conscious that they did not move.

“ At 10 p.m. I regained my normal state by an effort of the will, and then took a pencil and wrote down on a sheet of note-paper the foregoing statements.

“ When I went to bed on this same night, I determined that I would be in the front bedroom of the above-mentioned house at 12 p.m., and remain there until I had made my spiritual presence perceptible to the inmates of that room.

“ On the next day, Saturday, I went to Kew to spend the evening, and met there a married sister of Miss V. (viz., Mrs. L.). This lady I had only met once before, and then it was at a ball two years previous to the above date. We were both in fancy dress at the time, and as we did not exchange more than half-a-dozen words, this lady would naturally have lost any vivid recollection of my appearance, even if she had remarked it.

¹ Mr. B. does not remember how he was dressed on the night of the occurrence.

"In the course of conversation (although I did not think for a moment of asking her any questions on such a subject), she told me that on the previous night she had seen me distinctly upon two occasions. She had spent the night at Clarence Road, and had slept in the front bedroom. At about half-past 9 she had seen me in the passage, going from one room to another, and at 12 p.m., when she was wide awake, she had seen me enter the bedroom and walk round to where she was sleeping, and take her hair (which is very long) into my hand. She also told me that the apparition took hold of her hand and gazed intently into it, whereupon she spoke, saying, 'You need not look at the lines, for I have never had any trouble.' She then awoke her sister, Miss V., who was sleeping with her, and told her about it. After hearing this account, I took the statement which I had written down on the previous evening, from my pocket, and showed it to some of the persons present, who were much astonished although incredulous.

"I asked Mrs. L. if she was not dreaming at the time of the latter experience, but this she stoutly denied, and stated that she had forgotten what I was like, but seeing me so distinctly she recognised me at once.

"Mrs. L. is a lady of highly imaginative temperament, and told me that she had been subject, since childhood, to psychological fancies,¹ &c., but the wonderful coincidence of the time (which was exact) convinced me that what she told me was more than a flight of the imagination. At my request she wrote a brief account of her impressions and signed it.

"S. H. B."

[Mr. B. was at Southall when he made this trial. He tells me that the above account was written down about ten days after the experiment, and that it embodies the entry made in his rough diary on the night of the trial.]

The following is the lady's statement, which was forwarded to Mr. B., he tells us, "within a few weeks of the occurrence."

"8, Wordsworth Road, Harrow.

"On Friday, December 1st, 1882, I was on a visit to my sister, 21, Clarence Road, Kew, and about 9.30 p.m. I was going from my bedroom to get some water from the bathroom, when I distinctly saw Mr. S. B., whom I had only seen once before, about two years ago, walk before me past the bathroom, towards the bedroom at the end of the landing. About 11 o'clock we retired for the night, and about 12 o'clock I was still awake, and the door opened² and Mr. S. B. came into the room and walked round to the bedside, and there stood with one foot on the ground and the other knee resting on a chair. He then took my hair into his hand, after which he took my hand in his, and looked very intently into the palm. 'Ah,' I said (speaking to him), 'you need not look at the lines, for I never had any trouble.' I then awoke my sister; I was not nervous, but excited, and began to fear some serious illness would befall her, she being delicate at the time, but she is progressing more favourably now.

"H. L." [Full name signed.]

¹ Asked to explain this phrase, Mr. B. says: "I have never heard of Mrs. L. having had any *hallucinations*. The fancies I alluded to were simply a few phenomena accounted for on the ground of 'telepathic' rapport between herself and Mr. L., such as having a distinct impression that he was coming home unexpectedly (whilst absent in the North of England), and finding on several occasions that the impressions were quite correct."

² See p. 82, note; see also p. 92.

Miss Verity corroborates as follows :—

" I can remember quite well Mrs. L.'s mentioning her two visions—one at 9.30 and one at 12—at the time, and before S. H. B. came. *When he came*, my sister told him, and immediately he took a card (or paper, I forget which) out of his pocket, containing an account of the previous evening. I consider this testimony quite as good as if Mrs. L. were giving it, because I can recall *so well* these two days.

" My sister has told me that she never experienced any hallucination of the senses except on this occasion. L. S. VERITY."

The present writer requested Mr. B. to send him a note on the night that he intended to make his next experiment of the kind, and received the following note by the first post on Monday, March 24th, 1884.

" March 22nd, 1884.

(16) " DEAR MR. GURNEY,—I am going to try the experiment to-night of making my presence perceptible at 44, Norland Square, at 12 p.m. I will let you know the result in a few days.—Yours very sincerely,

" S. H. B."

The next letter was received in the course of the following week :—

" April 3rd, 1884.

" DEAR MR. GURNEY,—I have a strange statement to show you, respecting my experiment, which was tried at your suggestion, and under the test conditions which you imposed.

" Having quite forgotten which night it was on which I attempted the projection, I cannot say whether the result is a brilliant success, or only a slight one, until I see the letter which I posted you on the evening of the experiment.

" Having sent you that letter, I did not deem it necessary to make a note in my diary, and consequently have let the exact date slip my memory.

" If the dates correspond, the success is complete in every detail, and I have an account signed and witnessed to show you.

" I saw the lady (who was the subject) for the first time last night, since the experiment, and she made a voluntary statement to me, which I wrote down at her dictation, and to which she has attached her signature. The date and time of the apparition are specified in this statement, and it will be for you to decide whether they are identical with those given in my letter to you. I have completely forgotten, but yet I fancy that they are the same. S. H. B."

This is the statement :—

" 44, Norland Square, W.

" On Saturday night, March 22nd, 1884, at about midnight, I had a distinct impression that Mr. S. H. B. was present in my room, and I distinctly saw him whilst I was quite widely awake. He came towards me, and stroked my hair. I *voluntarily* gave him this information, when he called to see me on Wednesday, April 2nd, telling him the time and the circumstances of the apparition, without any suggestion on his part. The appearance in my room was most vivid, and quite unmistakable.

" L. S. VERITY."

Miss A. S. Verity corroborates as follows:—

“ I remember my sister telling me that she had seen S. H. B., and that he had touched her hair, *before* he came to see us on April 2nd. A. S. V.”

Mr. B.’s own account is as follows:—

“ On Saturday, March 22nd, I determined to make my presence perceptible to Miss V., at 44, Norland Square, Notting Hill, at 12 midnight, and as I had previously arranged with Mr. Gurney that I should post him a letter on the evening on which I tried my experiment (stating the time and other particulars), I sent a note to acquaint him with the above facts.

“ About ten days afterwards I called upon Miss V., and she voluntarily told me, that on March 22nd, at 12 o’clock midnight, she had seen me so vividly in her room (whilst widely awake) that her nerves had been much shaken, and she had been obliged to send for a doctor in the morning.

“ S. H. B.”

[Unfortunately Mr. B.’s intention to produce the impression of touching the percipient’s hair is not included in his written account. On August 21st, 1885, he wrote to me, “ I remember that I had this intention ”; and I myself remember that, very soon after the occurrence, he mentioned this as one of the points which made the success “ complete in every detail ”; and that I recommended him in any future trial to endeavour instead to produce the impression of some spoken phrase.]

It will be observed that in all these instances the conditions were the same—the agent concentrating his thoughts on the object in view before going to sleep. Mr. B. has never succeeded in producing a similar effect when he has been awake. And this restriction as to time has made it difficult to devise a plan by which the phenomenon could be tested by independent observers, one of whom might arrange to be in the company of the agent at a given time, and the other in that of the percipient. Nor is it easy to press for repetitions of the experiment, which is not an agreeable one to the percipient, and is followed by a considerable amount of nervous prostration. Moreover, if trials were frequently made with the same percipient, the value of success would diminish; for any latent expectation on the recipient’s part might be argued to be itself productive of the delusion, and the coincidence with the agent’s resolve might be explained as accidental. We have, of course, requested Mr. B. to try to produce the effect on ourselves; but though he has more than once made the attempt, it has not succeeded. We can therefore only wait, in the hope that time will bring fresh opportunities, and that other persons may be induced to make the trial.¹

The following [similar case was received after publication of the book, and was inserted in “ Additions and Corrections ” in later issues. It adds to its interest that it was] directly due to the publication of this

¹ Since this was written two further cases have been received—Nos. 685 and 686 in the Additional Chapter at the end of vol. ii. [No. 685 has, however, since broken down (see *Proceedings S.P.R.*, vol. xiv., p. 114), and No. 686 being rather remote, is not reproduced in the present edition. It is, however, interesting as the agent was awake and in a normal state.—ED.]

book. The receipt of it justifies us in hoping that we may encounter more like it. On November 16th, 1886, the Rev. C. Godfrey, of 5, The Goffs, Eastbourne, wrote to Mr. Podmore as follows :—

“ I was so impressed by the account on p. 105, that I determined to put the matter to an experiment.

“ Retiring at 10.45, I determined to appear, if possible, to [a friend], and accordingly I set myself to work, with all the volitional and determinative energy which I possess, to stand at the foot of her bed. I need not say that I never dropped the slightest hint beforehand as to my intention, such as would mar the experiment, nor had I mentioned the subject to her. As the ‘ agent,’ I may describe my own experiences.

“ Undoubtedly the *imaginative* faculty was brought extensively into play, as well as the volitional ; for I endeavoured to *translate myself*, spiritually, into the room, and to attract her attention, as it were, while standing there. My effort was sustained for perhaps 8 minutes, after which I felt tired, and was soon asleep.

“ The next thing I was conscious of was meeting the lady next morning, (*i.e.*, in a dream, I suppose ?) and asking her at once if she had seen me last night. The reply came ‘ Yes.’ ‘ How ? ’ I inquired. Then in words strangely clear and low, like a well-audible whisper, came the answer, ‘ I was sitting beside you.’ These words, so clear, awoke me instantly, and I felt I must have been dreaming ; but on reflection, I remembered what I had been ‘ willing ’ before I fell asleep ; and it struck me, ‘ This must be a *reflex* action from the percipient.’

“ My watch showed 3.40 a.m. The following is what I wrote immediately in pencil, standing in my night-dress :—‘ As I reflected upon those clear words, they struck me as being quite *intuitive*—I mean *subjective*, and to have proceeded *from within*, as *my own* conviction, rather than a communication from anyone else.¹ And yet I can’t remember her face at all, as one can after a vivid dream ! ’

“ But the words were uttered in a clear, quick tone, which was most remarkable, and awoke me at once.

“ My friend, in the note with which she sent me the enclosed account of *her own* experience, says : ‘ I remember the man put all the lamps out soon after I came upstairs, and that is only done about a quarter to 4.’ ”

Mr. Godfrey went next morning to see someone who resided in the same house as Mrs. —, and was leaving, when “ she called out to me from the window that she had something special to tell me ; but being very busy, I could not return again into the house, and replied to the effect that it would keep. I am not quite certain now² whether it was on

¹ At first sight, this seems inconsistent with the idea of the “ reflex ” or reciprocal action in the preceding paragraph. But Mr. Godfrey explains what he means as follows : “ I was dreaming : reflection convinced me that the particular words were not uttered in course of *natural* dream, but by reflex [reciprocal] action : also that they proceeded from *myself*, and not from any one standing over my bed in the room. It was ‘ from any one else ’ that confused my meaning. I meant any one *in the room*, not any one in another house : from *her* they clearly *did* proceed.” There does not seem, however, to be any such proof of reciprocal action as Mr. Godfrey supposes ; no reason appears why his dream should not have been purely subjective.

² The letter here quoted was written to me on Jan. 13, 1887. Mr. Podmore says that it entirely accords with Mr. Godfrey’s and Mrs. —’s independent *vivâ voce* accounts given on the previous Nov. 22. The reason why these details were not included in Mr. Podmore’s notes was that at the moment he was under the impression that they had been mentioned in Mr. Godfrey’s first letter, which was in my possession.

the afternoon of the same day, or later in the morning, that she called. I asked her, *as usual* [for she suffered from neuralgia], if she had had a good night, and she at once commenced to narrate as I have told you. When she had told me all, I begged her at once to go home and write it down. The account which I sent to you was the result; and it compared accurately with a few scribbled notes in pencil which I had hastily jotted down as she was relating it to me originally."

The following is the percipient's account:—

"Yesterday, viz., the morning of Nov. 16, 1886, about half-past 3 o'clock, I woke up with a start, and an idea that someone had come into the room. I also heard a curious sound, but fancied it might be the birds in the ivy outside. Next I experienced a strange, restless longing to leave the room and go downstairs. This feeling became so overpowering that at last I rose, and lit a candle; and went down, thinking if I could get some soda-water it might have a quieting effect. On returning to my room, I saw Mr. Godfrey standing under the large window on the staircase. He was dressed in his usual style, and with an expression on his face that I have noticed when he has been looking very earnestly at anything. He stood there, and I held up the candle and gazed at him for 3 or 4 seconds in utter amazement; and then, as I passed up the staircase, he disappeared. The impression left on my mind was so vivid that I fully intended waking a friend who occupied the same room as myself; but remembering I should only be laughed at as romantic and imaginative, refrained from doing so.

"I was not frightened at the appearance of Mr. Godfrey, but felt much excited and could not sleep afterwards."

In conversation with Mrs. — (Nov. 22, 1886), Mr. Podmore learnt that she is a good sleeper, and not given to waking at nights. She does not remember ever before having experienced anything like the feeling which she had on first waking up. She was at the bottom of the stairs when she saw Mr. Godfrey's figure, which appeared on the landing, about 11 steps up. It was quite distinct and life-like at first,—though she does not remember noticing more than the upper part of the body; as she looked, it grew more and more shadowy, and finally faded away. It must be added that she has seen in her life two other phantasmal appearances, which represented a parent whom she had recently lost. But a couple of experiences of this sort, coming at a time of emotional strain, cannot be regarded as a sign of any abnormal liability to subjective hallucinations (see p. 330); and even if she was destined anyhow to experience one other, the chances against its representing one particular member of her acquaintance, at the very time when he happened for the first time in his life to be making the effort above described, would be at least many hundreds of thousands to 1.

We requested Mr. Godfrey to make another trial, without of course giving Mrs. — any reason to expect that he would do so. He made a trial at once, thinking that we wanted the result immediately, though he himself thought the time unsuitable; and this was a failure. But on Dec. 8, 1886, he wrote as follows:—

"My friend Mrs. — has just been in, and given me an account of what she experienced last night; she is gone home to write it out for you, and it will be enclosed with mine. I can state that I have not attempted one experiment since I last communicated with you; therefore there are no failures to record. I was at Mrs. —'s house last evening, and she testifies this morning that she had not the faintest suspicion that I intended

attempting another experiment. The *first* words she used on seeing me this morning were (laughingly), 'Well, I saw you last night, anyway.'

"All the interest, as on the former occasion, of course lies with the percipient. I may simply explain that I acted as on the former occasion—viz., concentrated my attention on the percipient, while I was undressing; then devoted some 10 minutes, when in bed, to intense effort to transport myself to her presence, and make my presence felt both by *voice* and *touch*,—viz., placing my hand upon the percipient's head. Then I fell asleep, slept well, and was conscious of nothing sufficiently vivid to *awake* me.

"Directly I awoke at my usual time, about 6.40 a.m., I guessed that I had succeeded, because I instantly remembered that I had dreamt (as last time) of meeting the lady next day, and asking her the same question—viz., whether she had seen me, and the answer was, 'Yes, I saw you indistinctly.' This reflex action is very important, and I would undertake to tell, on any occasion, whether I had failed or succeeded. The words of reply (above) were written down by me on paper¹ before hearing the percipient's account.

"This case is, I think, very instructive, because of the *sound* of voice, as well as of *sight*."

Mr. Godfrey adds that Mrs. —, though she appeared in good spirits, had been "frightened and a little unnerved"; and that he should not feel justified in repeating the experiment.

The percipient's account, written on December 8th, 1886, is as follows:—

"Last night, Tuesday, Dec. 7th, I went upstairs at half-past 10. I remember distinctly locking the bedroom door, which this morning, to my astonishment, was unlocked. I was soon asleep, and had a strange dream of taking flowers to a grave. Suddenly I heard a voice say 'Wake,' and felt a hand rest on the left side of my head. (I was lying on the right side.) I was wide awake in a second, and heard a curious sound in the room, something like a Jew's harp. I felt a cold breath streaming over me, and violent palpitation of the heart came on; and I also distinctly saw a figure leaning over me. The only light in the room was from the lamp outside, which makes a long line on the wall over the wash-stand. This line was partly obscured by the figure. I turned round at once, and the hand seemed to slip from my head to the pillow beside me. The figure was stooping over me, and I felt it leaning up against the side of the bed. I saw the arm resting on the pillow the whole time it remained. I saw an outline of the face, but it seemed as if a mist were before it. I think the time when it came must have been about half-past 12. It had drawn the curtain of the bed slightly back, but this morning I noticed it was hanging straight as usual. The figure was undoubtedly that of Mr. Godfrey. I knew it by the appearance of the shoulders and the shape of the face. The whole time it remained, there was a draught of cold air streaming through the room, as if both door and window were open. I heard the dining-room clock strike half-past something; and as I could

¹ As to this note, and the one made on the former occasion, Mr. Godfrey writes, "I am very sorry that I never kept the scraps of newspaper edge upon which I jotted down my reflections, and the words which reached me, in the middle of the night. I jotted them down to exclude any invalidation of the inferences on score of defective memory; not thinking it needful to retain them as a check, when I had copied from them into my letters, they were committed to the flames."

not sleep again, but heard the clock strike hours and half-hours consecutively up to 5 o'clock, I think I am right in saying the time was half-past 12."

I have drawn attention (pp. 125-6, and p. 467) to the fact that the first-hand evidence for telepathic experiences includes no reports of physical changes produced in the material world—which, if they occurred, would be impossible to account for by the hypothesis of a temporary psychical transference from one mind to another. A percipient may have the hallucination of seeing the door opening (p. 82, note); but the door not having really been moved, it of course is not afterwards found open. So, in the above account, the curtain, which seemed to the percipient to be shifted at the time of her experience, was found in its place in the morning. On the other hand, the door, which she says that she had locked, was found unlocked. On being questioned as to this, she replies that the door is habitually locked at night, and that she does not walk in her sleep; but she thinks it probable that, after locking the door, she left the room to get some matches, and that she omitted to lock it again on her return. If anyone, after this, should be inclined to connect the unlocking with the apparition, I would suggest to him that a "ghost" which has shown its capacity to walk through a closed hall-door would, on finding a bedroom door locked *on the inside*, be more likely to walk through it than to unlock it.

§ 9. Even a reader who can sufficiently rely on our knowledge of the witnesses to feel that the evidence in these last-described cases is important, may find an objection of another kind. He may question our right to make any *theoretic connection* between them and the experimental results before discussed. I have called the phenomena of the present chapter *transitional*, and have pointed out the way in which they form a bridge from the experimental thought-transference of the last chapter to the spontaneous telepathy that will occupy us for the future. But it may seem that the line of connection is after all only an external one; and that there is a deep essential difference—a gulf which cannot be thus lightly crossed—between the more ordinary facts of thought-transference and these apparitions of the agent. It is not only that in the latter the percipient's impression has been of an external object—of something not merely flashed on the mind, but independently located in space: that might be a mere question of degree. The more radical difference is this—that what the one party perceived was not that on which the mind of the other party had been concentrated. In a "thought-transference" experiment of the normal type, the percipient's image or idea of a card or diagram is due (as we hold) to the fact that the agent has been directing his attention to that very image or idea. But in the case of these will-produced phantasms, the agent has not been picturing his own visible aspect. So far as he has been thinking of himself at all, it has been not of his aspect particularly, but of his personality, and of his personality in relation to the percipient. It is thus probable that the *percipient's* aspect has formed a larger part of the agent's whole idea than his own; yet it is *his* aspect, and nothing else, that is telepathically perceived. And a similar departure from the normal experimental type will meet us again in the large majority of the *spontaneous* telepathic cases. In some of these, the content of the agent's mind, at the time

when the percipient received some sensory impression of him, has been a forcible idea of the percipient, and of himself in relation to the percipient; in others, we shall find that even this bond was lacking, and that the percipient's impression cannot be even loosely identified with any part of the conscious contents of the agent's mind.

These facts have, no doubt, a very real theoretic importance: they reveal a certain incompleteness in the transition which I have been endeavouring to make. As long as the impression in the percipient's mind is merely a reproduction of that in the agent's mind, it is possible to conceive some sort of *physical* basis for the fact of the transference. The familiar phenomena of the transmission and reception of vibratory energy are ready to hand as analogies—the effect, for instance, of a swinging pendulum on another of equal length attached to the same solid support; or of one tuning-fork or string on another of the same pitch; or of glowing particles of a gas on cool molecules of the same substance. Still more tempting are the analogies of magnetic and electrical induction. A permanent magnet brought into a room will throw any surrounding iron into a similar condition; an electric current in one coil of wire will induce a current in a neighbouring coil; though here even the medium of communication is unknown. So it is possible to conceive that vibration-waves, or nervous induction, are a means whereby activity in one brain may evoke a kindred activity in another—with, of course, a similar correspondence of psychical impressions. Even here, perhaps, the conception should rather be regarded as a metaphor than an analogy. We have only to remember that the effect of all the known physical forces diminishes with distance—whereas we shall find reason to think that, under appropriate conditions, an idea may be telepathically reproduced on the other side of the world as easily as on the other side of the room. The employment, therefore, of words like *force*, *impulse*, *impact*, in speaking of telepathic influences, must not be held to imply the faintest suspicion of what the force is, or any hypothesis whatever which would co-ordinate it with the recognised forces of the material world. Not only, as with other delicate phenomena of life and thought, is the *subjective* side of the problem the only one that we can yet attempt to analyse: we do not even know where to look for the *objective* side. If there really is a physical counterpart to the *fact* of transmission—over and above the movements in the two brains which are the *termini* of the transmission—that counterpart remains wholly unknown to us.

But a much more serious difficulty in the way of any physical conception of telepathy presents itself as soon as we pass to the cases where the image actually present in the agent's mind is no longer reproduced in the percipient's. A is dying at a distance; B sees his form. We may perhaps trace a relation between the processes in their two minds; but it certainly does not amount to anything like identity or distinct parallelism. That being so, there can be no such simple and immediate concordance as we have supposed between the nervous vibrations of their two brains; and that being so, there is no obvious means of translating into physical terms the causal connection between their experiences. This difficulty will take a somewhat different aspect when we come later to consider the part which the mind's *unconscious* operations may bear

in telepathic phenomena. We may see grounds for thinking that a considerable community of experience (especially in emotional relations) between two persons may involve nervous records sufficiently similar to retain for one another some sort of revivable affinity, even when the experience has long lost its vividness for conscious memory. Meanwhile it is best to admit the difficulty without reserve, and to state in the most explicit way that in the *rapprochement* between experimental thought-transference and spontaneous telepathic impressions we are confining ourselves to the *psychical* aspect; we connect the phenomena as being in all cases affections of one mind by another, occurring otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense. The objector may urge that if we have not, we ought to have, a *physical* theory which will embrace all the phenomena—that we ought not to talk about a *rappori* between A's mind and B's unless we can establish a *bridge* between their two brains. This seems rather to assume that the standing puzzle of the relation between cerebral and psychical events *in the individual*, B, can only be stated in one crude form—viz., that the former are prior and *produce* the latter; and though for ordinary purposes such an expression is convenient, the convenience has its dangers. Still, as the converse proposition—that the psychical events are the prior—would be equally dangerous, a *crux* remains which we cannot evade. Since we cannot doubt that B's unwonted experience has its appropriate cerebral correlate, we have to admit that the energy of B's brain is directed in a way in which it would not be directed but for something that has happened to A. In this physical effect it is impossible to assume that an external physical antecedent is not involved; and the relation of the antecedent to the effect is, as I have pointed out, hard to conceive, when the neural tremors in A's brain are so unlike the neural tremors in B's brain as they must presumably be when A's mind is occupied with his immediate surroundings, or with the idea of death, and B's mind is occupied with a sudden and unaccountable impression or vision of A.

But however things may be on the physical plane, the facts recorded in this book are purely *psychical* facts; and on the psychical plane it is possible to give to a heterogeneous array of them a certain orderly coherence, and to present them as a graduated series of natural phenomena. Can it be asserted that this treatment is illegitimate unless a concurrent physical theory can also be put forward? It is surely allowable to do one thing at a time. There is an unsolved mystery in the background; that we grant and remember; but it need not perpetually oppress us. After all, is there not that standing mystery of the cerebral and mental correlation in the individual—a mystery equally unsolved and perhaps more definitely and radically insoluble—at the background of every fact and doctrine of the recognised psychology? The psychologists work on as if it did not exist, or rather as if it were the most natural and intelligible thing in the world, and no one complains of them. All that we claim is a similar freedom.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL CRITICISM OF THE EVIDENCE FOR SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

§ 1. WE have now to quit the experimental branch of our subject. We have been engaged, so far, with cases of thought-transference deliberately sought for and observed within the four walls of a room, both the agent and the percipient being aware of the object in view; and with the further cases where—though the distance between the agent and the percipient was often greater, and the latter had no intimation of what was intended—there was still a deliberate desire on the agent's part to exert a telepathic influence, and a concentration of his mind on that object. For the remainder of our course we shall be entirely occupied with cases where no such desire or idea existed—where the effect produced on the percipient, though we may connect it with the state of the agent, was certainly not an effect which he was aiming at producing. And this change in the character of the facts is accompanied by a marked change in the character of the evidence—a change for which some of the transitional cases in the last chapter have already prepared us. Our conclusions will now have to be drawn from the records of persons who, at the time when the phenomena which they describe took place, were quite unaware that these would ever be used as evidence for telepathy or anything else. Nor have my colleagues and I any observations of our own to compare with what our witnesses tell us; the facts are known to us only through the medium of their report, and we shall have to decide how far the medium may be a distorting one. Our method of inquiry will thus be the historical method; and success will depend upon the exercise of a wider and less specialised form of common-sense than was required in the experimental work. A great many more points have to be taken into account in weighing human testimony than in arranging the conditions of a crucial trial of thought-transference. There, one precise and simple form of danger had to be guarded against—the possibility of conscious or unconscious physical signs: here, dangers multifarious and indeterminate will have to be allowed for. We shall be brought face to face with questions of character, of the general behaviour of human beings in various circumstances, and of the unconscious workings of the human mind; and a quite different sort of logic must come into play, involving often a very complex estimate of probabilities.

So all-important is it for our purpose to form a correct judgment as to the possible sources of error in this new department of evidence,

that I have thought it best to devote the present chapter entirely to that subject.

§ 2. First, then, to face the most general objection of all. This may perhaps be stated as follows. All manner of false beliefs have in their day been able to muster a considerable amount of evidence in their support, much of which was certainly not consciously fraudulent. The form of superstition varies with the religious and educational conditions of the time ; but within certain limits a diligent collector will be able to obtain evidence for pretty well anything that he chooses. There is, of course, a line—and every age will have its own line—beyond which it would be impossible for anyone who wished to be thought sane and educated to go ; for instance, it would be impossible in the present day to obtain anything like respectable contemporary testimony for the transformation of old women into hares and cats. But short of this line there is always a range of ideas and beliefs as to which opinion is divided—which it is perfectly allowable to repudiate, and which science may treat with scorn, but which it is not a sign of abnormal ignorance or stupidity to entertain. And within this range evidence, and even educated evidence, for the beliefs will pretty certainly be forthcoming. For however much advancing knowledge may have limited the field of superstition, the fund of possibilities in the way of mal-observation, misinterpretation, and exaggeration of facts is still practically inexhaustible ; and with such a fund to draw on, the belief, or the mere desire or tendency to believe, in any particular order of phenomena is sure, now and again, to light on facts which can be made to yield the semblance of a proof.

Now, though it is difficult to deny the force of this argument when stated in general terms, I think that it can be shown not seriously to invalidate the evidence which is here relied on as proof of the reality of spontaneous telepathy. For the sake of comparison, it will be worth while to glance at the most striking example that modern times supply of the support of false beliefs by a large array of contemporary evidence—the case of witchcraft.

We may begin by excluding the enormous amount of the witch-evidence which consisted in confessions extracted by torture, terror, or false promises—"the casting evidence in most tryals," as Hutchinson says ; and also the large class of cases where the actual facts attested would not be disputed ;—as where a woman was condemned because a child who had been with her hung its head on its return home, and rolled over in its cradle in the evening ; or because a good many people or cattle had fallen sick in her village ; or because she kept a tame frog, presumed to be her "imp" ; or because on the very day that she had scolded a carter whose cart knocked up against her house, the self-same cart stuck in a gate, and the men who should have emptied it at night felt too tired to do so.¹ Putting these cases aside as irrelevant, anyone

¹ Lilienthal, *Die Hexenprocesse der beiden Städte Braunsberg* (Königsberg, 1861), p. 152 ; *A Detection of Chelmsford Witches* (London, 1579) ; *Malleus Maleficarum* (Lyons, 1620), vol. i., p. 242 ; Müller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hexenglaubens* (Brunswick, 1854), p. 35, etc. ; Ady, *Candle in the Dark* (London, 1656), p. 135 ; Hutchinson, *Historical Essay Concerning Witchcraft* (London, 1720), p. 147.

who looks carefully into the remaining records will find (1) that the actual testimony on which the alleged facts were believed came exclusively from the uneducated classes; and (2) that the easy acceptance of this evidence by better educated persons was due to the ignorance which was at that time all but universal respecting several great departments of natural phenomena—those of hallucination, trance, hysteria, and mesmerism. This ignorance took effect in the following way—that every piece of evidence to marvellous facts was perforce regarded as presenting one simple alternative:—either the facts happened as alleged; or the witnesses must be practising deliberate fraud. The latter hypothesis was, of course, an easy one enough to make in respect of this or that individual case, and was supported by indisputable examples; but it could not long be applied in any wholesale manner. The previous character of many of the persons involved, the aimlessness of such a fraud, the vast scale of the conspiracy which would have had to be organised in order to impose it on the world, and above all the fact that many of the witnesses brought on themselves nothing but opprobrium and persecution by their statements, made it practically impossible to doubt that the testimony was on the whole honestly given. Fraud, then, being excluded, there remained nothing but to believe the facts genuine. Sane men and women spoke with obvious sincerity of what they had seen with their own eyes; how could such a proof be gainsaid? This is a point which Glanvil and other writers of the witch-epoch are for ever urging; if we reject these facts, they argue, we must reject all beliefs that have their basis in human testimony.

Happily we have now a totally different means of escaping from the dilemma. We know now that subjective hallucinations may possess the very fullest sensory character, and may be as real to the percipient as any object he ever beheld. I have myself heard an epileptic subject, who was perfectly sane and rational in his general conduct, describe a series of interviews that he had had with the devil, with a precision, and an absolute belief in the evidence of his senses, equal to anything that I ever read in the records of the witches' compacts. And further, we know now that there is a condition, capable often of being induced in uneducated and simple persons with extreme ease, in which any idea that is suggested may at once take sensory form, and be projected as an actual hallucination. To those who have seen robust young men, in an early stage of hypnotic trance, staring with horror at a figure which appears to them to be walking on the ceiling, or giving way to strange convulsions under the impression that they have been changed into birds or snakes, there will be nothing very surprising in the belief of hysterical girls that they were possessed by some alien influence, or that their distant persecutor was actually present to their senses. It is true that in hypnotic experiments there is commonly some preliminary process by which the peculiar condition is induced, and that the idea which originates the delusion has then to be suggested *ab extra*. But with sensitive "subjects" who have been much under any particular influence, a mere word will produce the effect; nor is there any feature in the evidence for witchcraft that more constantly recurs than the

touching of the victim by the witch.¹ Moreover, no hard and fast line exists between the delusions of induced hypnotism and those of spontaneous trance, or of the grave hystero-epileptic crises which mere terror is now known to develop. And association between persons who were possessed with certain exciting ideas would readily account for the generation of a mutually contagious influence; as in cases where magic rites were performed by several persons in company; or where a whole household or community was affected with some particular delusion.²

The above seems a sufficient explanation of the testimony which to the eyes of contemporaries appeared the strongest—the testimony of “possessed” persons, and of the professed participators in the incantation scenes and nocturnal orgies. As regards the alleged statements of independent persons who testified to having witnessed the aerial rides, transformations into animal forms, and such-like marvels, I would remark in the first place that the literature of witchcraft may be searched far and wide without encountering half-a-dozen *first-hand* statements of the sort;³ and in the second place, that there is a characteristic of un-

¹ Thus, in a case mentioned by De l'Ancre, in the *Tableau de l'Inconstance des mauvais Anges et Démons* (Paris, 1612), p. 115, all the children who believed themselves to have been taken to a “Sabbath,” stated that the witch had passed her hand over their faces, or placed it on their heads.

² *A True and Just Record of the Information taken at St. Osey, in Essex* (London, 1582); Potts, *Wonderfull Discoverie of Witches in the Countie of Lancaster, &c.* (London, 1613); the case of the Flowers in *A Collection of Rare and Curious Tracts relating to Witchcraft between the Years 1618 and 1664*, pp. 19, 21; Glanvil, *Sadducismus Triumphatus*, p. 581; Hutchinson, *Op. cit.*, p. 53; Durbin, *A Narrative of Some Extraordinary Things* (Bristol, 1800), p. 47; Horst, *Zauber-Bibliothek*, p. 219; Madden, *Phantasmata*, vol. i., pp. 346-7; T. Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston, 1692), vol. ii., p. 18; Richet, *L'Homme et l'Intelligence* (Paris, 1884), p. 392.

³ If “first-hand” be restricted (as it is throughout this book) to statements in the witness's own words, I cannot point to a single such statement; but in the above phrase I mean merely the author's statement of what was told directly to himself. The *circumstantial* evidence (also very meagre) for these miracles stands on different ground; as there the *facts* recorded are quite credible, and only the *inference* need be rejected. For example, the external evidence relied on for the supposed transformations was usually that the accused proved to have some bodily hurt on the same day as a wolf or some other animal had been wounded. [In “Additions and Corrections” Gurney adds:—] After this note had been printed off, I came across a passage from *Die Christliche Mystik*, by J. J. von Goerres, in which a learned bishop, Prudencio de Sandoval, is made to describe a witch's journey through the air as though he had himself been a judicial spectator of it. A reference to Sandoval's own account, however, in his *Historia de la vida y hechos del Emperador Carlos V.* (Pamplona, 1618), vol. i., p. 830, shows that the trial of the witch in question took place in 1527. Now Sandoval died in 1621; clearly, therefore, he could not have been a first-hand witness, as represented. Nor does he even name his authority; and discredit is thrown on his sources of information by Llorente, in his *Anales de la Inquisición de España* (Madrid, 1812), p. 319. As the passage from Goerres was quoted in a first-class scientific review, and, if accurate, would have told against my statements as to the absence of first-hand evidence for alleged magical occurrences, I have thought it worth while to forestall a possible objection.

The only instance that I can find, during the witch-epoch, of definite first-hand evidence for a marvel of a type which our present knowledge of abnormal bodily and mental states will not explain, is, as it happens, not part of the history of so-called magic, but is connected with the extraordinary epidemic of religious excitement which took place in the Cevennes at the beginning of the eighteenth century. [Gurney then gives the facts concerning an alleged case of standing in a fire unburnt; the evidence going to show that the first-hand witnesses were untrustworthy persons. —ED.]

educated minds which is only exceptionally observed in educated adults—the tendency to confound mental images, pure and simple, with matters of fact. This tendency naturally allies itself with any set of images which is prominent in the beliefs of the time; and it is certain now and then to give to what are merely vivid ideas the character of *bonâ fide* memories. The imagination which may be unable to produce, even in feeble-minded persons, the belief that they *see* things that are not there, may be quite able to produce the belief that they *have seen* them—which is all, of course, that their testimony implies.¹

There is, however, one small class of phenomena connected with witchcraft which stands on different ground, as regards the quality of the evidence adduced for it. A few cases are recorded, on really respectable authority, of a remarkable susceptibility, shown by persons whom we might now recognise as hypnotic “subjects,” to the conscious or unconscious influence of some absent person supposed to be a witch; and perhaps also of abnormal powers of discernment on the part of the supposed witches themselves. These alleged telepathic cases naturally fell into discredit along with all the other phenomena of occult agency. For the belief in witchcraft faded and ultimately died as a whole; not because each sort of phenomenon was in turn exposed or explained, or because any critical account of hallucinations and popular delusions was forthcoming, or even because a certain amount of distinct fraud was proved, but because the general tide of uncritical opinion took a turn towards scepticism as to matters supernatural. Now we are certainly not concerned to maintain that this or that influence of alleged telepathic influence ought to have been allowed to stand as genuine, when belief in the more phantastic phenomena was undermined. It is probable that in the former, as in the latter, the influence of imagination was not allowed for, and that the different items of evidence were never tested and compared in the manner that true scientific scepticism would dictate. We, at any rate, have difficulty enough in testing the accuracy of contemporary evidence, and certainly are not going to rest any part of our case on the records of a bygone age. But if anyone who has studied the evidence for witchcraft urges these cases as a proof that the more recent telepathic evidence is unworthy of attention, it is reasonable to remark that if telepathy is in operation now, it was probably in operation then; and that the only cases of supposed magic with which persons of sense and education seem, at the time, to have come to close quarters were similar in character to cases for which

¹ Another explanation might be attempted, if (on the analogy of certain Indian juggling tricks) we could suppose the spectator to have been unawares subjected to a “mesmeric glamour,” whereby the suggestion of the magical occurrence was enabled to develop in his mind into an actual vision of it. One story in the *Malleus Maleficarum*, where a girl appeared to herself and to her friends to be a mare, while a priest (over whom the evil influence had no power) saw her as a girl, strongly recalls some of the Indian stories. See also the curious account of imps which appears in *Witches of Huntingdon, Renfrew, and Essex* (London, 1646). Such a result would, however, enormously transcend the range of mesmeric influence as so far recognised in the West; and we certainly need not strain hypotheses to save the credit of writers like Sprenger.

persons of sense and education are still found to offer their personal testimony.¹

But in whatever light these residual cases be regarded, the general conclusion remains the same—that the phenomena which were characteristic of witchcraft, and which are an accepted type of exploded superstitions, never rested on the first-hand testimony of educated and intelligent persons; and the sweeping assertion which is often made that such persons were, in their day, witnesses to the truth of these absurdities needs, therefore, to be carefully guarded. What the educated and intelligent believers did was to accept from others, as evidence of *objective* facts, statements which were really only evidence of *subjective* facts. And they did this naturally and excusably, because they lived at a time when the science of psychology was in its infancy, and the necessary means of correction were not within their reach.²

One further criticism may be made as to the mental condition of those who were in any direct sense witnesses to the facts. They were invariably persons inclined to such beliefs to begin with—who had been

¹ Of the early records the best known is the evidence of the Père Surin and others in respect of the hysterical epidemic in the Ursuline convent at Loudun, in 1633. But perhaps the most carefully observed case is the older one given in the *Most Strange and Admirable Discovery of the Three Witches of Warboys* (London, 1593), of which Sir W. Scott's account (*Demonology and Witchcraft*, p. 238) gives a very imperfect idea. Another example of much the same kind is given in G. More's *True Discourse against S. Harsnet* (London, 1600). The cases where the victim showed uneasiness when the absent witch was at large, and relief when she was bolted, though quite inconclusive, seem occasionally to have been rationally tested. (*Witchcraft further Displayed*, London, 1712, p. 21; *History of the Witches of Renfrewshire*, Paisley, 1809, p. 134; *Sadducismus Debellatus*, London, 1698, p. 47.) The assertions that "possessed persons" were able to read secrets present sometimes this sign of sobriety, that the revelations are said to have concerned only past and present, not future, things (see, e.g., Lercheimer, *Ein Christlich Bedenken und Erinnerung von Zauberei*, Heidelberg, 1585; and Majolus, *Dies Caniculares*, Mainz, 1614, p. 593); but as such a power finds no parallel in the telepathy of our day, it is satisfactory rather than otherwise to find that it is supported by hardly anything that can be called evidence. The strongest item is perhaps the testimony of Poncet to the powers of some of the *convulsionnaires* of St. Médard (see Bertrand, *Du Magnétisme Animal*, Paris, 1826, p. 435). Nor do the "thought-reading" stories about Somers (e.g., in Darrell's *Brief Apologie and Detection*, London, 1599 and 1600), and about Escot de Parme (De l'Ancre, *L'Incredulité et Mescreance du Sortilège*, Paris, 1622) reach even the lowest evidential grade. It would be useless to multiply indecisive instances. If the *least* wretchedly-attested cases, even in the most wretched collections of witch-anecdotes, turn out to be those which admit of a telepathic explanation, yet much stronger cases might well be damned by such company. And though some of the less credulous authors, who have a real notion of natural causes and of what constitutes proof, seem to have felt the evidence for supersensuous communications to be too strong to resist (e.g., Cotta in *The Infallible, True and Assured Witch*, London, 1625) their general position is too wavering for their authority to have any weight. One rises from their works feeling that this was the side of the subject which had produced on them the strongest impression of reality; and that is all that can be said.

² I am speaking—it must be remembered—of the attitude of educated and intelligent persons towards assertions which might (however loosely) be described as *evidence*. That such persons often showed themselves credulous and uninquiring in attaching value to mere legends and local gossip is of course true enough, but does not concern the present argument. For a justification of the above remarks, see the Note on Witchcraft at the end of this chapter. [Considerations of space have led to the omission in this edition of this very important Note, which is of considerable length. An abstract of it is retained in the Synopsis.—ED.]

brought up in them and had accepted them as a matter of course. We have no record of anyone who had all his life declined to admit the reality of the alleged phenomena, and who was suddenly convinced of his mistake by coming into personal contact with them.

§ 3. We are now in a position to perceive, by comparison, how the case stands with the evidence for telepathy which awaits examination. It would almost be sufficient to say that the comparison is an absolute contrast in respect of every point which has been mentioned. A very large number of our first-hand witnesses are educated and intelligent persons, whose sobriety of judgment has never been called in question. For the most part, moreover, they have been in no way inclined to admit the reality of the phenomena, prior to themselves encountering them. By many of them even what they themselves narrate has not been regarded with special interest; while others, who have been unable to get behind their own experience, have expressed scepticism as to the existence of the phenomena as a class.¹ The facts themselves have no special affinity with any particular form of faith; they are not facts in a belief of which any one is specially brought up. And here we may contrast telepathy, not only with the comparatively modern superstition of witchcraft, but with phenomena of much older and wider acceptance—the alleged apparitions of the dead. The continued existence of departed friends and relatives has been one of the most constant elements of religious beliefs; and that myths should grow up respecting their appearances to survivors is what might have naturally been looked for. But even in respect of the most striking sort of phenomena with which we shall here be concerned—apparitions at the time of death—we do not find in men's prevalent habits of thought, at any state of culture, elements which would be particularly likely to produce a myth on the subject. And as a matter of fact, if we go to the classes of persons whose beliefs have no special relation to evidence, we do actually find the one myth prevalent, and not the other. The idea of apparitions after death has a wide and strong hold on the popular mind; the idea of apparitions at the time either of death, or of serious crises in life, has no established vogue. Instances are, no doubt, to be met with in books of history, biography, and travel; and the range which such notices cover is itself important, as showing that the idea, though so far from universally prevalent, is for all that not in any sense a speciality of particular times or localities. But though numerous, the instances are sporadic; they appear as isolated marvels, which even those who experienced them regarded as such, and not as evidences to any widely-believed reality. So much is this the case that to many persons with whom we have con-

¹ It is amusing sometimes to encounter arbitrary fragments of scepticism, combined with a belief in the "supernatural" character of many of the coincidences which we are endeavouring to account for as natural. Thus a gentleman contributes a case to *Knowledge* (May 16th, 1884) and concludes his letter thus: "Personally, I do not believe in apparitions, nor in anything akin thereto; but coincidences such as you record from week to week must have happened to most of us, and obtuse indeed must the individual be who does not think that there is something supernatural sometimes even in coincidences."

versed on the subject we find that the very idea of such phenomena is practically new; and that "apparitions," whether delusions or realities, have always been considered by them as apparitions of the *dead*.¹ And if this is true of the more striking telepathic cases, *à fortiori* is it true of the less striking. The class of apparitions and impressions which have corresponded with the death of the "agent" has only been vaguely recognised; the class which have corresponded with a state of passing excitement or danger can hardly be said to have been recognised at all. Even persons with whose general way of thinking they might seem compatible are apt to be repelled by their apparent uselessness, and certainly are not wont to exhibit any *à priori* belief in their reality; while to others who have encountered them, they have appeared in the objectionable light of a puzzle, without analogies and without a place in the recognised order of Nature.

But though I think that it is not hard to distinguish the evidence on which we rely from the evidence for various forms of popular superstition, and to show that, as a matter of fact, telepathy is *not* a popular superstition, I am far from denying a certain degree of force to the line of objection above suggested. Ignorance, credulity, and a predisposition to believe in a particular order of marvels, are not the only sources of unconscious falsification in human testimony; and it by no means follows, because these particular elements of error are absent, that a *bonâ-fide* first-hand narrative of contemporary facts is trustworthy. And having briefly considered certain dangers and objections from which we think that our telepathic evidence is free, I proceed now to consider certain others to which it is to a certain extent exposed, and to explain the means by which we have endeavoured to obviate or reduce them.

§ 4. It will be best to enumerate, one by one, the general sources of error which may affect the testimony of honest and fairly-educated persons, to events that are both unusual and of a sort unrecognised by contemporary science. We shall thus be able to observe in detail how far each is likely to have affected the evidence here brought forward.

The most obvious danger may seem to lie in errors of observation and inference. And first as to errors of *observation*. The phenomena

¹ Next to these, the best-recognised class are undoubtedly the *premonitory* apparitions of "second-sight."

Since the above remarks were written, I am glad to find them implicitly confirmed by a very high authority on myth and folk-lore, Mr. Andrew Lang. In the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1885, he showed very clearly and amusingly how the same types of "ghost-story" are found in the most distant places, and in the most diverse stages of culture—whether owing to some common basis of fact, or to the same pervading love of the mysterious, or (as is sometimes undoubtedly the case) to the survival of remnants of primitive superstitions in the midst of an advancing civilisation. But though most of his instances are drawn from barbarous countries, he "has not encountered, among savages, more than one example" pointing to a belief in what we call telepathic impressions; and even that one is a very doubtful example. There is, as I have said, a certain amount of sporadic evidence that the phenomena have been noticed at many different times and places; but of any pervading belief, such as would cause people to be on the *qui vive* for them and would ensure a perpetual supply of spurious evidence, neither we nor apparently Mr. Lang can find any indication whatever.

with which these have to do are naturally *objective* phenomena. It is only in reference to the objective world that observation can be proved to be accurate or faulty; the faulty observation is that which interprets real things in a way that does not correspond with reality. Now misinterpretation of this sort may undoubtedly produce spurious telepathic cases; and wherever we can suppose it to have been possible, we are bound to exclude the case from our evidence. Thus we have a group of narratives of the following type, suggesting a mistake of identity.

Mrs. Campbell, of Dunstaffnage, Oban, wrote, in June, 1884:—

“Two years ago one of our tenant farmers was very ill, and my brother asked me to inquire how he was, on my way back from a walk I was going to take with a cousin of mine. We went, but on passing the old man’s house I forgot to go in, and soon we arrived at our avenue, when my cousin reminded me of not having asked for the sick man. I thought of returning, when I distinctly saw the old man, followed by his favourite dog, cross a field in front of us, and go into his house, and I remarked to my cousin, who also had seen the old man and his dog, that as he was so well that he was able to walk about, there was not much use in going to inquire for him, so we went on home. But on arriving there, my brother came to tell us that the old man’s son had just been to say that his father had just died.”

Here it is possible, and therefore for evidential purposes necessary, to suppose that the figure seen was a neighbour, or perhaps the old man’s son.¹

[Two further examples are here omitted.—ED.] In another case, two gentlemen crossed Piccadilly under the impression that they saw a friend, who, as it turned out, died in India on that day. But it is needless to multiply instances; in all of them the figure seen has been out of doors, and at some yards’ distance; and these being the very circumstances in which we know that spurious recognitions often take place, there is nothing surprising in an occasional coincidence of the sort described. Similarly, a person may hear a call, perhaps of his own Christian name, outside his house, and may mistake the voice for that of a friend; and, “in due course,” as our informants sometimes say, the news of that friend’s death may arrive. But it is only to an inconsiderable fraction of the evidence here presented that such explanations could by any possibility be applied. The large majority of the alleged experiences are, on the face of them, *subjective* phenomena, in the sense that they are independent of any real objects in the environment, and of any mistakes possible in connection with such objects, and are due to a peculiar affection of the percipient’s own mind. This mode of regarding them (and the reservations with which the word “subjective” must be used) will be fully explained in the sequel. It is enough for the present to note that the witness who would be an unsafe authority if he said, “Sea-serpents exist,” may be a safe authority if he says, “I saw what appeared to be a sea-serpent”; and this amount of assertion is all that the telepathic

¹ I may say here, once for all, that our gratitude to an informant is none the less because his or her experience may not have appeared relevant to the direct argument of this book. Such cases have often been very useful and instructive in other ways.

evidence involves. All the accuracy of observation required of the witness has to do with what he *seemed to himself* to see, or to hear, or to feel.

Nor in our cases is the danger of errors of *inference* so serious as might be imagined. A man may, no doubt, see something odd or indefinite, at the time that his mother dies at a distance, and may infer that it bodes calamity; and if, after he hears of the death, he infers and reports that he saw his mother's form, the error will be a very grave one. But it will be more convenient to treat retrospective mistakes of this sort under the head of errors of *memory*. And with a percipient's interpretation of his impression *at the moment* we have really very little concern. He may see the apparition of a relative in his room, and infer first that it is the relative's real figure in flesh and blood, and next that it is the relative's spirit. Neither inference has any relation to our argument. The only fact that concerns us is the fact that he had the subjective impression of seeing his relative. I may refer once more, by way of contrast, to the case of witchcraft, where the very basis of the superstition was error of inference—error shown (and by the more intelligent class exclusively shown) not in the giving but in the interpreting of testimony.

§ 5. The tendencies to error which more vitally concern us fall broadly into two classes—tendencies to error in *narration*, and tendencies to error of *memory*. Let us ask, then, what are the various conscious or unconscious motives which may cause persons who belong to the educated class, and who have a general character for truthfulness, to *narrate* experiences of telepathic impressions in a manner which is not strictly accurate?

One motive which has undoubtedly to be allowed for in some cases is the desire to make the account *edifying*. This danger naturally attaches to the evidence for any class of facts which can be regarded, however erroneously, as transcending natural law. Enthusiastic persons will value an unusual occurrence, not for its intrinsic interest, but for its tendency, if accepted, to convert others to their own way of belief; and they will be apt to shape and colour their account of it with a view to the desired effect. Intent on pointing the moral, they will unconsciously adorn the tale. This source of error is one which it is specially necessary to bear in mind where some particular type of story is connected with a particular religious sect. The literature of the Society of Friends, for instance, is remarkably rich in accounts of providential monitions and premonitions; and it supplies also a considerable number of telepathic cases. But we have already seen that telepathy does not specially lend itself to the support of definite articles of faith. Nor is any one who takes the trouble to study our evidence likely to maintain that errors of narration have largely entered into it under the influence of a propagandist zeal. It is rather for the sake of completeness than on account of its practical importance that such a possibility has been mentioned.

A far more frequent and effective source of error in narration is the tendency to make the account *graphic and picturesque*. Among human beings, the motives which prompt narration of matters unconnected with business or the mere machinery of life are mainly two—a desire

to interest one's auditor ; and a desire to put oneself *en evidence*, to feed one's own self-esteem by attracting and retaining the attention of others. The influence of each of these motives is towards making the story as good a one as possible. And though, as I have already said, a good deal of our evidence comes from persons who profess to have had no bias in favour of the reality of such events as they describe, and wish rather that they had not occurred, still the instinct to make what one says seem worth saying is too general for it ever to be safe to assume its absence. In such a subject as ours, this instinct will find its chief opportunity in making things appear *marvellous*. The reader must decide for himself how far the evidence to be here presented bears the stamp of the wonder-monger or *raconteur*. The desire to make people open their eyes is no doubt perfectly compatible with a habit of truthfulness in the ordinary affairs of life. Still, the desire, as a rule, is actually to see the eyes opening ; and the danger is therefore greater in the case of a story which is told off-hand and *vivâ voce* for the sake of immediate effect, than in the case of evidence which is first written down at leisure, and has then to undergo the ordeal of a careful and detailed scrutiny. Nor must we forget that there is another instinct which tends directly to discourage wonder-mongering, at any rate in the narration of unusual personal experiences—the instinct to *win belief*. Where the risk of being disbelieved is appreciable, a sense of accuracy becomes also a sense of security ; a thing being credible to oneself just because it is fact, the consciousness of not exaggerating the fact begets a sort of trust that others may somehow find it credible. And with the class from whom our evidence is chiefly drawn, this influence seems not less likely to be operative than the desire to say something startling. The latter tendency is more prone on the whole to affect *second-hand* witnesses, who do not feel bound to exercise any economy of the miraculous, who can always fall back on the plea that they are only telling what was told to them, and who may easily be led into inaccuracies by the analogy of other marvellous stories.

And indeed it is a matter of ordinary observation, by no means confined to "psychical research," that where the subject of narration has nothing to do with merit, and what is alleged to have been done or suffered is not of a sort to attract admiration to the doer or sufferer, the more extravagant sort of stories are given, not as personal experiences, but on the authority of someone else. If there is exaggeration, it is "a friend" who is to blame ; and this term is used on such occasions with considerable latitude. I have already noted how, in the case of witchcraft, the more bizarre incidents do not rest on anything like traceable first-hand testimony. This remark is applicable in a general way to the whole field of evidence for marvellous events, as recorded in modern literature ; and the same fact has been very noticeable with respect to the evidence, of very various sorts and qualities, which has come under the attention of my colleagues and myself during the last few years. We have often taken the trouble to trace and test the matter of those sensational newspaper-paragraphs which get so freely copied from one journal into another ; but in scarcely one per cent. of the cases has the evidence held water. And in the ordinary talk of society, where there

is often a show or assertion of authority for the statements made, one gradually learns to diagnose with confidence the accounts which profess to be second or third hand from the original, but of which no original will ever be forthcoming. An example is the well-known tale of a dripping letter, handed to a lady by the phantasmal figure of a midshipman who had been drowned before he could execute his commission. If the newspaper anecdotes were like bubbles that break in the pursuer's hand, a society marvel of this stamp may be more fitly compared to a will-o'-the-wisp: one never gets any nearer to it. Then there is the young lady who was preserved from a railway accident by seeing the apparition of her *fiancé* on the platform of three consecutive stations—which induced her to alight. Here I was actually promised an introduction to the heroine: what I finally received was a reference to "a friend of the lady who told the story." Or, again, there is the tale of second-sight, so widely told during the last three years, where the visitor saw a daughter of the house stabbed by a stranger, whom he has since identified as her husband, and has remorselessly dogged in hansom cabs. Three or four times have we been, so to speak, "one off" this story; but the various clues have shown no sign of converging; and we still occasionally hear of the happy couple as on their honeymoon.

§ 6. Turning now to the sources of error in *memory*, we find the danger here is of a more insidious kind, in that comparatively few persons realise the extent to which it exists in their own case. For one who is innocent of any desire to impress his auditor in any particular way, and who simply desires to tell the truth, it is not easy to realise that he may be an untrustworthy witness about matters concerning himself. The weaknesses of human memory, and the precautions which they necessitate, will be so frequent a topic in the sequel that a brief classification will here suffice.

We must allow, in the first place, for a common result of the belief in supernatural influences and providential interpositions. Persons who are interested in such ideas will be keenly alive to any phenomena which seem to transcend a purely materialistic view of life. They will be apt to see facts of this class where they do not exist, and to interpret in this sense small or vague occurrences which if accurately examined at the time might have been otherwise explained. And where this tendency exists, it is almost inevitable that, as time goes on, the occurrence should represent itself to memory more and more in the desired light, that inconvenient details should drop out, and that the remainder should stand out in a deceptively significant and harmonious form. Of the cases to be here presented, however, only a very small proportion betray any idea on the part of the witness that what he recounts has any special religious or philosophical significance. Our informants have had no motive to conceal from us their real view of the facts; and if they narrate an incident as simply strange or unaccountable, we have no right to assume their evidence to have been coloured by an emotional sense that materialism had been refuted in their person, or that supernatural communications had been permitted to them. Indeed, as regards religious and emotional prepossessions, we are certainly justified in thinking that they have rather been hindrances than helps to the presentation of an

abundant array of evidence. For it has happened in many instances that persons whose testimony would have been a valuable addition to the case for telepathy, have felt their experiences to be too intimate or too sacred for publication.¹

But apart from any bias of an emotional or speculative sort, we must certainly admit a general tendency in the human mind to make any picture of facts definite. To many people vagueness of emotion or of speculation is a delight; but no one enjoys vagueness of memory. In thinking of an event which was in any way shadowy or uncertain, there is always a certain irksomeness in realising clearly how little clear it was. The same applies, of course, to events at which we look back through any considerable interval of time. The very effort to recall them implies an effort to represent them to the mind as precisely and completely as possible, and it is often not observed that the precision thus attained is not that of reality.

Lastly, there is a general tendency to lighten the burden of memory by *simplifying* its contents—by bringing any group of connected events into as round and portable a form as possible. This may, of course, only result in the loss of excrescences and subordinate features, while the essential incident is left intact. But we shall find instances further on where simplification really alters the character of the evidence. Details may not simply drop out; they may undergo a change, and group themselves conveniently round some central idea. It might reasonably be expected, and we ourselves certainly began by expecting, that error from this source would always tell in the direction of actual distortion and exaggeration; if the aspect of the case was to some extent striking and insignificant to begin with, it would seem likely that this aspect of it should become more pronounced as it assumed a more isolated place in the mind, and lost its connection with the normal stream of experience in the course of which it appeared. As a matter of fact, however, this is by no means always what happens. For instance, we have met with several cases of the following sort. An impression of a remarkable kind, and which, if telepathy exists, may fairly be regarded as telepathic, has been produced on a percipient while in a state which he recognised at the time as one of complete wakefulness, and which was practically proved to be so by the fact that he did not wake from it—that it formed a connected part of his waking life. But in the natural gravitation towards *easy* accounts of things, he gradually gets to look back on this experience as a *dream*; that is, he allows the verdict of subsequent memory to supplant the verdict of immediate consciousness. We must not then say in our haste, all men—or all memories—are exaggerators. Even where evidence has been modified in passing through several mouths,

¹ To take a single instance—a lady sends us an unsensational narrative of the ordinary type, as to how one day in 1882, when just about to sit down to the piano, she saw close to her the figure of an old school-friend, who, as it turned out, died on that day at a distance. "I am confident," she says, "of having seen the vision, though my common sense makes me wish to put it down to imagination. I never saw any vision of any kind before or since." But we are withheld from quoting the account in a form which could have any evidential value, by her feeling that such publication would be wrong.

a comparison between later and earlier versions of the same occurrence has sometimes shown that its more striking and significant characteristics have lost rather than gained by the transmission. But this is no doubt the exception.

§ 7. Such, in brief outline, are the principal sources of error which may in a general way be supposed to affect the sort of evidence with which we are concerned ; and our next step must be to fix with precision what the actual opportunities for perversion are. The evidence for telepathy has a certain type and structure of its own, and we must realise what this is, in order to know where to look for the weak points. What, then, are the essential elements of a typical telepathic phenomenon ? They consist in two events or two states, of a more or less remarkable kind, and connected, as a rule, by certain common characteristics ; and of a certain time-relation between the two. For example, if a flawless case is to be presented, it would be of the following type and composition : It would comprise (1) indisputable evidence that A (whom we call the agent) has had an unusual experience—say, has died ; (2) indisputable evidence that B (whom we call the percipient) has had an unusual experience which includes a certain impression of A—say, has, while wide awake, had a vision of A in the room ; (3) indisputable evidence that the two events coincided in time—which, of course, implies that their respective dates can be accurately fixed. When I call such evidence as this *flawless*, I do not, of course, mean that it is *conclusive* : the fact that the two events occurred, and the fact that they occurred simultaneously, might be placed beyond dispute, and the coincidence might, for all that, be due not to telepathy, but to chance alone. But though no single case can prove telepathy, no case where the above conditions are not to some extent realised can even help to prove it. Briefly, then, if the account of some alleged instance of telepathy is evidentially faulty, there must be misrepresentation as to one or more of the following items : (1) the state of the agent ; (2) the experience of the percipient ; (3) the time of (1) ; (4) the time of (2).

Now the evidence where the chances of misrepresentation have primarily to be considered is clearly that of the *percipient*. It is the percipient's mention of his own experience which makes, so to speak, the groundwork of the case ; unless the percipient gives his own account of this experience, the case is in no sense a first-hand one ; whereas if such an account is given we should consider the evidence first-hand, even though the account of the *agent's* state is not obtained from himself. Of course when the agent is in a position to give an account, it is important that his evidence should be procured ; but this is impossible in the numerous cases where his share in the matter consists simply in dying. In these cases, then, we are dependent on others for evidence as to the agent's side of the occurrence ; and primarily often on the percipient, who is our first and indispensable witness for the whole matter. This being premised, we shall have no difficulty in discovering where the risks of misrepresentation really lie.

§ 8. Taking the above four items in order, the first of them—the

state of the agent—is the one where the risk is smallest. To take the commonest case, the very fact, death, which makes it impossible to obtain the agent's personal testimony, is an event as to which, of all others in his history, it is least likely that a person who knew him should be in error. It is one also as to which corroboration of the percipient's statement is often most easily obtained; either from the verbal testimony of surviving relatives and friends, or from contemporary letters, notices, and obituaries. And where the event which has befallen the agent falls short of this degree of gravity, it is probably still sufficiently out of the common for the ascertainment of it by the percipient and others to have been natural and easy; and *à fortiori* sufficiently out of the common to have stamped itself on the memory of the agent himself, who may now be available as a witness.

When we come to the next item—the experience of the percipient—the risk of misrepresentation seems decidedly to increase. For the witness is now recounting something purely personal, for the occurrence of which he can produce no objective proofs. He says that he saw something, or heard something, or felt something, which struck him as remarkable (in many cases, indeed, as *unique* in his experience), and this has to be taken on his word; no external observation of him (even were anyone present with him at the time) could reveal whether he was actually experiencing these sensations which he afterwards described. Now to a careless glance it may seem that there is a loophole here, through which enough error may enter to invalidate the whole case. It may be said that the percipient was perhaps nervous, or unwell, or imaginative; and that a report of impressions which are received under such conditions cannot be relied on as evidence. But in what was said above as to errors of observation, this objection has been practically answered. It would be in place if the question were whether what he thought he perceived was really there; but it is not in place when the question is simply what he thought he perceived. We are discussing the experience of the percipient as the second of the four heads under which misrepresentation may enter. Now, *misrepresentation* of this experience would consist simply in the statement that he had had certain sensations or impressions which he had not had: *misinterpretation* of the experience—*e.g.*, if he imagined that his friend was actually physically present where his form had been seen or his voice heard—has nothing to do with the evidential point. Grant that the percipient's senses played him false—that his impression was a hallucination; that, as I have implied, is the very light in which we ourselves regard it; it may even be the light in which he regarded it himself. That does not prevent its being an unusual experience; and it is simply as an unusual experience, which included an impression of his friend, that it has a place in the evidence.

Now the probability that this unusual experience has been misrepresented will be very different, according as the mention of it by the percipient precedes or follows his knowledge of what has befallen the agent. If he gives his account in ignorance of that event, and independently of any ideas which it might be calculated to awake in his mind, there seems no ground at all for supposing that he has coloured his statement, at any rate in any way which would affect its evidential value. If A, a

person with a general character for truthfulness, and with no motive to deceive, mentions having had an unusual experience—a hallucination of the senses, an unaccountable impression, or whatever he likes to call it—which was strongly suggestive of B, no one will tell him that he is romancing or exaggerating, and that he had no such impression as he reports. He will simply be told that his nerves are overstrung, or that he has had a waking dream, or something of that sort. And this assumption of the truth of the statement could of course not be impugned merely because it subsequently turned out that B died at the time.

Hence, one of the points to which we have, throughout our inquiry, attached the highest value, is the proof that evidence of the percipient's experience was in existence prior to the receipt of the news of the agent's condition. This prior evidence may be of various sorts. The percipient may at once make a written record in a diary, or in a letter which may have been preserved. Where this has been the case, we have always endeavoured to obtain the document for inspection. Or he may have mentioned his hallucination or impression to some one who made a note of it, or who distinctly remembers that it was so mentioned; and whenever this has been done, we have endeavoured to get written corroboration from this second person. Evidence of this class affords comparatively little opportunity for the various sorts of error which have been passed in review. No amount of carelessness of narration, or of love of the marvellous, would enable a witness to time his evidence in correspondence with an event of which he was ignorant, nor to fix on the right person with whom to connect his alleged experience. Errors of *memory* are equally unlikely to take a form which makes the impression correspond with an *unknown* event; and danger from that source is, moreover, at a minimum, in cases which are distinguished by the very fact that the impression has been itself recorded immediately, or very shortly, after its occurrence.

But apart from the actual records of the experience in writing or in someone else's memory, it may have produced *action* of a sufficiently distinct sort on the percipient's part; for instance, it may have so disturbed him as to make him take a journey, or write at once for tidings of the agent's condition. Such immediate action, which can often be substantiated by others, affords a strong independent proof that the impression had occurred, and had been of an unusual kind. And even if he has done none of these things, yet if he describes a state of discomfort or anxiety, following on his experience and preceding his receipt of the news, this must, at any rate, be accounted a fresh item of testimony, confirmatory of the mere statement that such-and-such an unusual experience had befallen him; and it is sometimes possible to obtain the corroboration of others who have noticed or been made aware of this anxiety, even though the source of it was not mentioned. If, however, he has kept his feelings as well as their cause, to himself, there is, of course, nothing but his subsequent memory to depend on. Here, therefore, we shall have a transitional step to the next evidential class, where the percipient's own perception of the importance of the experience, and any possibilities of confirmation, date from a time when the condition of the agent has become known:

§ 9. Cases of this type are of course, as a class, less satisfactory. It is here that some of the recognised tendencies to error—the impulse to make vague things definite, and the impulse to make a group of facts compact and harmonious—may find their opportunity. The error will, of course, not arise without a certain foundation in fact: the news that a friend has died is not in itself calculated to create a wholly fictitious idea that one has had an unusual experience shortly before the news arrived. But an experience which has been somewhat out of the common may look quite different when recalled in the light of the subsequent knowledge. It may not only gain in significance; its very content may alter. A person perhaps heard his name called when no one was near, and, not being subject to hallucinations of hearing, he was momentarily struck by the fact, but dismissed it from his mind. A day or two afterwards he hears of a friend's death. It then occurs to him that the events may have been connected. He endeavours to recall the sound that he heard, and seems to hear in it the tones of the familiar voice. Gradually the connection that he has at first only dimly surmised, becomes a certainty for him; and in describing the occurrence, without any idea of deceiving, he will mention his friend's voice as though he had actually recognised it at the time. In the same way something dimly seen in an imperfect light may take for subsequent memory the aspect of a recognisable form; or a momentary hallucination of touch may recur to the mind as a clasp of farewell.

Now such possibilities cannot be too steadily kept in view, during the process of collecting and sifting evidence. At the same time, the interrogation of witnesses, and the comparison of earlier and later accounts, have not revealed any definite instance of this sort of inaccuracy. Now the number of alleged telepathic cases which we have examined (a number of which the [700] narratives given in this book form less than a third) seems sufficiently large for the various types of error that really exist to have come to light; and, as a matter of fact, certain types *have* come to light, and have helped us to a view of what may be called the laws of error in such matters. If, then, a particular form of inaccuracy is conspicuous by its absence from our considerable list of proved inaccuracies, it may be concluded, we think, not to have been widely operative. It would be a different matter if the cases of the lower evidential class stood alone—if we were unable to present any cases where the percipient's identification of his impression with the particular personality of the agent had been established beyond dispute. But in face of the large number of those stronger instances, it would be unwarrantably violent to suppose that in all, or nearly all, the other cases where the percipient declares that the identification was clear and unmistakable, he is giving fictitious shape and colour to a purely undistinctive experience.

But there is yet another reason for allowing this inferior evidence to stand for what it is worth. For even if we make very large allowance for inaccuracy, and suppose that in a certain number of these cases the visible or audible phantasm, afterwards described as recognised, was really unrecognised at the moment, the evidence for a telepathic production of it does not thereby vanish. If, indeed, a witness's mental or moral status were such that he might be supposed capable of giving retro-

spective and objective distinctness to what was an utterly indefinite impression, with no external or sensory character at all, his testimony would, of course, be valueless; simply because we could not assure ourselves that he had not had experiences of that sort daily, so that the coincidence with the real event would lose all significance. But in the case of a witness of fair intelligence, the point remains that the presence of a human being was suggested to his senses in a manner which was in his experience markedly unusual or unique, at the time that a human being at a distance with whom he was more or less closely connected, was in a markedly unusual or unique condition. By itself such evidence might fairly, perhaps, be regarded as too uncertain to support any hypothesis. But if a case for telepathy can be founded on the stronger cases, where the immediate reference of the impression to the agent is as much established as the fact of the impression itself, then we have no right to lay down as an immutable law of telepathic experience that such a reference is indispensable. Recognition is beyond doubt the best of tests; and in a vast majority of our cases we have the percipient's testimony, and in a very large number corroborative testimony as well, to the fact of recognition. But distinctness and unusualness in the experience are also evidential points. We have, indeed, a whole class of cases where the percipient has expressly stated that a phantasm which coincided with the supposed agent's death was unrecognised, and where, therefore, the distinctness and unusualness of the impression were the only grounds for paying any attention to the coincidence. Such cases may be far from proving telepathy; yet if telepathy be a *vera causa*, it would be unscientific to leave them out of account.

§ 10. So much for the evidence of the state of the agent, and of the experience of the percipient, regarded simply as events, of which we want to know (1) to what extent we can rely on the description that we receive of them; (2) to what extent the presumption of a telepathic connection between them is affected by the sort of inaccuracies that may be revealed or surmised. The sketch that has been given is, of course, a mere outline. It must wait for further amplifications of detail till we come to examine the evidence itself. Meanwhile it may serve to prepare the reader's mind, and to indicate what special points to be on the look-out for. But of those four essential items of a case, as to which the opportunities and the effect of misrepresentation were to be specially considered, two still remain, namely, the precise *times* of the two items already discussed—of the agent's and the percipient's respective shares in the incident. It is clearly essential to a telepathic case that these times should approximately coincide; and error in the assertion of this coincidence is a possibility requiring fully as much attention as error in the description of the two events.

But here the reader may fairly ask where the line of error is to be drawn. Must the coincidence be exact to the moment? And, if not, what degree of inexactness may be permitted before we cease to regard a case as supporting the telepathic hypothesis? It is unfortunately not easy for the moment to give any satisfactory answer to this question. Two distinct questions are in fact involved. The first is a question of

natural fact : What are the furthest limits of time within which it appears, on a review of the whole subject, that a single telepathic phenomenon may really be included ? At what distance of time, from the death of an absent person, may a friend receive telepathic intimation of the fact ? The second question is one of interpretation and argument. It will be a most important part of our task hereafter to estimate the probability that it was by *chance*, and not as cause and effect, that the two events occurred at no very great distance of time from one another. The wider the interval, the greater, of course, does this probability become ; in other words, the larger the scope that we give to " coincidences " which we are willing to regard as *primâ facie* telepathic in origin, the greater is the chance that we shall be wrong in so regarding them. Now, unless some provisional limit were assigned to the interval which may separate the two events, it would be impossible to obtain numerical data for calculating what the force of the argument for chance really is, and how far the hypothesis of some cause beyond chance is justified. This point will be made clear in Chapter XIII., which deals with " the theory of chance-coincidence " ; meanwhile it will be convenient to defer both these questions, and to make the following brief statement without discussion or explanation.

There is one class of cases which are not available for a numerical estimate at all—those, namely, where the agent's condition is not strictly limited in time ; for instance, where he is merely very ill, and no particular crisis takes place at or near the time when the percipient's impression occurs. This indefiniteness is, of course, a serious evidential weakness. But in a vast majority of the cases to be brought forward, the event that befalls the agent is short and definite. If, then, the experience of the percipient does not exactly coincide with that event, it must either follow or precede it. And, first, if it *follows* it ; then it will be convenient to limit the interval within which this must happen to 12 hours. I may mention at once that in most of our cases the coincidence seems to have been very considerably closer than this. But in a few cases the 12 hours' limit has been reached ; and if we found that, though some error in evidence had made the coincidence appear to have been closer than it really was, yet after correction the 12 hours seemed not to have been over-passed, we should still treat the case as having a *primâ facie* claim to be considered telepathic. Next as to the cases where the percipient's impression *precedes* some marked event or crisis in the existence of the other person concerned ; the question will then be, What was that other person's condition at the actual time that the impression occurred ? If it was *normal*, we should not argue here for any connection between the experiences of the two parties. For instance, we should not treat as evidence for telepathy an impression, however striking, which preceded by an appreciable interval an *accident* or *sudden* catastrophe of any sort. But it may happen that the percipient's impression falls within a season in which the condition of the other party is distinctly *abnormal*—say a season of serious illness ; and that it likewise precedes by less than 12 hours the crisis—usually death—with which that season closes. And these cases will not only have a *primâ facie* claim to be considered telepathic, but will also admit of being used in a strict numerical estimate.

§ 11. To return now to the evidential question, it is really in the matter of dates, rather than facts, that the risk of an important mistake is greatest. In the first place, dates are hard things to remember : many persons who have a fairly accurate memory for facts which interest them have a poor memory for dates. This is a natural failing, and it is also one that may easily escape notice ; for in the vast majority of instances where a personal experience is afterwards recounted, the whole interest centres in the fact, and none at all in the date. But in examining the evidence for an alleged telepathic case, much more than ordinary human frailty in the matter of dates has to be considered. It is just here that the action of the various positive tendencies to error, above enumerated, is really most to be apprehended. Two unusual events—say the death of a friend at a distance, and the hearing of a voice which certainly sounded like his—have happened at no very great distance of time. The latter event recalls the former to the mind of the person who experienced it ; and on reflection he feels that the character of the one connects it in a certain way with the other. True, he has kept no record of the day and hour when he heard the voice ; or his friend may have died in South America, and no accurate report of the date of the occurrence may ever have reached England ; but the connection which has been surmised cannot but raise a presumption that the two events corresponded in time as well as in character. “ Why, otherwise, should I have heard the voice at all ? ” the person who heard it will argue : “ I am not given to hearing phantasmal voices. I did not know how to account for it before ; but now I see my way to doing so.” This train of thought being pursued, it will seem in a very short time that the two events *must* have been simultaneous ; and what can that mean but that they *were* simultaneous ? And the fact thus arrived at will remain the point of the story, as long as it continues to be told. In allowing his mind to act thus, it will be seen that the percipient has merely followed the easy and convenient course. There was something baffling and aimless in the occurrence of the phantasmal voice, without rhyme or reason, at a time when the hearer was in good health and not even thinking of his friend. Rhyme and reason—significance and coherence—are supplied by the hypothesis that his friend, finding death imminent, was thinking of him. It does not occur to him that this account of the matter is in itself harder to accept than the fact of a subjective auditory hallucination. To realise this would require a certain amount of definite psychological knowledge. Things are sufficiently explained to him if they seem to cohere in an evident way. Or if he is sensible that his version of the matter introduces or suggests a decided element of the marvellous, still the marvel is of a sort which is a legitimate subject of human speculation, and with which it is interesting to have been in personal contact. And not only has his reason thus followed the line of least resistance ; his memory has also been relieved by the unity which he has given to its contents. It has now got a single and well-compacted story to carry, instead of two disconnected items. It has, so to speak, exchanged two silver pieces, of different coinages and doubtful ratio, for a single familiar florin.

The above is no mere fancy sketch ; it represents what is really not unlikely to occur. When we were just now considering how far an honest

and intelligent witness is likely to imagine afterwards that a passing impression which at the time was vague and unrecognised had really been distinct and recognised, it will be remembered that such a perversion seemed decidedly unlikely—that we saw no ground for assuming that an error of that type had entered into anything like a majority of the cases where we have no conclusive evidence that it has not entered. But with the dates it is otherwise. We have received several illustrations of the liability of even first-hand witnesses to make times exactly coalesce without due proof of their having done so, or even in spite of proof that they did not do so. Having by a reasoning process of a vague kind come to the conclusion that the two events were simultaneous, they will be apt to note any items of facts or inference which tell in this direction, and not such as may tell in the other. An informant sometimes by his very accuracy reveals the attitude of mind which might easily produce inaccuracy in other cases. He will tell us that all that was proved was that the death fell in the same month as the impression; but that it is “borne in on him” that it was at the same hour. A good many people upon whom such a conviction is “borne in” will treat that as if it were itself the evidence required. One sort of case in which the tendency in question has been specially evident is that where the death has taken place at a great distance from the percipient. The instinct of artistic perfection overshoots the mark, when a ship’s log in the Indian Ocean shows that death took place at a quarter-past 3, and a clock on an English mantelpiece reveals that that is the very minute of the apparition. Telepathy, like electricity, may “annihilate space”; but it will never make the time of day at two different longitudes the same. This particular error would not, it is true, completely vitiate the case from our point of view, since the 12 hours’ interval would not have been exceeded; but *pro tanto* it, of course, diminishes the credit of the witness.

§ 12. Let us now examine the two dates separately, and see where the danger more particularly lies, and what tests and safeguards can be adopted. And first as to the date of the event that has befallen the agent. As we have seen, it is almost always first from the percipient’s side that we hear of this event; and to him the knowledge of it came as a piece of news, sometimes by word of mouth, sometimes in a letter or telegram, occasionally in some printed form. In very many cases the date would, of course, be part of the news. Now, if his own experience was impressive enough to have caused him real anxiety or curiosity, and if his recollection is clear that the news came almost immediately afterwards—say within a couple of days—and that the time of the two events was there and then compared, and found to coincide, the coincidence will then rest on something better, at any rate, than the mere memory of a date. It will depend on the memory that a certain unusual and probably painful state of mind received remarkable justification, and that this justification in turn produced another state of mind which was also of an unusual type. If there was really no such synchronism as is represented, then not only the abstract fact of correspondence, but a distinct and interesting piece of mental experience must have been fictitiously imagined. Now, it may be said, I think, as a rule, that a fictitious imagination of

this sort needs some little time to grow up ; that it is decidedly improbable that any case which is definitely recorded very soon after the event will have suffered this degree of misrepresentation. But a few years will give the imagination time to play very strange tricks. We have had one very notable proof of this, in a case where a curiously detailed vision of a dead man, which (so far as we can ascertain) must have followed the actual death by at least three months, was represented to us, after an interval of ten years, by the person who had seen it—a witness of undoubted integrity—as having occurred on the very night of the death. We may be right in regarding so complete a lapse of memory on the part of an intelligent witness as exceptional ; but we should certainly not be justified in *assuming* that it is exceptional ; and no case of anything like that degree of remoteness can be relied on, without some evidence beyond the percipient's mere present recollection that the event which befell the agent took place at the time mentioned. The evidence may be of various sorts. If the exact date of the percipient's experience can be proved, then it is often possible to fix the other date as the same, by letters, diaries, or obituaries, or by the verbal testimony of some independent witness. If no such evidence is accessible, or even if the exact date of the percipient's experience is forgotten, it may still be possible to obtain corroboration of the coincidence from someone who was immediately cognisant of the percipient's experience, and who had independent means of ascertaining the further fact and of noting the connection at the time. But the absence of a written record of either event is, of course, a decidedly weak point.

§ 13. But, on the whole, the danger that the closeness of the coincidence may be exaggerated depends rather on misstatement of the date of the *percipient's* than of the *agent's* share in the alleged occurrence. Clearly the fact that some one has died or has had a serious accident, or has been placed in circumstances of some unusual sort, is likely to be known to more persons, and to be more frequently recorded in some permanent form, than the fact that some one has had, or says he has had, an odd hallucination. And clearly also, if one of the points is fixed, and the other, by hasty assumption or defective memory, is moved up to it, the movable date is likely to be that of the event which has no ascertainable place in the world of objective fact. As a rule, it is at any rate possible at the time to obtain certainty as to the date of what has befallen the agent ; and therefore if the percipient has been struck by his experience and retains evidence of its date, either in writing or in the memory of others to whom he mentioned it, he will very likely be prompted, when he hears of the other event, to assure himself as to what the degree of coincidence really was. But the converse case is very different. If the percipient does not record his experience at the time of its occurrence, even a week's interval may destroy the possibility of making sure what its exact date was ; and therefore, however certain the date of the other event may be, assurance as to the degree of coincidence will here be unattainable. It is often expressly recognised as such by the percipient himself ; and then one can only regret that the importance of the class of facts—if facts indeed they are—has been so little realised that the simple measures which would have ensured accurate evidence have not been taken. But where the account

given is one of accurate coincidence, we cannot be satisfied without good evidence that the point was critically examined into at the time. It may, of course, happen that the percipient has a clear recollection that the coincidence was adequately made out at the time, although he can produce no documentary evidence which would establish it; and if others confirm his memory in this respect, that is so far satisfactory. Such unwritten confirmation, however, will have little independent force, unless the person who gives it was made aware of the percipient's experience within a very short time of its occurrence.

But though the danger here must be explicitly recognised, it is important not to exaggerate its practical scope. The coincidence may have been reported as closer than it was; but it may still, in a majority of cases, be fairly concluded to have fallen within the 12 hours' limit. As a rule, the news of what has befallen the agent arrives soon enough for not more than a space of two days to intervene between the percipient's knowledge of this event and the time when, to make the coincidence complete, his own experience must have taken place. We are not, therefore, making a large demand on his memory; we are only requiring that he shall remember that an experience, which he represents as remarkable, befell him, or did not befall him, on the day before yesterday. No doubt, after a lapse of years, the evidential value of what a person reports ceases to have a close relation to the knowledge of the facts which it seems pretty certain he must have had at the time. But the demands made at the time on the intelligence either of the percipient, or of anyone else who had the opportunity of asking questions and forming conclusions, are so slight that we may fairly take contemporary written records of the matter, or even later verbal corroboration, as having a considerable claim to attention, even when the best evidence of all—evidence whose existence preceded the arrival of the news—is wanting. And it is important to notice that, while we have had several coincidences reported to us as having been close to the hour, which turned out, on further inquiry or examination of documents, to have been only close to the day, we have had few cases where a similar correction has proved that the 12 hours' limit was really overpassed.¹ A good many coincidences, no doubt, have been represented as extremely close, where no independent evidence on this point has been accessible, and closer inquiry has occasionally revealed that the assertion rested only on a guess. But wholly to neglect cases where the exactitude of the coincidence is not brought within the 12 hours' limit would clearly be unreasonable, provided that—on the evidence—it is not likely that this limit was much exceeded, and not certain that it was exceeded at all. Such cases must, of course, be excluded from any numerical estimate based on precise data; but they may fairly be allowed their own weight on the mind.

§ 14. We see, then, that cases where the alleged correspondence of facts and coincidence of dates are sufficiently close to afford a *prima facie* presumption of telepathic action may present very various degrees of strength and weakness; and it may be convenient to summarise the

¹ [In a footnote Gurney describes eight.—ED.]

evidential conditions according to their value, in the following tabular form. (The words "the news" mean always the news of what has befallen the supposed agent.)

A. Where the event which befell the agent, with its date, is recorded in printed notices, or contemporary documents which we have examined ; or is reported to us by the agent himself independently, or by some independent witnesses or witness ; and where—

(1) The percipient (*a*) made a written record of his experience, with its date, at the time of its occurrence, which record we have either seen or otherwise ascertained to be still in existence ; or (*β*) before the arrival of the news, mentioned his experience to one or more persons, by whom the fact that he so mentioned it is corroborated ; or (*γ*) immediately adopted a special course of action on the strength of his experience, as is proved by external evidence, documentary or personal.

(2) The documentary evidence mentioned in (1*a*) and (1*γ*) is alleged to have existed, but has not been accessible to our inspection ; or the experience is alleged to have been mentioned as in (1*β*), or the action taken on the strength of it to have been remarked as in (1*γ*), but owing to death or other causes, the person or persons to whom the experience was mentioned, or by whom the action was remarked, can no longer corroborate the fact.

This second class of cases is placed here for convenience, but should probably rank below the next class. At the same time the fact that the percipient's experience was noted in writing by him, or was communicated to another person, or was acted on, before the arrival of the news, is not one which is at all specially likely to be unconsciously invented by him afterwards.

(3) The percipient did not (*a*) make any written record, nor (*β*) make any verbal mention of his experience until after the arrival of the news, but then did one or both ; of which fact we have confirmation.

This class is of course, as a rule, decidedly inferior to the first class. At the same time, cases occur under it in which the news was so immediate that the fact of the coincidence could only be impugned by representing the whole story as an invention.¹

(4) The immediate record or mention on the arrival of the news is alleged to have been made, but owing to loss of papers, death of friends, or other causes, cannot be confirmed.

(5) The percipient alleges that he remarked the coincidence when he heard the news ; but no record or mention of the circumstance was made until some time afterwards.

Such cases, of course, rapidly lose any value they may have as the time increases which separates the account from the incident. Still, sometimes we have been able to obtain the independent evidence of some one who heard an account previous to the present report to

¹ See, for instance, case 17, pp. 132-3.

us ; or we have ourselves obtained two reports separated by a considerable interval. And where a comparison of accounts given at different times shows that they do not vary, this is to some extent an indication of accuracy.

B. Where the percipient is our sole authority for the nature and date of the event which he alleges to have befallen the agent.

In many of these cases, the percipient is also our sole authority for his own experience ; and the evidence under this head will then be weaker than in any of the above classes. But where we have independent testimony of the percipient's mention of the two events, and of their coincidence, soon after their occurrence—he having been at the time in such circumstances that he would naturally know the nature and date of what had befallen the agent—the case may rank as higher in value than some of those of Class A (5).

§ 15. The evidence which I have so far analysed is *first-hand* evidence—in the sense that the main account comes to us direct from the percipient. The present collection, however [i.e. that in the original edition], includes (in the Supplement) a certain number of second-hand narratives ; and it will be well, therefore, to consider briefly what are the best sorts of second-hand evidence, and what kinds of inaccuracy are most to be apprehended in the transmission of telepathic history from mouth to mouth.

There is one, and only one, sort of second-hand evidence which can on the whole be placed on a par with first-hand ; namely, the evidence of a person who has been informed of the experience of the percipient while the latter was still unaware of the corresponding event ; and who has had equal opportunities with the percipient for learning the truth of that event, and confirming the coincidence. The second-hand witness's testimony in such a case is quite as likely to be accurate as the percipient's ; for though his impression of the actual details will no doubt be less vivid, yet on the other hand he will not be under the same temptation to exaggerate the force or strangeness of the impression in subsequent retrospection. Specimens of this class have therefore been admitted to the body of the work, as well as to the Supplement. Putting this exceptional class aside, the value of second-hand evidence chiefly depends on the relation of the first narrator to the second. A second-hand account from a person only slightly acquainted with the original narrator is of very little value ; not only because it is probably the report of a story which has been only once heard, and that, perhaps, in a hurried or casual way ; but also because the less the reporter's sense of responsibility to his informant, the less also will be his sense of responsibility to the facts, and the greater the temptation to improve on the original. But we cannot so lightly dismiss the testimony of near relatives and close friends to a matter which they have heard the first-hand witness narrate more than once, or narrate in such a manner as convinced them that the alleged facts were to him realities, and had made a lasting impression on his mind. Here we at any rate have a chance of forming a judgment as to the character of the original authority ; we can make tolerably certain that what we hear was never the mere anecdote of a *raconteur* ; and we have grounds for assuming in our own informants a certain instinct of fidelity which may at any rate preserve their report from the errors of wilful care-

lessness and exaggeration. It not infrequently happens, too, that we can obtain several independent versions from several second-hand witnesses which may mutually confirm one another; and contemporary documentary evidence may give further support to the case.

[The author proceeds to discuss and illustrate at some length the risks of error in transmitted evidence. The discussion, though both instructive and interesting, is omitted here for the sake of brevity.—ED.]

It would, however, not be fair to leave this list of causes which diminish the amount of presentable second-hand evidence, without adding that of the more reliable sort of second-hand (no less than of first-hand) cases. A considerable number are withheld from publication from motives with which it is hard altogether to sympathise. Persons who have a really accurate knowledge of some incident in which a deceased relative has been concerned, and who—seeing that the incident did no dishonour to any one's head or heart—have no scruple in publishing it at casual dinner-parties, become sometimes almost morbidly scrupulous when there is a question of making it available, even in an anonymous form, for a scientific purpose.

Here I may close this preliminary survey of the possibilities of error which must be constantly kept in view in the investigation of alleged telepathic cases, and which must be either excluded by evidence or carefully allowed for. Both the dangers and the safeguards will, of course, be better realised when we come to the details of particular cases. It does not seem necessary to give a similar synopsis of the evidential flaws and weaknesses which are not in any sense *errors*. Some of these may be apparent on the very face of the evidence; as when the percipient expressly states that his impression was of an undefined sort, or was of a sort which he had experienced on other occasions without the correspondence of any real event, or that the coincidence of dates, though close, was not exactly ascertained. Others may appear when we take all the circumstances into consideration, although the percipient may fail to admit them; for instance, a person who is in decided anxiety about an absent relative or friend may be regarded as to some extent predisposed to subjective impressions which suggest his presence, so that the accidental coincidence of such an impression with some actual crisis that is apprehended may be regarded as not violently improbable. All such topics, however, will find a more convenient place in the sequel.

§ 16. And now with regard to the cases that have been included in the evidential part of the present work. A certain separation has been attempted. In the main body of the book, no cases are given which are not first-hand, or of the particular second-hand sort which (as explained on p. 119) is on a par with the first-hand¹; or in which the *primâ facie* probability that the facts stated are substantially correct is not tolerably strong. But the Supplement includes a good many second-hand accounts²; as well as first-hand accounts where the evidence, from lack of

¹ Cases 256, 257, are in part exceptions, but see remarks thereon.

² We have seen that there is one sort of second-hand evidence which must rank as on a par with first-hand. On the same principle there is one sort of third-hand evidence which must rank as on a par with second-hand. A few third-hand accounts of this type have been admitted to the Supplement; and one or two others by special exception.

corroboration or other causes, falls short of the standard previously attained.¹ Our principle in selecting cases for the Supplement has been to take only those which—supposing telepathy to be established as a fact in Nature—would reasonably be regarded as examples of it. Their existence adds force to the proof of telepathy; but we should not have put them forward as an adequate proof by themselves. This separation, however, does not apportion the evidential weight of the two divisions with rigid precision. For, given a certain amount of assurance that the facts are correctly reported, the value of the facts *in the argument for telepathy* will vary according to the class to which they belong. There are strong classes and weak classes. Now the body of the work includes specimens of purely emotional impressions, and of dreams—classes which we shall find by their very nature to be weak; and more weight might reasonably be attached to some case in the Supplement, even though less completely attested, if it belonged to the strongest class, which we shall find to be the class of waking visual phantasms. And even within the limits of a single class, it is impossible to evaluate the cases with exactness. A phantasm of sight or sound which does not at the moment suggest the appearance or voice of an absent friend, may still—if unique in the percipient's experience, and if the coincidence of time with the friend's death is exact—have about an equal claim to be considered telepathic with a distinctly recognised phantasm, the coincidence of which with the death (though it may have been exact) cannot with certainty be brought closer than three or four days.

Then as regards the mere accuracy of the records—though it has been possible to draw up a sort of table of degrees, such a table, of course, affords no final criterion. It is a guide in the dissection of testimony; it directs attention to important structural points; but it takes no account of the living qualities, the character, training, and habits of thought of witnesses. We have included no cases where the witnesses were not, to the best of our belief, honest in intention, and possessed of sufficient intelligence to be competent reporters of definite facts with which they had been closely connected. But the report, say, of a sceptical lawyer or a man of science, who had totally disbelieved in the whole class of phenomena until convinced by his own experience, is naturally stronger evidence than the report of a lady who, whether owing to natural proclivities or to want of scientific training, has no sense of any *à priori* objections to the telepathic hypothesis. The report of a person who has seen the phantasm of a friend at the time of his death, but considers that the coincidence may have been accidental, is stronger evidence than the report of a person who would regard such a supposition as irreverent. Each case must be judged on its merits, by reference to a considerable number of points; and, as far as written testimony goes, the reader will have the same opportunities as we have had for forming an opinion. We have done our best to obtain corroborative evidence of all sorts, whether from private sources, from public notices, or from official records. We have often failed; and these failures, and other evidential flaws, have

¹ There are, however, a few first-hand cases in the Supplement which would have found a place in the main body of the work (in substitution probably for some which now appear there), had they been received earlier.

been brought into (I fear) wearisome prominence. In quotations, care has, of course, been taken to give the exact words of witnesses. The only exceptions are that (1) we have occasionally omitted reflections and other matter which formed no part of the evidence; and (2) we have corrected a few obvious slips of writing, and introduced an occasional word for the sake of grammatical coherence, where the narrative has come to us piecemeal, or where the above-named omissions have been made. But in no case have we made the slightest alteration of meaning, or omitted anything that could by any possibility be held to modify the account given. A few cases have been summarised, in whole or in part; but here the form of the sentences will show that they are not quotations. Any word or phrase interpolated for other than grammatical reasons is clearly distinguished by being placed within square brackets.

One advantage, however, which we ourselves have had, cannot be communicated to our readers—namely, the increased power of judgment which a personal interview with the narrator gives. The effect of these interviews on our own minds has been on the whole distinctly favourable. They have greatly added to our confidence that what we are here presenting is the testimony of trustworthy and intelligent witnesses. And if the collection be taken as a whole, this seems to be a sufficient guarantee. It follows from the very nature of telepathic cases (as distinguished, say, from the alleged phenomena of “ghost-seeing” or of “Spiritualism”) that the evidence often in great measure, so to speak, *makes itself*—the agent’s side in the matter being beyond dispute. Thus a valid case, as has been shown above, might perfectly well rest on the testimony of a person whose own interpretation of it was totally erroneous, and whose intelligence and memory were only adequate to reporting truthfully that he thought he saw so-and-so in his room yesterday or the day before. But we have naturally preferred to be on the safe side. We have, therefore, excluded all narratives where, on personal acquaintance with the witnesses, we felt that we should be uneasy in confronting them with a critical cross-examiner; and we have frequently thought it right to exclude cases, otherwise satisfactory, that depended on the reports of uneducated persons. Nor, I think, will the reader find much to suggest perversion of facts through superstitious *à priori* fancies. The greater part of our witnesses, as already stated, have had no special belief in the phenomena, except so far as they have themselves come in contact with them; and even where their interest has been awakened, it has seldom been of a more intense kind than might naturally be excited by a remarkable passage of personal or family experience. They have not, for instance, been at all in the attitude towards the subject which is now ours, and which it is hoped that the reader may come to share. Thus even on this score, their common sense, in the ordinary straightforward meaning of the term, could hardly be impugned. Perhaps even so general a testimony to character as this is somewhat of an impertinence; to give it precision in particular cases would, as a rule, be out of the question. But however little weight such an expression of opinion may have, the mere statement that we are, in the large majority of cases, personally acquainted with our witnesses, has a distinct bearing on the evidence;

for it practically implies that they gave us their account in such a way that their good faith is pledged to it.

§ 17. But there is quantity as well as quality to consider : the basis of our demonstration needs to be broad as well as strong. We might have a few correspondences perfect in every detail, a few coincidences precise to the moment, established by evidence which was irresistible ; and pure accident might still be the true explanation of them. Later, however, it will be proved, as I think, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that that line cannot be taken in respect of the several hundreds of coincidences included in these volumes. And the majority of persons who regard the book from an evidential point of view, and who start with the legitimate *à priori* prejudice against the whole class of phenomena, will certainly take other ground. They will take exception to the evidence as it stands. They will not be concerned to deny that there would be an enormously strong case for the reality of telepathy, supposing the correspondences and coincidences to have occurred exactly as stated ; but they will take the ground that they did not so occur ; and will frame various hypotheses, according to which it should be possible that the evidence should be thus, and the facts otherwise.

Now not only is the endeavour to frame such hypotheses legitimate : it has been throughout an indispensable part of our own work. Even improbable hypotheses ought to be carefully considered ; for we have no desire to underrate the *à priori* improbability of our own hypotheses of telepathy. It is extremely difficult to compare the improbability of any particular combination of known conditions with the improbability of the existence of a hitherto unknown condition. But the point on which we desire to lay stress is the *number* of improbable hypotheses that will have to be propounded if the telepathic explanation is rejected. Of course, this point may be evaded by including all the hypotheses needed in a single sweeping assumption, as to the general untrustworthiness of human testimony. This mode of argument would be perfectly legitimate if we were presenting a collection of unsifted second and third hand stories ; but it will scarcely seem equally so in application to what we do present. The evidence (or at any rate a very large amount of it) is of a sort which merits attention, even from those who most fully share the views that I have endeavoured to express as to the chances of error in the records of unusual occurrences. It cannot be summarily dismissed ; if it is to be got rid of, it must be explained away in detail. And it is the continued process of attempts to explain away which may, we think, produce on others the same cumulative effect as it has produced on ourselves. The attempts have been made on the lines already sketched ; and so far as any reader agrees that the risks and vulnerable points have been carefully considered in the abstract, he may be willing provisionally to accept an assurance that a similar careful and rationally sceptical mode of examination has been applied to the concrete instances. The work is, no doubt, wearisome ; but there is no avoiding it, for anyone who wishes to form a fair independent opinion as to what the strength of the case for telepathy really is. The narratives are very various, and their force is derived from very various characteristics ; the endeavour to account for them without

resorting to telepathy must, therefore, be carried through a considerable number of groups, before it produces its legitimate effect on the mind. That effect arises from the number and variety of the improbable suppositions, now violent, now vague—contradictory of our experience of all sorts of human acts and human relations—that have to be made at every turn. Not only have we to assume such an extent of forgetfulness and inaccuracy, about simple and striking facts of the immediate past, as is totally unexampled in any other range of experience. Not only have we to assume that distressing or exciting news about another person produces a havoc in the memory which has never been noted in connection with distress or excitement in any other form. We must leave this merely general ground, and make suppositions as detailed as the evidence itself. We must suppose that some people have a way of dating their letters in indifference to the calendar, or making entries in their diaries on the wrong page and never discovering the error; and that whole families have been struck by the collective hallucination that one of their members had made a particular remark, the substance of which had never entered that member's head; and that it is a recognised custom to write mournful letters about bereavements which have never occurred; and that when A describes to a friend how he has distinctly heard the voice of B, it is not infrequently by a slip of the tongue for C; and that when D says he is not subject to hallucinations of vision, it is through momentary forgetfulness of the fact that he has a spectral illusion once a week; and that when a wife interrupts her husband's slumbers with words of distress or alarm, it is only her fun, or a sudden morbid craving for undeserved sympathy; and that when people assert that they were in sound health, in good spirits, and wide awake, at a particular time which they had occasion to note, it is a safe conclusion that they were having a nightmare, or were the prostrate victims of nervous hypochondria. Every one of these improbabilities is, perhaps, in itself a possibility; but as the narratives drive us from one desperate expedient to another, when time after time we are compelled to own that deliberate falsification is less unlikely than the assumptions we are making, and then again when we submit the theory of deliberate falsification to the cumulative test, and see what is involved in the supposition that hundreds of persons of established character, known to us for the most part and unknown to one another, have simultaneously formed a plot to deceive us—there comes a point where the reason rebels. Common sense persists in recognising that when phenomena, which are united by a fundamental characteristic and have every appearance of forming a single natural group, are presented to be explained, an explanation which multiplies causes is improbable, and an explanation which multiplies improbable causes becomes, at a certain point, incredible.

§ 18. I am aware that in its abstract form, and apart from actual study of the cases, this reasoning must be wholly unconvincing. But meanwhile the argument for the *general* trustworthiness of our evidence may be put in another and, perhaps, clearer light. Amid all their differences, the cases present one general characteristic—an unusual affection of one person, having no apparent relation to anything outside him except the

unusual condition, otherwise unknown to him, of another person. It is this characteristic that gives them the appearance, as I have just said, of a *true natural group*. Now the full significance of these words may easily escape notice. They have an *evidential* as well as a *theoretic* bearing. They involve, of course, the hypothesis that the facts, if truly stated, are probably due to a single cause; but they involve, further, a very strong argument that the facts *are* truly stated. Let us suppose, for the moment, that any amount of laxity of memory and of statement may be expected even from first-hand witnesses, belonging to the educated class. And let us ignore all the heterogeneous improbabilities which we were just now considering; and assume that the mistakes mentioned, and others like them, may occur at any moment. What, then, is the likelihood that all these various causes—all these errors of inference, lapses of memory, and exaggerations and perversions of narration—will issue in a consistent body of evidence, presenting one well-defined type of phenomenon, free in every case from excrescences or inconsistent features and explicable, and completely explicable, by one equally well-defined hypothesis? What is the likelihood that a number of narratives, which are assumed to have diverged in various ways from the actual facts, should thus converge to a single result? Several hundreds of independent and first-hand reporters have, wittingly or unwittingly, got loose from the truth, and are well started down the inclined plane of the marvellous. Yet all of them stop short at or within a given line—the line being the exact one up to which a particular explanation, not of theirs but of ours, can be extended, and beyond which it could not be extended. Tempting marvels lie further on—marvels which in the popular view are quite as likely to be true as the facts actually reported, and which the general traditions of the subject would connect with those facts. But our reporters one and all eschew them. To take, for instance, the group of cases which the reader will probably find to be the most interesting, as it is also the largest, in our collection—apparitions at the time of death. Why should not such apparitions hold prolonged converse with the waking friend? Why should they not produce *physical* effects—shed tears on the pillow and make it wet, open the door and leave it open, or leave some tangible token of their presence? It is surely noteworthy that we have not had to reject, on grounds like these, a single narrative which on other grounds would have been admitted. Have all our informants drawn an arbitrary line, and all drawn precisely the same arbitrary line, between the mistakes and exaggerations of which they *will* be guilty, and the mistakes and exaggerations of which they *will not*? We might imagine them as travellers, ignorant of zoology, each of whom reports that he has landed on a strange shore, and has encountered a strange animal. Some of the travellers have been nearer the animal, and have had a better view of him than others, and their accounts vary in clearness; but these accounts, though independently drawn up, all point to the same source; they all present a consistent picture of the self-same animal, and, what is more, the picture is one which zoology can find no positive cause to distrust. We find in it none of the familiar features of myth or of untrained fancy; the reports have not given wings to a quadruped, or horns and hoofs to a carnivore; they contradict nothing that is known. Can we fairly suppose that this

complete agreement, alike in what they contain and in what they do not contain, is the accidental result of a hundred disconnected mistakes ?

It is most instructive, in this connection, to compare first-hand (and the better sort of second-hand) narratives with others. I have already spoken of the greater general sobriety of the first-hand evidence. I may now add that the suspiciously startling details which often characterise the more remote narratives are precisely of the sort which the telepathic hypothesis could by no possibility be made to cover. To wet the pillow or leave the door open would be quite an ordinary breach of manners in the popular "ghost," or the second-hand apparition of doubtful authority. I have mentioned the real dripping letter conveyed by the phantasmal midshipman. I may further recall the scar reported to have been left on the lady's wrist by the touch of the well-known "Beresford" apparition ; and the wounds alleged to have been produced on the bodies of absent witches, by blows and sword thrusts directed to their "astral" appearances. No marvels in the least resembling these find any place in our first-hand records ; yet why should they not, if those records are fundamentally untrustworthy ? The existence of such features in other narratives sufficiently shows how wide is the possible range of incidents, in stories where the ordinary limitations of communication between human beings are alleged to have been transcended. Of this wide field, the hypothesis of the action of mind on mind, which we are endeavouring to develop, covers only a single well-defined portion. By what fatality, if error is widely at work in the case of our first-hand evidence, do its results always fall inside and not outside this very limited area ? If our witnesses are assumed to sit loose to the facts which they *have* known, why should they bring their accounts into rigid (though purely accidental) conformity with a theory which they have *not* known ?

§ 19. What I have here indicated is the general impression produced by the evidence in our own minds. In our view, the reality of telepathy (even apart from a consideration of the experimental evidence) may be not unreasonably taken as proved. Having formed this view, we are bound to state it ; but we expressly refrain from putting it forward dogmatically, and from saying that to reject it would argue want of candour or intelligence. We hold that, in such a matter, it is idle to attempt to define the line of complete proof ; and the proof given—if it be one—is far from being of an *éclatant* or overwhelming sort. To those who do not realise the strength of the *à priori* presumption against it, it may easily look more overwhelming than it is. To others, again, it may appear that, on the hypothesis that the faculty has acted as widely as we have supposed, the highest evidential standard ought to have been reached in a larger number of cases. To us it rather seems that the evidence that we find is just about what might have been expected. We see nothing in the mere existence of telepathy that would tend to make reserved people mention strange experiences, or to make careless or busy people keep conscientious diaries—or generally that would lead the persons immediately connected with a telepathic case, in which their emotions may be deeply involved, to act with a single eye to producing a clinching piece of evidence for the future benefit of critical psychological

inquirers. It would, of course, be useless for us to urge that evidence which falls short of the best is still as good as can be expected, unless we were able to present a certain nucleus of fairly conclusive cases, and this we think we can do. But if the proof is held to demand more cases of the highest evidential quality, we must trust to time for them. The ideal collection would, of course, be one where every independent instance should be so evidentially complete that it must be either (1) telepathic, or (2) a purely accidental coincidence of a most striking kind, or (3) the result of a fraudulent conspiracy to deceive, in which several persons of good character and reputation have taken part. In our view, this point has been reached in a sufficient number of the examples here given to exclude the second and third of these alternatives; but these examples constitute only a very small minority compared with the mass of cases which are merely confirmatory—strongly confirmatory, as we think, but still confirmatory only and not crucial. And the collection so far falls short of the ideal.

In saying, then, that telepathy may not unreasonably be taken as proved, I do not wish for a moment to imply that the proof which we give is the one which we should eventually desire to see given. To no reader, we think, will the various imperfections and weak spots of our case be more patent than they have been to ourselves. Some of these are beyond remedy—as the absence of contemporary documents. Others may possibly be remedied at a later stage—for instance, the suppression of names.¹ It has been impossible to bring home to all our informants that where a person refuses to a phenomenon, belonging to a certain class, the direct testimony which he would give, if needful, to any other sort of personal experience, the world is sure to take the view that he lacks that complete assurance of the reality of the experience which alone can make his evidence worthy of serious attention. This is not always just; since the reason why he suppresses his name may be, not that he doubts the truth of his evidence, but that he regards the truth in this particular department of Nature as something disgraceful or uncanny; or it may be mere fear of ridicule, or a shrinking from any form of publicity. But meanwhile the defect must not be extenuated. Even minor points may detract from the businesslike look of the work. Informants whose evidence is otherwise satisfactory sometimes feel it a sort of mysterious duty to throw a veil over something—if it is only to put C—for Clapham. A dash is the last refuge of the occult. We must not be held to be blind to these blots because we have printed the evidence in which they occur. But the case, as it stands, seemed worth presenting, and the time for presenting it seemed to have arrived. Even if it be weaker than we think it, there is the future as well as the past to think of. By far the greater part of the telepathic evidence, even of the last twenty years, has undoubtedly perished, for all scientific purposes; we want the account for the next twenty years to be different. But it is only by a decided change in the

¹ The suppressed names have in all cases [with seven exceptions in the Supplement as explained in Gurney's Additions and Corrections—Ed.] been given to us in confidence; and in some instances with permission to mention them to any persons who have any *bonâ fide* interest in the subject. Purely anonymous cases can of course have no weight at all.

attitude of the public mind towards the subject that the passing phenomena can be caught and fixed ; and it is only by a wider knowledge of what there already is to know that this change can come about. Thus our best chance of a more satisfactory harvest hereafter is to exhibit our sheaf of gleanings now. If telepathy is a reality, examples of it may be trusted to go on occurring ; and with the increase of intelligent interest in psychical research we may hope that the collection and verification of good first-hand evidence will gradually become easier, and that the necessity of careful contemporary records, and of complete attestation, will be more widely perceived.

§ 20. Meanwhile it may be just worth while to forestall an objection—which, as it has been made before, may be made again—to the argument from numbers. It has been urged that no accumulation of instances can make up a solid case, if no individual instance can be absolutely certified as free from flaw. But the different items of inductive proof are, of course, not like the links of a deductive chain. The true metaphor is the sticks and the faggot ; and our right to treat any particular case as a stick depends, not on its being so flawlessly strong, as evidence for our hypothesis, that no other hypothesis can possibly be entertained with regard to it, but the much humbler fact that any other hypothesis involves the assumption of *something in itself improbable*. Third-hand ghost-stories, and the ordinary examples of popular superstitions, have no claim to be regarded as sticks at all, since the rejection of the popular explanation of them involves no improbable assumptions of any kind ; at best they are dry reeds, and no multiplication of their number could ever make a respectable faggot. But in every one of the examples on which we rest the telepathic hypothesis, the rejection of that hypothesis does, as I have pointed out, involve the assumption of something in itself improbable ; and every such example adds to the cumulative force of the argument for telepathy. The multiplication of such examples, therefore, makes a faggot of ever-increasing solidity.

When made explicit, this seems too plain to be denied ; but an extreme case may perhaps make the point even clearer. If, since the world began, nobody had ever died without a phantasm of him appearing to one or more of his friends, the joint occurrence of the two events would have been a piece of universally recognised knowledge ; of the cause of which we should to this day possibly not know more, and could not possibly know less, than we know of the cause of gravitation. Nor, if the attestation had been forthcoming in the case of only *half* the deaths, would its significance have been much more likely to be disputed ; nor if it had been forthcoming in the case of a quarter, or a tenth, or even a hundredth of the number. But those who admit this, practically admit that there is a conceivable number of well-attested cases which they would regard as conclusive evidence of telepathy. We may ask them, then, to name their number ; and if they do so, we may not unreasonably proceed to inquire the grounds of their selection. A writer on the subject lately named 5000 as the mark ; but can he make his reasons explicit for considering 5000 as conclusive, and 4000, or even 1000, as inconclusive ? In course of time we hope that his minimum may be reached ; but any

limit must be to a great extent arbitrary. We shall be content if impartial readers, who do not feel convinced that an adequate inductive proof has been attained, are yet brought to see that our object and method are scientifically defensible; while we, on our side, fully admit that the adequacy of the present collection does not admit of demonstration, and are perfectly willing that it should be regarded as only a first imperfect instalment of what is needed.

§ 21. Perhaps, after all, the differences of instinct as to what really is needed may be considerably less than at first sight appears. For we have not been able to regard the alleged phenomena in the completely detached fashion which most of those who consider them naturally adopt. We are unable to determine how far the impression on our own minds of the evidence for *spontaneous* telepathy has been dependent on our conviction of the genuineness of cognate *experimental* cases. These latter being for the most part trivial, recent, and little known, it is not surprising that comparatively few persons should have considered them, and that still fewer should have grasped their bearing on the spontaneous cases. But to anyone who accepts the experimental results, the *à priori* presumption against other forms of supersensuous communication can hardly retain its former aspect. The presumption is diminished—the hospitality of the mind to such phenomena is increased—in a degree which is none the less important that it does not admit of calculation. A further step of about equal importance is made when we advance to the better-evidenced of the *transitional* cases; though here again the effect on our own minds, due to our knowledge of the persons concerned, cannot be imparted to others. Attention has been duly drawn to the difficulty of embracing these several classes in a common *physical* conception; but on *psychological* ground we cannot doubt that we are justified (provisionally at any rate) in regarding them as continuous. Remembering the existence of the transitional class, we may regard the extremes as not more remote from one another than the electrical phenomena of the cat's coat from those of the firmament. Electricity, indeed, affords in this way a singularly close parallel to telepathy. "The spontaneous apparitions of the dying" (I quote Mr. Myers' words) "may stand for the lightning; while the ancient observations on the attraction of amber for straw may fairly be paralleled by our modest experiments with cards and diagrams. The spontaneous phenomena, on the one hand, have been observed in every age, but observed with mere terror and bewilderment. And, on the other hand, candid friends have expressed surprise at our taking a serious interest in getting a rude picture from one person's mind into another, or proving that ginger may be hot in the mouth by the effect of unconscious sympathy alone. Yet we hold that these trivial cases of community of sensation are the germinal indications of a far-reaching force, whose higher manifestations may outshine these as the lightning outshines the sparks on Puss's back. We hold that the lowest telepathic manifestations may be used to explain and corroborate the highest." Their conditions differ widely; so widely, indeed, as to supply indirectly an argument for the genuineness of the facts, since totally distinct and independent hypotheses—that of collusion in the one case, and of forgetfulness or exaggeration

in the other—would be needed to refute them. Yet, with all this difference of conditions, when we compare the facts of either class with any facts which the accepted psychology includes, we cannot help recognising the great common characteristic—a supersensuous influence of mind on mind—as a true generic bond. Where that characteristic is found, there we have a natural group of phenomena which differ far more fundamentally from all other known phenomena than they can possibly differ among themselves. Their unity is found in contrast. Till more is known of their causes, it may be impossible for science to establish their inner relationships, just as it is impossible to establish the degrees of affinity between casually selected members of a single human community. But they draw together, so to speak, on the field of science, even as men of one race draw together when cast among an alien population.

CHAPTER V

SPECIMENS OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF SPONTANEOUS TELEPATHY

§ 1. WE now come to the actual evidence for spontaneous telepathy. As has been explained, the proof is cumulative, and its strength can only be truly estimated by a patient study of a very large mass of testimony. But to wade through a number of the cases is far from an attractive task. They are very unexciting—monotonous amid all their variety—as different from the *Mysteries of Udolpho* as from the dignified reports of a learned society, and far more likely to provoke slumber in the course of perusal than to banish it afterwards. And for the convenience of those who desire neither to toil nor to sleep, it will be well to disregard logical arrangements and to present at once a few preliminary samples. This chapter, therefore, will include a small batch of narratives which may serve as types of the different classes of telepathic phenomena, while further illustrating various important evidential points. At the present stage it will, no doubt, be open to anyone who accepts the facts in these cases as essentially correct to regard every one of the coincidences as accidental. The reasoning that will prevent this conclusion must still be taken on trust; it could not be given now without delaying the concrete illustrations till the reader would be weary of waiting for them. Nor would it be profitable at this place to enter fully into the principles of the classification, which can only be made clear in connection with the evidence. I will therefore sketch here the main headings, without comment, trusting to the further development of the work to justify the arrangement adopted.

We find our most distinct line of classification in the nature of the percipient's impression. This at once divides the cases into two great families—those (A) where the impression is *sensory and externalised*, and those (B) where it is *not sensory or externalised*. In the first division the experience is a percept or quasi-percept—something which the person seems to see, hear, or feel, and which he instinctively refers to the outer world. In the second division, the impression is of an inward or ideal kind—either a mental image, or an emotion, or a mere blind impulse towards some sort of action. There is also a small group of cases (C) which it is not easy to assign to either division—those, namely, where the experience of the percipient is sensory, without being an external-seeming affection of sight, hearing, or touch—for instance, a physical feeling of illness or malaise. This small group will be most conveniently treated with the emotional division, into which it shades. Further, each of these divisions is represented in sleeping as well as in waking life, so that *dreams* form a comprehensive class (D) of their own; and the *externalised*

division is also strongly represented in a region of experience which is on the *borderland* (E) between complete sleep and complete normal wakefulness. Lastly, there are two peculiarities attaching to certain cases in all or nearly all the above divisions, which are of sufficient importance to form the basis of two separate classes. The first of these is the *reciprocal* class (F), where each of the persons concerned seems to exercise a telepathic influence on the other; and the second is the *collective* class (G), where more percipients than one take part in a single telepathic incident.

§ 2. Now the logical starting-point for the following inquiry will naturally be found in the cases which present most analogy to the results of experimental thought-transference. All those results, it will be remembered, were of the *non-externalised* type. I shall therefore start with inward impressions, ideal and emotional, and shall advance, through dreams—where each of us has, so to speak, an outer as well as an inner world of his own—to the “borderland” and waking impressions which seem to fall on the senses in an objective way from the outer world that is common to us all.

But though the impressions received by the percipient in the experimental cases had no *external* quality, a good many of them were distinctly *sensory*—one important branch being transference of *pains*. And if the parallel between experimental and spontaneous effects be a just one, we might fairly expect to find cases where a localised pain has been similarly transferred from one person to another at a distance. I will open this preliminary batch of narratives with just such a case, the simplest possible specimen of group C, and as pure an instance of transference of sensation, unattended by any idea or image, as can well be conceived. The parties concerned are Mr. Arthur Severn, the distinguished landscape-painter, and his wife; and the narrative was obtained through the kindness of Mr. Ruskin. Mrs. Severn says:—

“Brantwood, Coniston.

“October 27th, 1883.

(17) “I woke up with a start, feeling I had had a hard blow on my mouth, and with a distinct sense that I had been cut, and was bleeding under my upper lip, and seized my pocket-handkerchief, and held it (in a little pushed lump) to the part, as I sat up in bed, and after a few seconds, when I removed it, I was astonished not to see any blood, and only then realised it was impossible anything could have struck me there, as I lay fast asleep in bed, and so I thought it was only a dream!—but I looked at my watch, and saw it was seven, and finding Arthur (my husband) was not in the room, I concluded (rightly) that he must have gone out on the lake for an early sail, as it was so fine.

“I then fell asleep. At breakfast (half-past nine), Arthur came in rather late, and I noticed he rather purposely sat farther away from me than usual, and every now and then put his pocket-handkerchief furtively up to his lip, in the very way I had done. I said, ‘Arthur, why are you doing that?’ and added a little anxiously, ‘I know you have hurt yourself! but I’ll tell you why afterwards.’ He said, ‘Well, when I was sailing a sudden squall came, throwing the tiller suddenly round, and it struck me a bad blow in the mouth, under the upper lip, and it has been bleeding a good deal and won’t stop.’ I then said, ‘Have you any idea

what o'clock it was when it happened ? ' and he answered, ' It must have been about seven.'

" I then told what had happened to *me*, much to *his* surprise, and all who were with us at breakfast.

" It happened here about three years ago at Brantwood, to me.

" JOAN R. SEVERN."

In reply to inquiries Mrs. Severn writes :—

" There was no doubt about my starting up in bed wide awake, as I stuffed my pocket-handkerchief into my mouth, and held it pressed under my upper lip for some time before removing it to ' see the blood,'—and was much surprised that there was none. Some little time afterwards I fell asleep again. I believe that when I got up, an hour afterwards, the impression was still vividly in my mind, and that as I was dressing I did look under my lip to see if there was any mark."

Mr. Severn's account, dated November 15th, 1883, is as follows :—

" Early one summer morning, I got up intending to go and sail on the lake ; whether my wife heard me going out of the room I don't know ; she probably did, and in a half-dreamy state knew where I was going.

" When I got down to the water I found it calm, like a mirror, and remember thinking it quite a shame to disturb the wonderful reflections of the opposite shore. However, I soon got afloat, and as there was no wind, contented myself with pulling up my sails to dry, and putting my boat in order. Soon some slight air came, and I was able to sail about a mile below Brantwood, then the wind dropped, and I was left becalmed for half an hour or so, when, on looking up to the head of the lake, I saw a dark blue line on the water. At first I couldn't make it out, but soon saw that it must be small waves caused by a strong wind coming. I got my boat as ready as I could, in the short time, to receive this gust, but somehow or other she was taken aback, and seemed to spin round when the wind struck her, and in getting out of the way of the boom I got my head in the way of the tiller, which also swung round and gave me a nasty blow in the mouth, cutting my lip rather badly, and having become loose in the rudder it came out and went overboard. With my mouth bleeding, the mainsheet more or less round my neck, and the tiller gone, and the boat in confusion, I could not help smiling to think how suddenly I had been humbled almost to a wreck, just when I thought I was going to be so clever ! However, I soon managed to get my tiller, and, with plenty of wind, tacked back to Brantwood, and, making my boat snug in the harbour, walked up to the house, anxious of course to hide as much as possible what had happened to my mouth, and, getting another handkerchief, walked into the breakfast-room, and managed to say something about having been out early. In an instant my wife said, ' You don't mean to say you have hurt your mouth ? ' or words to that effect. I then explained what had happened, and was surprised to see some extra interest on her face, and still more surprised when she told me she had started out of her sleep thinking she had received a blow in the mouth ! and that it was a few minutes past seven o'clock, and wondered if my accident had happened at the same time ; but as I had no watch with me I couldn't tell, though on comparing notes, it certainly looked as if it had been about the same time.

" ARTHUR SEVERN."

Considering what a vivid thing pain often is, it might seem likely that this form of telepathy, if it exists, would be comparatively common, in

comparison with the more ideal or intellectual forms which are connected with the higher senses. This, however, is not so. It is conceivable, of course, that instances occur which go unnoticed. For, apart from injury, even a sharp pain is soon forgotten; and unless the copy reproduced the original with excruciating fidelity, a sudden pang might be referred to some ordinary cause, and the coincidence would never be noted. We, however, can only go by what *is* noted. I mentioned that even in experimental trials the phenomenon has been little observed except with hypnotised "subjects"; and on the evidence we must allow its spontaneous appearance to be even rarer. The stock instance is that of the brothers, Louis and Charles Blanc, the latter of whom professed to have experienced a strong physical shock at the time that his brother was felled in the streets of Paris by (as was supposed) some Bonapartist bully. But this is a third-hand story at best; and the above is our only first-hand instance where the pain was of an unusual kind, and was very exactly localised. It is specially for cases of this sort—most interesting to science, but with neither pathos nor dignity to keep them alive—that the chance of preservation will, we trust, be improved by the existence of a classified collection, where they may at once find their proper place.

What has been said of pains applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to all affections of the lower senses. In the first place, it is the exception and not the rule for the spontaneous transferences to reproduce in the percipient the exact sensation of the agent (p. 92); and, in the second place, such reproduction (or at any rate the evidence for it) seems almost wholly confined to the higher senses of sight and hearing. Thus, though we found that transference of *tastes* had been a very successful branch of the experimental work, we have no precisely analogous record in the spontaneous class. The nearest approach is a case which concerned the sense of smell, but where there was no direct transference of sensation as such. The case is, however, worth quoting here on another ground, as illustrating one of the evidential points of the last chapter—namely, that the strength of any evidence, in the sense of the assurance which it produces that the facts are correctly reported, is a very different thing from its strength as a contribution to the proof of telepathy. Thus, no one probably will care to dispute the facts in the following narrative; but the coincidence recorded is little, if at all, more striking than most of us occasionally encounter; and recourse to the telepathic explanation can only be justified by our knowledge that the two persons concerned have, on other occasions, given very much more conclusive signs of their power of supersensuous communication.¹ The Rev. P. H. Newnham, of Maker Vicarage, Devonport, writes to us:—

"January 26th, 1885.

(18) "In March, 1861, I was living at Houghton, Hants. My wife was at the time confined to the house, by delicacy of the lungs. One day, walking through a lane, I found the first wild violets of the spring, and took them home to her.

¹ See pp. 50-7. Mr. Newnham has further told us that coincidences of thought of a more or less striking kind occur to himself and his wife as matters of daily experience. But to differentiate these from the numerous domestic cases which pure accident will account for (Chap. vi., § 1), a written record would have to be accurately kept from day to day.

"Early in April I was attacked with a dangerous illness ; and in June left the place. I never told my wife exactly where I found the violets, nor, for the reasons explained, did I ever walk with her past the place where they grew, for many years.

"In November, 1873, we were staying with friends at Houghton ; and myself and wife took a walk up the lane in question. As we passed by the place, the recollection of those early violets of 12½ years ago flashed upon my mind. At the usual interval of some 20 or 30 seconds my wife remarked, ' It's very curious, but if it were not impossible, I should declare that I could smell violets in the hedge.'

"I had not spoken, or made any gesture or movement of any kind, to indicate what I was thinking of. Neither had my memory called up the perfume. All that I thought of was the exact locality on the hedge bank ; my memory being exceedingly minute for locality."

Mr. Newnham's residence at Houghton lasted only a few months, and with the help of a diary he can account for nearly every day's walking and work. "My impression is," he says, "that this was the first and only time that I explored this particular 'drive' ; and I feel certain that Mrs. Newnham never saw the spot at all until November, 1873. The hedges had then been grubbed, and no violets grew there."

The following is Mrs. Newnham's account :—

"May 28th, 1885.

"I perfectly remember our walking one day in November, 1873, at Houghton, and suddenly finding so strong a scent of violets in the air that I remarked to my husband, ' If it were not so utterly impossible, I should declare I smelt violets ! ' Mr. Newnham then reminded me of his bringing me the first violets in the spring of 1861, and told me that this was just about the spot where he had found them. I had quite forgotten the circumstance till thus reminded."

§ 3. We may now pass to illustrations of Class B—the class of ideal and emotional impressions. The following is a well-attested case of the transference of an idea. It was sent to us, in 1884, by our friend, the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, who wrote :—

"19, Heywood Street, Cheetham, Manchester.

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

"When the Rev. John Drake was minister of the Wesleyan Church at Aberdeen, Miss Jessie Wilson, the daughter of one of the principal lay office bearers in that church, sailed for India, to join the Rev. John Hutcheon, M.A., then stationed as a missionary at Bangalore, to whom she was under engagement to be married. Mr. Drake, one morning, came down to Mr. Wilson's place of business and said, ' Mr. Wilson, I am happy to be able to inform you that Jessie has had a pleasant voyage, and is now safely arrived in India.' Mr. Wilson said, ' How do you know that, Mr. Drake ? ' to which Mr. Drake replied, ' I saw it.' ' But,' said Mr. Wilson, ' it cannot be, for it is a fortnight too soon. The vessel has never made

the voyage within a fortnight of the time it is now since Jessie sailed.' To this Mr. Drake replied : ' Now you jot it down in your book that John Drake called this morning, and told you that Jessie has arrived in India this morning after a pleasant voyage.' Mr. Wilson accordingly made the entry, which Mrs. Hutcheon assures me she saw, when she returned home, and that it ran thus : ' Mr. Drake. Jessie arrived India morning of June 5th, 1860.' This turned out to have been literally the case. The ship had fair winds all the way, and made a quicker passage by a fortnight than ever she had made before."

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

" April 29th, 1885.

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

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

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

" C. HARGREAVES."

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

" Weston-super-Mare.

" February 20th, 1885.

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

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

" ' Why, Mr. D., what takes you abroad at this early hour ? '

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

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

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

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

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

"These particulars I received by letter at the time, and on our return home 7 years later, we heard it from my father's own lips. He is no longer with us, but the above are the plain facts as he gave them, and the little memo. in his handwriting, which he gave me as a curiosity, lies before me now.¹

"JESSIE HUTCHEON."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Hutcheon adds:—

"March 23rd.

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

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

[Mr. Macdonald tells us that he believes Mr. Drake had many such experiences, but that he found him so reticent that he despaired of getting an account of them from him. And Mr. Drake's death has now made the attempt impossible.]

As regards the facts here, the narrative will probably be accepted as trustworthy. As regards the inference that may be drawn, the case is eminently of a sort where the character of the professing percipient (in other points than the mere desire to be truthful) ought to be taken into account. From a person "given to little surprises," or who posed as a diviner if one out of a hundred guesses hit the mark, the evidence would deserve no attention; from a person of grave and reticent character, it is at any rate worthy of careful record.

In the last example, the idea apparently transferred was of a somewhat abstract kind—the impression of a mere event, without any concrete imagery. But the ideal class includes many instances of a distinctly pictorial kind, where a scene is as clearly presented to the inward eye as the image of a card or diagram in some of our experimental cases. The following account of a vivid mental picture of this sort was received from Mrs. Bettany, of 2, Eckington Villas, Ashbourne Grove, Dulwich.

"November, 1884.

(20) "When I was a child I had many remarkable experiences of a psychical nature, which I remember to have looked upon as ordinary and natural at the time.

"On one occasion (I am unable to fix the date, but I must have been about 10 years old) I was walking in a country lane at A., the place where my parents then resided. I was reading geometry as I walked along, a subject little likely to produce fancies or morbid phenomena of any kind, when, in a moment, I saw a bedroom known as the White Room in my home, and upon the floor lay my mother, to all appearance dead. The

¹ [Later, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for Oct., 1887, p. 530, Mr. Gurney states about this memorandum: "The original, which I have inspected, gives the gentleman's name, not initials."—ED.]

vision must have remained some minutes, during which time my real surroundings appeared to pale and die out ; but as the vision faded, actual surroundings came back, at first dimly, and then clearly.

" I could not doubt that what I had seen was real, so, instead of going home, I went at once to the house of our medical man and found him at home. He at once set out with me for my home, on the way putting questions I could not answer, as my mother was to all appearance well when I left home.

" I led the doctor straight to the White Room, where we found my mother actually lying as in my vision. This was true even to minute details. She had been seized suddenly by an attack at the heart, and would soon have breathed her last but for the doctor's timely advent. I shall get my father and mother to read this and sign it.

" JEANIE GWYNNE-BETTANY."

Mrs. Bettany's parents write :—

" We certify that the above is correct.

" S. G. GWYNNE.

" J. W. GWYNNE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Bettany says :—

(1) " I was in no anxiety about my mother at the time I saw the vision I described. She was in her usual health when I left her.

(2) " Something a little similar had once occurred to my mother. She had been out riding alone, and the horse brought her to our door hanging half off his back, in a faint. This was a long time before, and she never rode again. Heart-disease had set in. She was not in *the habit* of fainting unless an attack of the heart was upon her. Between the attacks she looked and acted as if in health.

(3) " The occasion I described was, I believe, the only one on which I saw a scene transported apparently into the actual field of vision, to the exclusion of objects and surroundings actually present.

" I have had other visions in which I have seen events happening as they *really were*, in another place, but I have been also conscious of *real* surroundings."

In answer to further inquiries, she adds :—

(1) " No one could tell whether my vision preceded the fact or not. My mother was supposed to be out. No one knew anything of my mother's being ill, till I took the doctor and my father, whom I had encountered at the door, to the room where we found my mother as I had seen her in my vision.

(2) " The doctor is dead. He has no living relation. No one in A. knew anything of these circumstances.

(3) " The White Room in which I saw my mother, and afterwards actually found her, was out of use. It was unlikely she should be there.

" She was found lying in the attitude in which I had seen her. I found a handkerchief with a lace border beside her on the floor. This I had distinctly noticed in my vision. There were other particulars of coincidence which I cannot put here."

Mrs. Bettany's father has given the following fuller account :—

" I distinctly remember being surprised by seeing my daughter, in company with the family doctor, outside the door of my residence ; and I asked ' Who is ill ? ' She replied, ' Mamma.' She led the way at once to the ' White Room,' where we found my wife lying in a swoon on the floor.

It was when I asked when she had been taken ill, that I found it must have been after my daughter had left the house. None of the servants in the house knew anything of the sudden illness, which our doctor assured me would have been *fatal* had he not arrived when he did.

“ My wife was quite well when I left her in the morning.

“ S. G. GWYNNE.”

If this vision suggests *clairvoyance*, owing to the amount of detail presented, we must still notice that it includes nothing which was not, or had not recently been, within the consciousness of the supposed agent. This point will claim further notice at a later stage. But the case is chiefly useful as illustrating an evidential point, which it will be very important to bear in mind in studying the mass of narratives in the sequel—namely, that possible inaccuracy as to details may leave the substantial fact which makes for telepathy quite untouched. It might, no doubt, be fairly urged that the vision described may have assumed its distinctness of detail in the percipient's mind only after the details of the actual scene had met her eyes. A child's mind might easily be indiscriminating in this respect; and, moreover, Mrs. Bettany is by nature a good visualiser; which may perhaps be supposed to involve a slight tendency to *retrospective hallucination*—to mistaking vividly-conceived images for memories of actual experiences. But even if this hypothesis be pressed to the uttermost, the fact that she unexpectedly fetched the doctor remains; and if her whole impression of her mother's critical condition was only a subsequent fancy, this very exceptional step must have been taken without a reason. That is to say, we can only reject what is the substantial part of the evidence by supposing a distinctly improbable thing to have happened. And that being so, the evidence is a true stick in the telepathic faggot (p. 128).

I will supplement these two last cases by a third, in which their respective points, the abstract idea of an event and the concrete picture of a scene, were both presented. This case will also illustrate an evidential point. It occasionally happens that a number of occurrences, perhaps trivial in character, and each of them likely enough to be dismissed as merely a very odd coincidence, fall to the experience of one person; and if he is observant of his impressions, he may gradually become conscious of a certain similarity between them, which leads him to regard them as telepathic, or at any rate as something more than accidental. Before it can be worth while to consider such evidence, we must have reason to believe that the witness is a good observer, and alive to the very general mistake of noting hits and not misses in these matters. Such an observer we believe that we have found in Mr. Keulemans, of 34, Matilda Street, Barnsbury, N., a well-known scientific draughtsman, of whose care and accuracy we have had several examples. He has experienced so many of these coincidences that, even before our inquiries quickened his interest in the matter, he had been accustomed to keep a record of his impressions—which, according to his own account, were invariably justified by fact. Some more of his cases will be given in the sequel. The one here quoted is trivial enough (except perhaps to the baby who fell out of bed), and of little force if it were a single experience. Yet it will be seen that the im-

pression was precise in character, was at once written down, and proved to be completely correct. We may perhaps assume Mrs. Keulemans to have been the agent.

" October 16th, 1883.

(21) " My wife went to reside at the seaside on September 30th last, taking with her our youngest child, a little boy 13 months old.

" On Wednesday, October 3rd, I felt a strong impression that the little fellow was worse (he was in weak health on his departure). The idea then prevailed on my mind that he had met with a slight accident; and immediately the picture of the bedroom in which he sleeps appeared in my mind's eye. It was *not* the strong sensation of awe or sorrow, as I had often experienced before on such occasions; but, anyhow, I fancied he had fallen *out of the bed*, upon chairs, and then rolled down upon the floor. This was about 11 a.m., and I at once wrote to my wife, asking her to let me know how the little fellow was getting on. I thought it rather bold to tell my wife that the baby had, to my conviction, really met with an accident, without being able to produce any confirmatory evidence. Also I considered that she would take it as an insinuation of carelessness on her part; therefore I purposely wrote it as a *post scriptum*.

" I heard no more about it, and even fancied that this time my impression was merely the consequence of anxiety. But on Saturday last I went to see my wife and child, and asked whether she had taken notice of my advice to protect the baby against such an accident. She smiled at first, and then informed me that he had tumbled out of bed upon the chairs placed at the side, and then found his way upon the floor, without being hurt. She further remarked, ' You must have been thinking of that when it was just too late, because it happened the same day your letter came, some hours previously.' I asked her what time of the day it happened. Answer: ' About 11 a.m.' She told me that she heard the baby fall, and at once ran upstairs to pick him up.

" I am certain, without the shadow of a doubt, that I wrote immediately after the impression; and that this was between 11 and 11.30 in the morning."

I have seen the letter which Mr. Keulemans wrote to his wife. The envelope bears the post-mark of Worthing, October 3rd; and the post-script contained the following words:—

" Mind little Gaston does not fall out of bed. Put chairs in front of it. You know accidents soon happen. The fact is, I am almost certain he has met with such a mishap this very morning."

Mrs. Kuelemans' aunt supplied the following testimony a day or two after Mr. Kuelemans' letter of October 16th.

" 36, Teville Street, Worthing.

" Mrs. Keulemans (my niece) and her baby are staying at my house. The baby had fallen out of bed the morning of the day the letter [*i.e.*, Mr. Keulemans' letter] was received. " C. GRAY."

The next account illustrates an emotional impression, with a certain amount of physical discomfort. The experience appears to have been of a very unusual sort, and the coincidence of time to have been exact; the case is therefore a strong example of a weak class. The narrator is Miss Martyn, of Long Melford Rectory, Suffolk.

" September 4th, 1884.

(22) " On March 16th, 1884, I was sitting alone in the drawing-room, reading an interesting book, and feeling perfectly well, when suddenly

I experienced an undefined feeling of dread and horror ; I looked at the clock and saw it was just 7 p.m. I was utterly unable to read, so I got up and walked about the room trying to throw off the feeling, but I could not : I became quite cold, and had a firm presentiment that I was dying.¹ The feeling lasted about half an hour, and then passed off, leaving me a good deal shaken all the evening ; I went to bed feeling very weak, as if I had been seriously ill.

" The next morning I received a telegram telling me of the death of a near and very dear cousin, Mrs. K., in Shropshire, with whom I had been most intimately associated all my life, but for the last two years had seen very little of her. I did not associate this feeling of death with her or with anyone else, but I had a most distinct impression that something terrible was happening. This feeling came over me, I afterwards found, just at the time when my cousin died (7 p.m.). The connection with her death may have been simply an accident. I have never experienced anything of the sort before. I was not aware that Mrs. K. was ill, and her death was peculiarly sad and sudden. " K. M."

Mr. White Cooper, through whose kindness we obtained this account, writes as follows :—

" 19, Berkeley Square, W.

" April 7th, 1885.

" I have asked Miss Martyn whether she had told anyone about her feeling of horror on March 16th, *before* she heard of the death of her cousin. She told me she had. She was quite convinced, and perfectly remembered telling Miss Mason the same evening, after Miss Mason had come from church, that she had had a peculiar feeling of horror and dread for which she could give no account. I then questioned Miss Mason, and enclose what she dictated."

Miss Mason says :—

" The Rectory, Long Melford, Suffolk.

" April 5th, 1885.

" I well remember Miss Martyn telling me that a feeling of horror and an indescribable dread came over her on Sunday evening, March 16th, 1884, while we were in church, and she was alone in the drawing-room ; that she was unable to shake it off, and felt very restless, and got up and walked about the room. She did not refer to anyone, and could give no cause for this peculiar feeling. I am under the impression that she told me the same evening (Sunday), and before she heard of the death of her cousin, but I am not certain whether it was Sunday or Monday that she told me about it. " ANNA M. MASON."

We have verified the date of the death in two local newspapers. The day was a Sunday, which is in accordance with the evidence.

§ 4. The next case illustrates the class of *dreams* (D). I am aware that the very mention of this class is apt to raise a prejudice against our whole inquiry. I shall explain later why it is extremely difficult to draw conclusive evidence of telepathy from dreams, and why we mark off the whole class of dreams, which are simply remembered as such, from the cases on which we rest our argument ; but I shall also hope to show that dreams, though needing to be treated with the greatest caution, have a necessary and instructive place in the conspectus of telepathic phenomena.

¹ Cf. case 70.

As to the evidential force of the present case, it will be enough to point out that the percipient states the experience to have been unique in his life; and that the violence of the effect produced, leading to the very unusual entry in the diary, puts the vision outside the common run of dreams which may justly be held to afford almost limitless scope for accidental coincidences. The narrative is from Mr. Frederick Wingfield, of Belle Isle en Terre, Côtes du Nord, France.

" 20th December, 1883.

(23) " I give you my most solemn assurance that what I am about to relate is the exact account of what occurred. I may remark that I am so little liable to the imputation of being easily impressed with a sense of the supernatural¹ that I have been accused, and with reason, of being unduly sceptical upon matters which lay beyond my powers of explanation.

" On the night of Thursday, the 25th of March, 1880, I retired to bed after reading till late, as is my habit. I dreamed that I was lying on my sofa reading, when, on looking up, I saw distinctly the figure of my brother, Richard Wingfield-Baker, sitting on the chair before me. I dreamed that I spoke to him, but that he simply bent his head in reply, rose and left the room. When I awoke, I found myself standing with one foot on the ground by my bedside, and the other on the bed, trying to speak and to pronounce my brother's name. So strong was the impression as to the reality of his presence and so vivid the whole scene as dreamt, that I left my bedroom to search for my brother in the sitting-room. I examined the chair where I had seen him seated, I returned to bed, tried to fall asleep in the hope of a repetition of the appearance, but my mind was too excited, too painfully disturbed, as I recalled what I had dreamed. I must have, however, fallen asleep towards the morning, but when I awoke, the impression of my dream was as vivid as ever—and, I may add, is to this very hour equally strong and clear. My sense of impending evil was so strong that I at once made a note in my memorandum book of this 'appearance,' and added the words, 'God forbid.'

" Three days afterwards I received the news that my brother, Richard Wingfield-Baker, had died on Thursday evening, the 25th of March, 1880, at 8.30 p.m., from the effects of the terrible injuries received in a fall while hunting with the Blackmore Vale hounds.

" I will only add that I had been living in this town some 12 months; that I had not had any recent communication with my brother; that I knew him to be in good health, and that he was a perfect horseman. I did not at once communicate this dream to any intimate friend—there was unluckily none here at that very moment—but I did relate the story after the receipt of the news of my brother's death, and showed the entry in my memorandum book. As evidence, of course, this is worthless; but I give you my word of honour that the circumstances I have related are the positive truth.

" FRED. WINGFIELD."

" February 4th, 1884.

" I must explain my silence by the excuse that I could not procure till to-day a letter from my friend the Prince de Lucinge-Faucigny, in which he mentions the fact of my having related to him the particulars of my dream on the 25th of March, 1880. He came from Paris to stay a few days with me early in April, and saw the entry in my note-book, which I

¹ This expression cannot be excluded, when the words of our informants are quoted. We, ourselves, of course, regard all these occurrences as strictly *natural*.

now enclose for your inspection. You will observe the initials R. B. W. B., and a curious story is attached to these letters. During that sleepless night I naturally dwelt upon the incident, and recalled the circumstances connected with the apparition. Though I distinctly recognised my brother's features, the idea flashed upon me that the figure bore some slight resemblance to my most intimate and valued friend, Colonel Bigge, and in my dread of impending evil to one to whom I am so much attached, I wrote the four initials, R. B. for Richard Baker, and W. B. for William Bigge. When the tidings of my brother's death reached me I again looked at the entry, and saw with astonishment that the four letters stood for my brother's full name, Richard Baker Wingfield-Baker, though I had always spoken of him as Richard Baker in common with the rest of my family. The figure I saw was that of my brother ; and in my anxious state of mind I worried myself into the belief that possibly it might be that of my old friend, as a resemblance did exist in the fashion of their beards. I can give you no further explanations, nor can I produce further testimony in support of my assertions.

"FRED. WINGFIELD."

With this letter, Mr. Wingfield sent me the note-book, in which among a number of business memoranda, notes of books, &c., I find the entry—"Appearance—Thursday night, 25th of March, 1880. R. B. W. B. God forbid !"

The following letter was enclosed :—

"Coat-an-nos, 2 février, 1884.

"Mon cher ami,—Je n'ai aucun effort de mémoire à faire pour me rappeler le fait dont vous me parlez, car j'en ai conservé un souvenir très net et très précis.

"Je me souviens parfaitement que le dimanche, 4 avril, 1880, étant arrivé de Paris le matin même pour passer ici quelques jours, j'ai été déjeuner avec vous. Je me souviens aussi parfaitement que je vous ai trouvé fort ému de la douloureuse nouvelle qui vous était parvenue quelques jours¹ auparavant, de la mort de l'un des messieurs vos frères. Je me rappelle aussi comme si le fait s'était passé hier, tant j'en ai été frappé, que quelques jours avant d'apprendre la triste nouvelle, vous aviez un soir, étant déjà couché, vu, ou cru voir, mais en tous cas très distinctement, votre frère, celui dont vous veniez d'apprendre la mort subite, tout près de votre lit, et que, dans las conviction où vous étiez que c'était bien lui que vous perceviez, vous vous étiez levé et lui aviez adressé la parole, et qu'à ce moment vous aviez cessé de le voir comme s'il s'était évanoui ainsi qu'un spectre. Je me souviens encore que, sous l'impression de l'émotion bien naturelle qui avait été la suite de cet événement, vous l'aviez inscrit dans un petit carnet où vous avez l'habitude d'écrire les faits saillants de votre très paisible existence, et que vous m'avez fait voir ce carnet. Cette apparition, cette vision, ou ce songe, comme vous voudrez l'appeler, est inscrit, si j'ai bon souvenir, à la date du 24 ou du 25 février,¹ et ce n'est que deux ou trois jours après que vous avez reçu la nouvelle officielle de la mort de votre frère.

"J'ai été d'autant moins surpris de ce que vous me disiez alors, et j'en ai aussi conservé un souvenir d'autant plus net et précis, comme je vous le disais en commençant, que j'ai dans ma famille des faits similaires auxquels je crois absolument.

¹ The words "*quelques jours auparavant*," coupled with the fact that the *number of the day* is right, suggest that *février* is a mere slip of the pen for *mars*.

"Des faits semblables arrivent, croyez-le bien, bien plus souvent qu'on ne le croit généralement; seulement on ne veut pas toujours les dire, parceque l'on se méfie de soi ou des autres.

"Au revoir, cher ami, à bientôt, je l'espère, et croyez bien à l'expression des plus sincères sentiments de votre tout dévoué

"FAUCIGNY, PRINCE LUCINGE."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Wingfield adds:—

"I have never had any other startling dream of the same nature, nor any dream from which I woke with the same sense of reality and distress, and of which the effect continued long after I was well awake. Nor have I upon any other occasion had a hallucination of the senses."

The *Times* obituary for March 30th, 1880, records the death of Mr. R. B. Wingfield-Baker, of Orsett Hall, Essex, as having taken place on the 25th. The *Essex Independent* gives the same date, adding that Mr. Baker breathed his last about 9 o'clock.

It will be seen here that the impression followed the death by a few hours—a feature which will frequently recur. The fact, of course, slightly detracts from the evidential force of a case, as compared with the completely simultaneous coincidences; inasmuch as the odds against the *accidental* occurrence of a unique impression of someone's presence within a few hours of his death, enormous as they are, are less enormous than the odds against a similar accidental occurrence within five minutes of the death. But the deferment of the impression, though to this slight extent affecting a case as an item of telepathic *evidence*, is not in itself any obstacle to the telepathic *explanation*. We may recall that in some of the experimental cases the impression was never a piece of conscious experience at all; while in others the latency and gradual emergencies of the idea was a very noticeable feature (pp. 47, 50–57). This justifies us in presuming that an impression which ultimately takes a sensory form may fail in the first instance to reach the threshold of attention. It may be unable to compete, at the moment, with the vivid sensory impressions, and the crowd of ideas and images, that belong to normal seasons of waking life; and it may thus remain latent till darkness and quiet give a chance for its development. This view seems at any rate supported by the fact that it is usually *at night* that the delayed impression—if such it be—emerges into the percipient's consciousness. It is supported also by analogies which recognised psychology supplies. I may refer to the extraordinary exaltation of memory sometimes observed in hypnotic and hystero-epileptic "subjects"; or even to the vivid revival, in ordinary dreaming, of impressions which have hardly affected the waking consciousness.

Mr. Wingfield's vision had another unusual feature besides the violence of its effect on him. It represented a single figure, without detail or incident. It was, so to speak, the *dream of an apparition*; and in this respect bears a closer affinity to "borderland" and waking cases than to dreams in general. It will be worth while to quote here one dream-case of a more ordinary type so far as its content is concerned, but resembling the last in its unusual and distressing vividness. The supposed agent in this instance experienced nothing more than a brief sense of danger and excitement, which, however, may have been sufficiently intense during the moments

that it lasted. The account is from Mrs. West, of Hildegarde, Furness Road, Eastbourne.

" 1883.

(24) " My father and brother were on a journey during the winter. I was expecting them home, without knowing the exact day of their return. The date, to the best of my recollection, was the winter of 1871-2. I had gone to bed at my usual time, about 11 p.m. Some time in the night I had a vivid dream, which made a great impression on me. I dreamt I was looking out of a window, when I saw father driving in a Spids sledge, followed in another by my brother. They had to pass a cross-road, on which another traveller was driving very fast, also in a sledge with one horse. Father seemed to drive on without observing the other fellow, who would without fail have driven over father if he had not made his horse rear, so that I saw my father drive under the hoofs of the horse. Every moment I expected the horse would fall down and crush him. I called out ' Father ! father ! ' and woke in a great fright. The next morning my father and brother returned. I said to him, ' I am so glad to see you arrive quite safely, as I had such a dreadful dream about you last night.' My brother said, ' You could not have been in greater fright about him than I was,' and then he related to me what had happened, which tallied exactly with my dream. My brother in his fright, when he saw the feet of the horse over father's head, called out, ' Oh ! father, father ! '

" I have never had any other dream of this kind, nor do I remember ever to have had another dream of an accident happening to anyone in whom I was interested. I often dream of people, and when this happens I generally expect to receive a letter from them, or to hear of them in the course of the next day. I dreamt of Mrs. G. Bidder the night before I received her letter asking me for an account of this dream ; and I told Mr. West, before we went down to breakfast, that I should have a letter that day from her. I had no other reason to expect a letter from her, nor had I received one for some time, I should think some years, previously.

" HILDA WEST."

Mrs. West's father, Sir John Crowe, late Consul-General for Norway, is since dead ; but her brother, Mr. Septimus Crowe, of Librola, Mary's Hill Road, Shortlands, sends us the following confirmation :—

" I remember vividly, on my return once with my father from a trip to the north of Norway in the winter time, my sister meeting us at the hall-door as we entered, and exclaiming how pleased she was to see us, and that we were safe, as she said at once to me that she had had such an unpleasant dream the evening before. I said, ' What was it ? ' She then minutely explained to me the dream, as she related it to you, and which is in accordance with the facts. It naturally astonished my father and myself a good deal, that she so vividly in her sleep saw exactly what happened, and I should say, too, she dreamt it at the very time it happened, about 11.30 p.m.

" SEPTIMUS CROWE."¹

¹ Our friend Mrs. Bidder, the wife of Mr. G. Bidder, q.c., sends us the following recollection of the narrative as told at her table by Mr. S. Crowe, who is her husband's brother-in-law.

" Ravensbury Park, Mitcham, Surrey.

" 10th January, 1883.

" The following was related at our table by my husband's brother-in-law, Mr. Septimus Crowe. His father, since dead, was Sir John Crowe, Consul-General for Norway.

" ' My father and I were travelling one winter in Norway. We had our carriages

This, again, is a good example of a weak class. But in the present instance we at any rate possess Mrs. West's testimony that her experience was unique ; and we have, further, Mr. Crowe's testimony that the dream was accurately described before the facts were known. It was described, no doubt, in a conversation with *him*—a person whose mind was full of the facts, and he probably did not keep silence during the whole course of his sister's narration : I have already noted that the unprepared actors in these cases are not likely to conduct themselves at the moment with a deliberate eye to the flawlessness of their evidence for our purposes some years afterwards. But it would be straining a sceptical hypothesis too far to assume that his interposed comments formed the real basis of the scene in Mrs. West's memory, while he himself remained completely unconscious that he was supplying the information which he appeared to be receiving.

§ 5. We now come to an example of the " borderland " class (E)—the class where the percipient, though not asleep, was not, or cannot be proved to have been, in a state of complete normal wakefulness. The case was first published in the *Spiritual Magazine* for 1861, by Dr. Collyer, who wrote from Beta House, 8, Alpha Road, St. John's Wood, N.W.

" April 15th, 1861.

(25) " On January 3rd, 1856, my brother Joseph being in command of the steamer ' Alice,' on the Mississippi, just above New Orleans, she came in collision with another steamer. The concussion caused the flagstaff or pole to fall with great violence, which, coming in contact with my brother's head, actually divided the skull, causing, of necessity, instant death. In October, 1857, I visited the United States. When, at my father's residence, Camden, New Jersey, the melancholy death of my brother became the subject of conversation, my mother narrated to me that at the very time of the accident, the apparition of my brother Joseph was presented to her. This fact was corroborated by my father and four sisters. Camden, New Jersey, is distant from the scene of the accident, in a direct line, over 1000 miles, and nearly double that distance by the mail route. My mother mentioned the fact of the apparition on the morning of the 4th of January to my father and sisters ; nor was it until the 16th, or 13 days after, that a letter was received confirming in every particular the extraordinary visitation. It will be important to mention that my brother William and his wife lived near the locality of the dreadful accident, now being in Philadelphia ; they have also corroborated to me the details of the impression produced on my mother."

as sledges, and my father drove first, I following. One day we were driving very quickly down a steep hill, at the bottom of which ran a road, at right angles with the one we were on. As we neared the bottom of the hill we saw a carriage, going as quickly as ourselves, just ready to cross our path. My father reined in suddenly, his horse reared and fell over, and I could not, at first, see whether he was hurt or not. He, luckily, had sustained no injury, and in due time we reached home. My sister, on our approach, rushed out, exclaiming : " Then you are not hurt ? I saw the horse rear, but I could not see whether you were hurt or not." "

It will be seen that if Mrs. Bidder's report is strictly accurate, there is a discrepancy as to which of the two horses it was that reared. But even eye-witnesses of a sudden and confusing accident might afterwards differ in such a point as this.

Dr. Collyer then quotes a letter from his mother, which contains the following sentences :—

“ Camden, New Jersey, United States.

“ March 27th, 1861.

“ My beloved Son,—On the 3rd of January, 1856, I did not feel well, and retired to bed early. Some time after, I felt uneasy and sat up in bed ; I looked round the room, and to my utter amazement, saw Joseph standing at the door, looking at me with great earnestness, his head bandaged up, a dirty night-cap on, and a dirty white garment on, something like a surplice. He was much disfigured about the eyes and face. It made me quite uncomfortable the rest of the night. The next morning, Mary came into my room early. I told her that I was sure I was going to have bad news from Joseph. I told all the family at the breakfast-table ; they replied, ‘ It was only a dream, and all nonsense,’ but that did not change my opinion. It preyed on my mind, and on the 16th of January I received the news of his death ; and, singular to say, both William and his wife, who were there, say that he was exactly attired as I saw him.

“ Your ever affectionate Mother,

“ ANNE E. COLLYER.”

Dr. Collyer continues :—

“ It will no doubt be said that my mother’s imagination was in a morbid state, but this will not account for the fact of the apparition of my brother presenting himself at the exact moment of his death. My mother had never seen him attired as described, and the bandaging of the head did not take place until hours after the accident. My brother William told me that his head was nearly cut in two by the blow, and that his face was dreadfully disfigured, and the night-dress much soiled.

“ I cannot wonder that others should be sceptical, as the evidences I have had could not have been received on the testimony of others ; we must, therefore, be charitable towards the incredulous.

“ ROBERT H. COLLYER, M.D., F.C.S., &c.”

On our applying to Dr. Collyer, he replied as follows :—

“ 25, Newington Causeway, Borough, S.E.

“ March 15th, 1884.

“ In replying to your communication, I must state that, strange as the circumstances narrated in the *Spiritual Magazine* of 1861 are, I can assure you that there is not a particle of exaggeration. As there stated, my mother received the mental impression of my brother on January 3rd, 1856. My father, who was a scientific man, calculated the difference of longitude between Camden, New Jersey, and New Orleans, and found that the mental impression was at the exact time of my brother’s death. I may mention that I never was a believer in any *spiritual* intercourse, or that any of the phenomena present during exalted conditions of the brain are *spiritual*. I am, and have been for the last 40 years, a materialist, and think that all the so-called *spiritual* manifestations admit of a philosophical explanation, on physical laws and conditions. I do not desire to theorise, but to my mind the sympathetic chord of relationship existed between my mother and my brother (who was her favourite son), when that chord was broken by his sudden death, she being at the time favourably situated to receive the shock.

“ In the account published in the *Spiritual Magazine*, I omitted to state that my brother Joseph, prior to his death, had retired for the night in his berth ; his vessel was moored alongside the levee, at the time of the

collision by another steamer coming down the Mississippi. Of course, my brother was in his *nightgown*. He ran on deck on being called and informed that a steamer was in close proximity to his own. These circumstances were communicated to me by my brother William, who was on the spot at the time of the accident. I do not attempt to account for the apparition having a bandage, as that could not have been put for some time after death. The difference of time between Camden, New Jersey, and New Orleans is nearly 15°, or one hour.

"My mother retired for the night on 3rd January, 1856, at 8 p.m., which would mark the time at New Orleans 7 p.m. as the time of my brother's death."

Mr. Podmore says :—

"I called upon Dr. Collyer on 25th March, 1884. He told me that he received a full account of the story verbally from his father, mother, and brother in 1857. All are now dead ; but two sisters—to one of whom I have written—are still living. Dr. Collyer was quite certain of the precise coincidence of time."

The following is from one of the surviving sisters :—

"Mobile, Alabama, 12th May, 1884.

"I resided in Camden, New Jersey, at the time of my brother's death. He lived in Louisiana. His death was caused by the collision of two steamers on the Mississippi. Some part of the mast fell on him, splitting his head open, causing instantaneous death. The apparition appeared to my mother at the foot of her bed. It stood there for some time gazing at her, and disappeared. The apparition was clothed in a long white garment, with its head bound in a white cloth. My mother was not a superstitious person, nor did she believe in Spiritualism. She was wide awake at the time. It was not a dream. She remarked to me when I saw her in the morning, 'I shall hear bad news from Joseph,' and related to me what she had seen. Two or three days¹ from that time we heard of the sad accident. I had another brother who was there at the time, and when he returned home I inquired of him all particulars, and how he was laid out. His description answered to what my mother saw, much to our astonishment.

"A. E. COLLYER."

Here we have no direct proof of the exactness of the coincidence ; but Dr. Collyer is clear on the fact that the matter was carefully inquired into at the time. As to the alleged resemblances between the phantasm and the real figure, we shall find reason further on to think that the impression of the white garment may have been really transferred. But the criticism made above in respect of Mrs. Bettany's narrative again applies : we cannot account it certain that points were not read back into the vision, after Mrs. Collyer had learnt the actual aspect which the dead man presented. It will be observed, too, that the more striking details—especially that of the bandage—could not in any case help the telepathic argument. For if the son who was killed was the "agent" of his mother's impression, any correspondence of the phantasmal appearance with features of reality which did not come into existence till *after* death must plainly have been accidental. We shall afterwards encounter plenty of

¹ This is probably incorrect, as it differs from Dr. Collyer's and the mother's statement ; but the point does not seem important.

instances where the percipient supplements the impression that he receives with elements from his own mind, and especially, in death-cases, with elements symbolic of death ; and it is not impossible that in the present instance the white garment and bandaged head were a dim representation of grave-clothes.

The following piece of independent evidence has been received as to the manner of Captain Collyer's death. An advertisement was inserted for us in the *Daily Picayune*, the leading New Orleans newspaper, offering a small reward for definite information as to the fatal accident on the "Alice." For some months no information was given ; but on January 6, 1886, the editor wrote to us as follows :—

"To-day a party called at the *Picayune* office and made the following statement : ' My name is J. L. Hall. I was a striker on the steamer " Red River " at the time she ran into the " Alice," John Collyer, master, at a point about 20 miles above New Orleans. The accident occurred at 10 o'clock at night, in January, 1856. The day of the month I do not remember. The " Red River " was bound up stream, and the " Alice " bound down. The collision broke the starboard engine of the " Alice " and stove in her upper guards and boiler deck. As soon as possible the " Red River " went to the assistance of the " Alice," when one of the crew of the disabled boat remarked that the captain had been killed. On investigation, Captain Collyer was found lying on his back on the starboard side of the boiler deck of his boat, with a severe wound in the head and life extinct. The crew of the " Alice," all of whom were negroes, stated that Captain Collyer had been killed by the collision, but the officers of the " Red River " thought otherwise, as the wound in his (Captain Collyer's) head appeared to have been made before the two boats met, and the blood on the deck was coagulated. Probably not more than 10 minutes elapsed from the time the collision took place until the body of Captain Collyer was viewed by the officers of the " Red River." After helping the " Alice " to make repairs, the " Red River " proceeded on her voyage. I cannot say positively, but I do not think the killing of Captain Collyer was ever investigated.' "

It will be seen that there is a suggestion here that the death preceded the collision ; and if this was so, it is an additional reason for supposing the coincidence with Mrs. Collyer's experience to have been extremely close ; for the witness had no idea why the evidence was wanted, and cannot have adjusted his account to a narrative of which he knew nothing.

Mrs. Collyer would probably have affirmed that at the time of her vision she was completely awake. That the percipient in the next example was completely awake is, I think, nearly certain ; but as he was in bed, the account may serve as a transition to the cases where the matter admits of no doubt. Mr. Marchant, of Linkfield Street, Redhill, formerly a large farmer, wrote to us in the summer of 1883 :—

(26) " About 2 o'clock on the morning of October 21st, 1881, while I was perfectly wide awake, and looking at a lamp burning on my washhand-

¹ The man who gave this account doubtless received the reward of a few dollars which had been placed in the editor's hands. In only one other instance has any payment been made to a witness : in that case the evidence had been spontaneously given, partly in writing and partly *vivâ voce*, and the payment was simply for the time occupied in drawing up a more complete written statement.

stand, a person, as I thought, came into my room by mistake, and stopped, looking into the looking-glass on the table. It soon occurred to me it represented Robinson Kelsey, by his dress and wearing his hair long behind. When I raised myself up in bed and called out, it instantly disappeared.¹ The next day² I mentioned to some of my friends how strange it was. So thoroughly convinced was I, that I searched the local papers that day (Saturday) and the following Tuesday, believing his death would be in one of them. On the following Wednesday, a man, who formerly was my drover, came and told me Robinson Kelsey was dead. Anxious to know at what time he died, I wrote to Mr. Wood, the family undertaker at Lingfield; he learnt from the brother-in-law of the deceased that he died at 2 a.m. He was my first cousin, and was apprenticed formerly to me as a miller; afterwards he lived with me as journeyman; altogether, 8 years. I never saw anything approaching that before. I am 72 years old, and never feel nervous; I am not afraid of the dead or their spirits. I hand you a rough plan of the bedroom, &c."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Marchant replied:—

"Robinson Kelsey had met with an accident. His horse fell with him, and from that time he seemed at times unfit for business. He had a farm at Penshurst, in Kent. His friends persuaded him to leave it. He did, and went to live on his own property, called Batnors Hall, in the parish of Lingfield, Surrey. I had not been thinking about him, neither had I spoken to him for 20 years. About 3 or 4 years before his death I saw him, but not to speak to him. I was on the up-side platform of Redhill Station, and I saw him on the opposite down-side. In the morning after seeing the apparition, I spoke about it to a person in the house. In the evening I again spoke about it to two persons, how strange it was. It was several days after our conversation about what I had seen that I heard of the death. These people will confirm my statement, for after I heard of his death I spoke of it to the same people, that my relation died the same night as I saw the apparition. When I spoke to these three persons I did not know of his death, but had my suspicions from what I had seen. As the apparition passed between my bed and the lamp I had a full view of it; it was unmistakable. When it stopped looking in the glass I spoke to it, then it gently sank away downwards.

"Probably it was 10 days before I found out, through Mr. Wood, the hour he died, so that these persons I spoke to knew nothing of his death at the time.

"GEORGE MARCHANT."

We have received the following confirmation of this incident:—

"July 18th, 1883.

"We are positive of hearing Mr. Marchant one day say that he saw the apparition of Robinson Kelsey during the previous night.

"ANN LANGERIDGE, Linkfield Street, Redhill.

"MATILDA FULLER, Station Road, Redhill.

"WILLIAM MILES, Station Road, Redhill."

Mr. Anthony Kelsey, of Lingfield, Surrey, brother-in-law and cousin of Robinson Kelsey, has confirmed October 21st, 1881, as the date of the death (which we have also verified in the Register of Deaths), but he has

¹ As to the disappearance on sudden speech or movement, see p. 427, second note.

² This means the day following the night of the experience; but, two lines lower, *that day* should no doubt be the *next day* as Oct. 21, 1881, was a Friday.

forgotten the hour ; and Mr. Robinson Kelsey's widow having since died, Mr. Marchant's recollection on this point cannot now be independently confirmed. As to the hour of the apparition, again, Mr. Marchant's statement is only a conclusion, drawn from his regular habit of waking once in the middle of the night at about 2. But there can be no reasonable doubt that the *day* of the death and of the vision was the same.

On February 12th, 1884, I had an interview with Mr. Marchant, who is a very vigorous and sensible old man, with a precise mind. He went through all the details of his narrative in a methodical manner, and his description corresponded in every particular with the written account, which was sent to me many months before. Mr. Marchant was positive that he never had any other hallucination of the senses, and laughed at the very idea of such things. He quite realised the ordinary criticisms which might be made about a nocturnal vision, *e.g.*, that he had had a glass too much, and also realised their absurdity as applied to his own case. I cannot doubt his statement that he has been a most temperate man. He showed me in his bedroom the precise line that the figure took ; appearing at his right hand, then passing along in front of a lamp which was on the wash-hand-stand, and finally standing between the foot of his bed and the dressing-table. He described Kelsey's long and bushy black hair as a very distinct peculiarity. In answer to inquiries on this point he says : " I have not any doubt whatever that Robinson Kelsey did have that peculiarity of the hair at the day of his death. My recollection of him is as clear as if I had his photo before me." The figure was visible, he thinks, for nearly a minute ; but the length of time in such cases is of course likely to be over-estimated.

I likewise saw Mrs. Langeridge, a sensible person, without any belief in "ghosts," who at once volunteered the remark that Mr. Marchant described his vision to her next morning.

This case is remarkable from the fact that there was no immediate interest between the two parties—though it is of course possible that the dying man's thoughts reverted to his kinsman and old employer. But comments on this point must be reserved.

§ 6. We now come to examples of the most important class of all, Class A—externalised impressions, occurring to persons who are up, and manifestly in the full possession of their waking senses. Of this class the most important examples are *visual* impressions, or apparitions. But I will first give a case which is on the line between Classes A and B, a vision not absolutely externalised in space, but where the mental image took on a sort of vividness and objectivity which the percipient believes to have been unexampled in his experience. The coincidence with the death of the agent was apparently quite exact ; and we have the testimony of a third person to the fact that the percipient mentioned his impression immediately on its occurrence. The narrator is Mr. Rawlinson, of Lansdown Court West, Cheltenham.

"September 18th, 1883.

(27) "I was dressing one morning in December, 1881, when a certain conviction came upon me that someone was in my dressing-room. On looking round, I saw no one, but then, instantaneously (in my mind's eye, I suppose), every feature of the face and form of my old friend, X., arose. This, as you may imagine, made a great impression on me, and I went at once into my wife's room and told her what had occurred, at the same

time stating that I feared Mr. X. must be dead. The subject was mentioned between us several times that day. Next morning, I received a letter from X.'s brother, then Consul-General at Odessa, but who I did not know was in England, saying that his brother had died at a quarter before 9 o'clock that morning. This was the very time the occurrence happened in my dressing-room. It is right to add that we had heard some two months previously that X. was suffering from cancer, but still we were in no immediate apprehension of his death. I never on any other occasion had any hallucination of the senses, and sincerely trust I never again shall.

"ROB. RAWLINSON."

The following is Mrs. Rawlinson's account :—

"June 18th, 1883.

"My husband was dressing, a few months ago, one morning about a quarter to 9 o'clock, when he came into my room and said: 'I feel sure X.' (an old friend of his) 'is dead.' He said all at once he felt as if there was someone in the room with him, and X.'s face came vividly before his *mind's* eye; and then he had this extraordinary conviction of X.'s death. He could not get the idea out of his mind all day. Strange to say, the next morning he had a letter saying X. had died the morning before, at a quarter to 9, just the very time my husband came into my room. About two months before, we had heard that X. had an incurable complaint, but we had heard nothing more, and his name had not been mentioned by anyone for weeks. I ought to tell you that my husband is the last person in the world to imagine anything, and he had always been particularly unbelieving as to anything supernatural."¹

A reference to the Consul's letter, and to the *Times* obituary, has fixed the date of the *death* as December 17th; but the date of the *vision* was not written down at the time: we therefore have to trust to Mr. and Mrs. Rawlinson's memory for the fact that it took place on the day before the letter was received. Not, however—be it observed—to their memory *now*, but to their memory at the time when the letter was received; and considering the effect that the occurrence had on their minds, we can scarcely suppose them to have agreed in referring it to the preceding day if several days had really intervened.

In the next case the coincidence was certainly close to within a very few minutes, and may have been exact. The impression was again completely unique in the percipient's experience, and was at once communicated to a third person, whose testimony to that point we have obtained. "N. J. S.," who, though he uses the third person, is himself the narrator, is personally known to us. Occupying a position of considerable responsibility, he does not wish his name to be published; but it can be given to inquirers, and he "will answer any questions personally to anyone having a wish to arrive at the truth." The account was received within a few weeks of the occurrence.

(28) "N. J. S. and F. L. were employed together in an office, were brought into intimate relations with one another, which lasted for about eight years, and held one another in very great regard and esteem. On Monday, March 19th, 1883, F. L., in coming to the office, complained of

¹ See p. 142, note. "X." in the above accounts is our own substitution for the real name.

having suffered from indigestion ; he went to a chemist, who told him that his liver was a little out of order, and gave him some medicine. He did not seem much better on Thursday. On Saturday he was absent, and N. J. S. has since heard he was examined by a medical man, who thought he wanted a day or two of rest, but expressed no opinion that anything was serious.

"On Saturday evening, March 24th, N. J. S., who had a headache, was sitting at home. He said to his wife that he was, what he had not been for months, rather too warm ; after making the remark he leaned back on the couch, and the next minute saw his friend, F. L., standing before him, dressed in his usual manner. N. J. S. noticed the details of his dress, that is, his hat with a black band, his overcoat unbuttoned, and a stick in his hand ; he looked with a fixed regard at N. J. S., and then passed away. N. J. S. quoted to himself from Job, 'And lo, a spirit passed before me, and the hair of my flesh stood up.' At that moment an icy chill passed through him,¹ and his hair bristled. He then turned to his wife and asked her the time ; she said, '12 minutes to 9.' He then said, 'The reason I ask you is that F. L. is dead. I have just seen him.' She tried to persuade him it was fancy, but he most positively assured her that no argument was of avail to alter his opinion.

"The next day, Sunday, about 3 p.m., A. L., brother of F. L., came to the house of N. J. S., who let him in. A. L. said, 'I suppose you know what I have come to tell you ?' N. J. S. replied, 'Yes, your brother is dead.' A. L. said, 'I thought you would know it.' N. J. S. replied, 'Why ?' A. L. said, 'Because you were in such sympathy with one another.' N. J. S. afterwards ascertained that A. L. called on Saturday to see his brother, and on leaving him noticed the clock on the stairs was 25 minutes to 9 p.m. F. L.'s sister, on going to him at 9 p.m., found him dead from rupture of the aorta.

"This is a plain statement of facts, and the only theory N. J. S. has on the subject is that at the supreme moment of death, F. L. must have felt a great wish to communicate with him, and in some way by force of will impressed his image on N. J. S.'s senses."

In reply to our inquiries Mr. S. says :—

"May 11th, 1883.

"(1) My wife was sitting at a table in the middle of the room under a gas chandelier, either reading or doing some wool work. I was sitting on a couch at the side of the room in the shade ; she was not looking in the direction I was. I studiously spoke in a quiet manner to avoid alarming her ; she noticed nothing particular in me.

"(2) I have never seen any appearance before, but have disbelieved in them, not seeing any motive.

"(3) Mr. A. L. told me that in coming to inform me of his brother's death, he wondered what would be the best way of breaking the matter to me, when, without any reason except the knowledge of our strong mutual regard, it seemed to flash upon his mind that I might know it.

"There had been no instances of thought-transmission between us.

"There are many slight details which it is nearly impossible to describe

¹ A cold sensation was a feature also of 194, 223, 286, where the percipient describes a sensation as of "cold water poured on the nape of the neck," 352, and other cases ; and perhaps compare 263. I have met with an interesting case of the peculiar sensation described, in connection with purely subjective hallucinations. Mr. J. Russell Lowell tells me that in past years he had frequent hallucinations of vision, of both the recognised and the unrecognised sort, which greatly interested him ; and that the experience was ushered in (he believes invariably) by a feeling of *marked chill*, which seemed to ascend from the feet to the head.

in writing, so I may say that I shall be most willing to give you a personal account and answer any questions at any time you should be in town.

"There is one thing which strikes me as singular—the instant certainty I felt that my friend was dead, as there was nothing to lead up to the idea ; and also that I seemed to accept all that passed without feeling surprise, and as if it were an ordinary matter of course.

"N. J. S."

Mrs. S. supplies the following corroboration :—

"September 18th, 1883.

"On the evening of the 24th March last, I was sitting at a table reading, my husband was sitting on a couch at the side of the room ; he asked me the time, and, on my replying 12 minutes to 9, he said, 'The reason why I ask is that L. is dead, I have just seen him.' I answered, 'What nonsense, you don't even know that he is ill ; I daresay when you go to town on Tuesday you will see him all right.' However, he persisted in saying he had seen L., and was sure of his death. I noticed at the time that he looked very much agitated and was very pale.

"MARIA S."

We find from the *Times* obituary that F. L.'s death took place on March 24th, 1883.

In a later communication Mr. S. says :—

"February 23rd, 1885.

"In compliance with your request, I have asked Mr. A. L. to send you the statement of what came to his knowledge with reference to the time of his brother's death.

"I have often thought the matter over since. I am unable to satisfy my own mind as to the *why* of the occurrence, but I still adhere to every particular, having nothing to add or withdraw."

Mr. L.'s brother corroborates as follows :—

"Bank of England.

"February 24th, 1885.

"Mr. S. having informed me that you have expressed a wish that I should corroborate some statements made by him relative to my brother Frederick's sudden death, I beg to send you the following particulars.

"On Saturday, March 24th, 1883, my brother having been absent from business, I called about 8 p.m. to see him, and found him sitting up in his bedroom. I left him, apparently much better, and came down to the dining-room about 8.40, where I remained with my sister for about half an hour, when I left, and she, going upstairs, immediately upon my departure, found her brother lying dead upon the bed, so that the exact time of his death will never be known. On my way over to Mr. S. the next day, to break the news to him, the thought occurred to me—knowing the strong sympathy between them—'I should not be surprised if he has had some presentiment of it' ; and when he came to the door to meet me, I felt certain from his look that it was so, hence I said, 'You know what I have come for,' and he then told me that he had seen my brother Frederick in a vision a little before 9 on the previous evening. I must tell you I am no believer in visions, and have not always found presentiments correct ; yet I am perfectly certain of Mr. S.'s veracity, and, having been asked to confirm him, willingly do so, though I strengthen a cause I am not a disciple of.

"A. C. L."

An attempt to form a numerical estimate of the probability (or im-

probability) that the coincidence in this case was accidental will be found in a subsequent chapter on "The Theory of Chance-Coincidence" (pp. 384-5).

The next case again exhibits the slight *deferment* of the percipient's experience which I have already mentioned (p. 144). But its chief interest is as illustrating what may be called a *local*, as distinct from a *personal*, *rapport* between the parties concerned.¹ The percipient, at the moment of his impression, was contemplating a spot with which the agent was specially connected, and which may even have had a very distinct place in her dying thoughts; and it is natural to find in this fact a main condition why he, of all people, should have been the one impressed. The case was thus narrated to us by the Rev. C. T. Forster, Vicar of Hinxton, Saffron Walden:—

"August 6th, 1885.

(29) "My late parishioner, Mrs. de Fréville, was a somewhat eccentric lady, who was specially morbid on the subject of tombs, &c.

"About two days after her death, which took place in London, May 8th, in the afternoon, I heard that she had been seen that very night by Alfred Bard. I sent for him, and he gave me a very clear and circumstantial account of what he had seen.

"He is a man of great observation, being a self-taught naturalist, and I am quite satisfied that he desires to speak the truth without any exaggeration.

"I must add that I am absolutely certain that the news of Mrs. de Fréville's death did not reach Hinxton till the next morning, May 9th. She was found dead at 7.30 p.m. She had been left alone in her room, being poorly, but not considered seriously or dangerously ill.

"C. T. FORSTER."

The following is the percipient's own account:—

"July 21st, 1885.

"I am a gardener in employment at Sawston. I always go through Hinxton churchyard on my return home from work. On Friday, May 8th, 1885, I was walking back as usual. On entering the churchyard, I looked rather carefully at the ground, in order to see a cow and donkey which used to lie just inside the gate. In so doing I looked straight at the square stone vault in which the late Mr. de Fréville was at one time buried. I then saw Mrs. de Fréville leaning on the rails, dressed much as I had usually seen her, in a coal-scuttle bonnet, black jacket with deep crape, and black dress. She was looking full at me. Her face was very white, much whiter than usual. I knew her well, having at one time been in her employ. I at once supposed that she had come, as she sometimes did, to the mausoleum in her own park, in order to have it opened and go in. I supposed that Mr. Wiles, the mason from Cambridge, was in the tomb doing something. I walked round the tomb, looking carefully at it, in order to see if the gate was open, keeping my eye on her and never more than five or six yards from her. Her face turned and followed me. I passed between the church and the tomb (there are about four yards between the two), and peered forward to see whether the tomb was open, as she hid the part of the tomb which opened. I slightly stumbled on a hassock of grass, and looked at my feet for a moment only. When I looked up she was gone. She could not possibly have got out of the

¹ As to this point, see pp. 515-16.

churchyard, as in order to reach any of the exits she must have passed me.¹ So I took for granted that she had quickly gone into the tomb. I went up to the door, which I expected to find open, but to my surprise it was shut and had not been opened, as there was no key in the lock. I rather hoped to have a look into the tomb myself, so I went back again and shook the gate to make sure, but there was no sign of any one's having been there. I was then much startled and looked at the clock, which marked 9.20. When I got home I half thought it must have been my fancy, but I told my wife that I had seen Mrs. de Fréville.

"Next day, when my little boy told me that she was dead, I gave a start, which my companion noticed, I was so much taken aback.

"I have never had any other hallucination whatever.

"ALFRED BARD."

Mrs. Bard's testimony is as follows :—

"July 8th, 1885.

"When Mr. Bard came home he said, 'I have seen Mrs. de Fréville to-night, leaning with her elbow on the palisade, looking at me. I turned again to look at her and she was gone. She had cloak and bonnet on.' He got home as usual between 9 and 10; it was on the 8th of May, 1885.

"SARAH BARD."

The *Times* obituary confirms the date of the death.

[Mr. Myers was conducted over Hinxton churchyard by Mr. Forster, and can attest the substantial accuracy of Mr. Bard's description of the relative position of the church, the tomb, and the exits. The words "must have passed me," however, give a slightly erroneous impression; "must have come very near me" would be the more correct description.]

[In 1887 and 1888, in replies to criticisms by Professor C. S. Peirce, Mr. Gurney gives (in the *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research*, vol. i., 1885-1889) three additional contributions to the evidence in this case, viz.: (a) On page 168 a testimonial to Mr. Bard's sobriety from the Vicar which I need not quote; (b) On page 273, footnote, a correction as to the hour of death; he says, "In case 29 it is stated that Mrs. de Fréville was found dead at 7.30 p.m. I learn from a near relative of hers that the time was certainly some hours earlier, about 2 p.m.;" (c) on page 292 the following explicit statement by Mr. Bard: "I had no knowledge that Mrs. de Fréville was ill, and was not even aware that she was away from Hinxton.—Alfred Bard." Ed.]

The next case is of a more abnormal type. We received the first account of it—the percipient's evidence—through the kindness of Mrs. Martin, of Ham Court, Upton-on-Severn, Worcester.

"Antony, Torpoint, December 14th, 1882.

(30) "Helen Alexander (maid to Lady Waldegrave) was lying here very ill with typhoid fever, and was attended by me. I was standing at the table by her bedside, pouring out her medicine, at about 4 o'clock in the morning of the 4th October, 1880. I heard the call-bell ring (this had been heard twice before during the night in that same week), and was attracted by the door of the room opening,² and by seeing a person entering the room whom I instantly felt to be the mother of the sick woman. She had a brass candlestick in her hand, a red shawl over her shoulders, and a flannel petticoat on which had a hole in the front. I looked at her as much as to

¹ See the remark within brackets, which follows the case.

² See p. 92.

say, 'I am glad you have come,' but the woman looked at me sternly, as much as to say, 'Why wasn't I sent for before?' I gave the medicine to Helen Alexander, and then turned round to speak to the vision, but no one was there. She had gone. She was a short, dark person, and very stout. At about 6 o'clock that morning Helen Alexander died. Two days after her parents and a sister came to Antony, and arrived between 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning; I and another maid let them in, and it gave me a great turn when I saw the living likeness of the vision I had seen two nights before. I told the sister about the vision, and she said that the description of the dress exactly answered to her mother's and that they had brass candlesticks at home exactly like the one described. There was not the slightest resemblance between the mother and daughter.

"FRANCES REDDELL."

This at first sight might be taken for a mere delusion of an excitable or over-tired servant, modified and exaggerated by the subsequent sight of the real mother. If such a case is to have evidential force, we must ascertain beyond doubt that the description of the experience was given in detail before any knowledge of the reality can have affected the percipient's memory or imagination. This necessary corroboration has been kindly supplied by Mrs. Pole-Carew, of Antony, Torpoint, Devonport.

"December 31st, 1883.

"In October, 1880, Lord and Lady Waldegrave came with their Scotch maid, Helen Alexander, to stay with us. [The account then describes how Helen was discovered to have caught typhoid fever.] She did not seem to be very ill in spite of it, and as there seemed no fear of danger, and Lord and Lady Waldegrave had to go a long journey the following day (Thursday), they decided to leave her, as they were advised to do, under their friends' care.

"The illness ran its usual course, and she seemed to be going on perfectly well till the Sunday week following, when the doctor told me that the fever had left her, but the state of weakness which had supervened was such as to make him extremely anxious. I immediately engaged a regular nurse, greatly against the wish of Reddell, my maid, who had been her chief nurse all through the illness, and who was quite devoted to her. However, as the nurse could not conveniently come till the following day, I allowed Reddell to sit up with Helen again that night, to give her the medicine and food, which were to be taken constantly.

"At about 4.30 that night, or rather Monday morning, Reddell looked at her watch, poured out the medicine, and was bending over the bed to give it to Helen, when the call-bell in the passage rang. She said to herself, 'There's that tiresome bell with the wire caught again.' (It seems it did occasionally ring of itself in this manner.) At that moment, however, she heard the door open, and, looking round, saw a very stout old woman walk in. She was dressed in a nightgown and red flannel petticoat, and carried an old-fashioned brass candlestick in her hand. The petticoat had a hole rubbed in it. She walked into the room, and appeared to be going towards the dressing-table to put her candle down. She was a perfect stranger to Reddell, who, however, merely thought, 'This is her mother come to see after her,' and she felt quite glad it was so, accepting the idea without reasoning upon it, as one would in a dream. She thought the mother looked annoyed, possibly at not having been sent for before. She then gave Helen the medicine, and turning round, found that the apparition had disappeared, and that the door was shut. A great change, meanwhile, had

taken place in Helen, and Reddell fetched me, who sent off for the doctor, and meanwhile applied hot poultices, &c., but Helen died a little before the doctor came. She was quite conscious up to about half an hour before she died, when she seemed to be going to sleep.

"During the early days of her illness Helen had written to a sister, mentioning her being unwell, but making nothing of it, and as she never mentioned anyone but this sister, it was supposed by the household, to whom she was a perfect stranger, that she had no other relation alive. Reddell was always offering to write for her, but she always declined, saying there was no need, she would write herself in a day or two. No one at home, therefore, knew anything of her being so ill, and it is, therefore, remarkable that her mother, a far from nervous person, should have said that evening going up to bed, 'I am sure Helen is very ill.'

"Reddell told me and my daughter of the apparition, about an hour after Helen's death, prefacing with, 'I am not superstitious, or nervous, and I wasn't the least frightened, but her mother came last night,' and she then told the story, giving a careful description of the figure she had seen. The relations were asked to come to the funeral, and the father, mother, and sister came, and in the mother Reddell recognised the apparition, as I did also, for Reddell's description had been most accurate, even to the expression, which she had ascribed to annoyance, but which was due to deafness. It was judged best not to speak about it to the mother, but Reddell told the sister, who said the description of the figure corresponded exactly with the probable appearance of her mother if roused in the night; that they had exactly such a candlestick at home, and that there was a hole in her mother's petticoat produced by the way she always wore it. It seems curious that neither Helen nor her mother appeared to be aware of the visit. Neither of them, at any rate, ever spoke of having seen the other, nor even of having dreamt of having done so.

"F. A. POLE-CAREW."

Frances Reddell states that she has never had any hallucination, or any odd experience of any kind, except on this one occasion. The Hon. Mrs. Lyttelton, of Selwyn College, Cambridge, who knows her, tells us that "she appears to be a most matter-of-fact person, and was apparently most impressed by the fact that she saw a hole in the mother's flannel petticoat, made by the busk of her stays, reproduced in the apparition."

Mrs. Pole-Carew's evidence goes far to stamp this occurrence as having been something more than a mere subjective hallucination. But it will be observed that there is some doubt as to who was the agent. Was it the mother? If so, we find nothing more definite on the agent's part, as a basis for the distant effect, than a certain amount of anxiety as to her daughter's condition; while the fact that Reddell and she were totally unknown to one another, would show, even more conclusively than the two preceding narratives, that a special personal *rappor*t between the parties is not a necessary condition for spontaneous telepathic transference. Thus regarded, the case would considerably resemble the instance of local *rappor*t last quoted—the condition of the telepathic impression being presumably the common occupation of the mind of both agent and percipient with one subject, the dying girl. But it is also conceivable that Helen herself was the agent; and that in her dying condition a flash of memory of her mother's aspect conveyed a direct impulse to the mind of her devoted nurse.

The last five cases have all been recent. I will now give an example which is 70 years old. It will show the value that even remote evidence may have, if proper care is exercised at the time; and it points the moral which must be enforced *ad nauseam*, as to the importance of an immediate written record on the percipient's part. The account was received from Mrs. Browne, of 58, Porchester Terrace, W. On May 29th, 1884, Mr. Podmore wrote:—

“ May 29th, 1884.

(31) “ I called to-day on Mrs. Browne, and saw (1) a document in the handwriting of her mother, Mrs. Carslake (now dead), which purported to be a copy of a memorandum made by Mrs. Browne's father, the late Captain John Carslake, of Sidmouth. Appended to this was (2) a note, also in Mrs. Carslake's handwriting, and signed by her; and (3) a copy, also in Mrs. Carslake's handwriting, of a letter from the Rev. E. B——r, of Sidmouth.

“ Mrs. Browne told me that, as far as she knows, the originals of (1) and (3) are no longer in existence.

“ Document (4) is a note from Mrs. Browne herself.

“ The Middleburg referred to is apparently the town of that name in the Netherlands.”

(1)

“ Thursday, July the 6th, 1815.—On returning to-day from Middleburg with Captain T., I was strongly impressed with the idea that between 2 and 3 I saw my uncle John cross the road, a few paces before me, and pass into a lane on the left leading to a mill, called Olly Moulin, and that when he arrived at the edge of the great road, he looked round and beckoned to me.

“ Query.—As he has long been dangerously ill, may not this be considered as an omen of his having died about this time?

“ JOHN CARSLAKE.”

(2)

“ He had not been thinking of his uncle, but talking with Captain T. about a sale where they had been; he was quite silent afterwards, and would not tell the reason. On going on board, he went to his cabin and wrote the time he saw his uncle, and wrote to Mr. B.

“ T. CARSLAKE.”

(3)

“ Long, in all probability, before this can reach you, you will have been informed that, precisely *at the minute* in which his apparition crossed your path in the neighbourhood of Middleburg, your dear and venerable uncle expired. I think it proves, beyond all contradiction, that his last and affectionate thoughts were fixed on you. The fact you have stated is the strongest of the kind, in which I could place such full confidence in the parties, that I ever knew.—E. B.”

[Judging from Mr. Carslake's own account, it seems unlikely that the writer of this can have *known* the coincidence to have been as close as he describes.]

(4)

“ May 29th, 1884.

“ I remember more than once hearing this story, exactly as it is told here, from my father's own lips. I remember that he added that the figure wore a peculiar hat, which he recognised as being like one worn by his uncle.

“ T. L. BROWNE.”

The next example repeats the peculiarity that the percipient's impression, though unique in his experience, did not at the moment suggest the agent; but it differs, as will be seen, from Frances Reddell's case. We received it from the Rev. Robert Bee, now residing at 12, Whitworth Road, Grangetown, near Southbank, Yorkshire.

"Colin Street, Wigan.

"December 30th, 1883.

(32) "On December 18th, 1873, I left my house in Lincolnshire to visit my wife's parents, then and now residing in Lord Street, Southport. Both my parents were, to all appearance, in good health when I started. The next day after my arrival was spent in leisurely observation of the manifold attractions of this fashionable seaside resort. I spent the evening in company with my wife in the bay-windowed drawing-room upstairs, which fronts the main street of the town. I proposed a game at chess, and we got out the board and began to play. Perhaps half an hour had been thus occupied by us, during which I had made several very foolish mistakes. A deep melancholy was oppressing me. At length I remarked; 'It is no use my trying to play, I cannot for the life think about what I am doing. Shall we shut it up and resume our talk? I feel literally wretched.'

"'Just as you like,' said my wife, and the board was at once put aside.

"This was about half-past 7 o'clock; and after a few minutes' desultory conversation, my wife suddenly remarked: '*I feel very dull to-night. I think I will go downstairs to mamma, for a few minutes.*'

"Soon after my wife's departure, I rose from my chair, and walked in the direction of the drawing-room door. Here I paused for a moment, and then passed out to the landing of the stairs.

"It was then exactly 10 minutes to 8 o'clock. I stood for a moment upon the landing, and a lady, dressed as if she were going on a business errand, came out, apparently, from an adjoining bedroom, and passed close by me. I did not distinctly see her features, nor do I remember what it was that I said to her.

"The form passed down the narrow winding stairs, and at the same instant my wife came up again, so that she must have passed close to the stranger, in fact, to all appearance, brushed against her.

"I exclaimed, almost immediately, 'Who is the lady, Polly, that you passed just now, coming up?'

"Never can I forget, or account for, my wife's answer. 'I passed nobody,' she said.

"'Nonsense,' I replied; 'You met a lady just now, dressed for a walk. She came out of the little bedroom. I spoke to her. She must be a visitor staying with your mother. She has gone out, no doubt, at the front door.'

"'It is impossible,' said my wife. 'There is not any company in the house. They all left nearly a week ago. There is no one in fact at all indoors, but ourselves and mamma.'

"'Strange,' I said; 'I am certain that I saw and spoke to a lady, just before you came upstairs, and I saw her distinctly pass you;¹ so that it seems incredible that you did not perceive her.'

"My wife positively asserted that the thing was impossible. We went

¹ In conversation Mr. Bee reiterated to me his certainty as to having seen the two figures simultaneously.

downstairs together, and I related the story to my wife's mother, who was busy with her household duties. She confirmed her daughter's previous statement. There was no one in the house but ourselves.

"The next morning, early, a telegram reached me from Lincolnshire; it was from my eldest sister, Julia (Mrs. T. W. Bowman, of Prospect House, Stechford, Birmingham), and announced the afflicting intelligence that our dear mother had passed suddenly away the night before; and that we (*i.e.*, myself and wife) were to return home to Gainsborough by the next train. The doctor said it was heart-disease, which in a few minutes had caused her death."

After giving some details of his arrival at home, and of the kindness of friends, Mr. Bee continues:—

"When all was over and Christmas Day had arrived, I ventured to ask my brother the exact moment of our mother's death.

"'Well, father was out,' he said, 'at the school-room, and I did not see her alive. Julia was just in time to see her breathe her last. It was, as nearly as I can recollect, 10 minutes to 8 o'clock.'

"I looked at my wife for a moment, and then said: 'Then I saw her in Southport, and can now account, unaccountably, for my impressions.'

"Before the said 19th of December I was utterly careless of these things; I had given little or no attention to spiritual apparitions or impressions.

"ROBT. BEE."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Bee adds:—

"My mother died in her dress and boots; she was taken ill in the street, and had to be taken to a neighbour's house in Gainsborough a few paces from her own house. The figure resembled my mother exactly as to size, dress, and appearance, but it did not recall her to my mind at the time. The light was not so dim that, if my mother had actually passed me in flesh and blood, I should not have recognised her."

We learn from the obituary notice in the *Lincolnshire Chronicle* that Mr. Bee's mother died on December 19, 1873, in Mr. Smithson's shop, in Gainsborough, of heart-disease; and that her usual health was pretty good.

In answer to the question whether this is the only case of hallucination that he has experienced, Mr. Bee answers "Yes."

He further adds:—

"The gas light over the head of the stairway shone within a frosted globe, and was probably not turned on *fully*.

"The fact is, there was ample light to see the figure in, but just as the face might have been turned to me, or was turned to me, I could not, or did not, clearly discern it. Many, many times, my regret and disappointment when I recall this fact have been deeply felt."

Mrs. Bee writes to us as follows:—

"January 9th, 1884.

"If anything I can say to you will be of any use, I will willingly give my testimony to all my husband has said. I remember perfectly ten years ago my visit to my mother's, and my husband's unaccountable restlessness on the particular evening mentioned, also Mr. Bee asking me, after I had been downstairs, if I had met a lady on the stairs. I said, 'No, I do not think there is anyone in the house but us.' Mr. Bee then said, 'Well, a lady has passed me just now on the landing; she came out of the small bedroom and went downstairs; she was dressed in a black bonnet and shawl.' I said, 'Nonsense, you must be mistaken.' He said, 'I am

certain I am not, and I assure you I feel very queer.' I then went to ask mamma if there was anyone in the house, and she said no, only ourselves ; still Mr. Bee insisted someone had passed him on the landing, although we tried to reason him out of it.

" In the morning while we were in bed, we received a telegram stating that Mrs. Bee had died suddenly the night before. I said at once, ' Robert, that was your mother you saw last night,' He said it was. When we got to Gainsborough we asked what time she died ; we were told about 10 minutes to 8, which was the exact time ; also that she was taken suddenly ill in the street (wearing at the time a black bonnet and shawl) and died in 10 minutes.

" MARY ANN BEE."

Mrs. Bourne, a sister of Mr. Bee's, writes to us :—

" Eastgate Lodge, Lincoln.

" October 2nd, 1885.

" My mother died on December 19th, 1873, about 10 minutes to 8 in the evening ; it might be a little later or a little earlier. Her attack resembled a fainting fit, and lasted from 30 to 40 minutes. At the commencement of it, she said a few words to my sister, when I was not present ; afterwards I believe she never opened her eyes or spoke again, though we tried our utmost to induce her to do so.

" MARIAN BOURNE."

If this case is accurately reported, the figure seen cannot be supposed to have been a real person ; for—to say nothing of the unlikelihood that a strange lady would be on the upper floor on some unknown errand—Mrs. Bee, who seemed to her husband to come into actual contact with the figure, could hardly have failed to observe that some one passed her on the stairs. The fact that the form did not at the moment suggest Mr. Bee's mother tends, no doubt, to weaken the case as evidence for telepathy, to this extent—that if a person has the one hallucination of his life at the moment that a near relative dies, this singular coincidence may with less violence be ascribed to accident if the hallucination is merely *an* appearance—an unrecognised figure—than if it is *the* appearance of that particular relative. The phantasm not being individualised, the conditions for the operation of chance are so far widened. Still, there are two strong evidential points. The coincidence of time seems to have been precise ; and the resemblance to the supposed agent " as to size, dress, and appearance " is described as exact. As for any theoretic difficulty that might be felt in the fact of non-recognition, I will make at this point only one remark. If we are prepared (as experiment has prepared us) to admit that telepathic impressions need not even affect consciousness at all—if it is possible for some of them to remain completely unfelt—it does not seem specially surprising that others should issue on the mental stage with various degrees of distinctness and completeness.

§ 7. So much for visual examples. I will now give an illustration of externalised impressions of the *auditory* sort. The case differs in another respect from the foregoing visual examples ; for though, as in most of them, the agent died, the percipient's experience *preceded* the death by some hours ; and that being so, we must clearly connect this experience with the serious condition in which her friend actually was, not with that

in which he was about to be. The narrative is from a lady who prefers that her name and address should not be published. She is a person of thorough good sense, and with no appetite for marvels.

" 1884.

(33) " On the morning of October 27th, 1879, being in perfect health and having been awake for some considerable time, I heard myself called by my Christian name by an anxious and suffering voice, several times in succession. I recognised the voice as that of an old friend, almost play-fellow, but who had not been in my thoughts for many weeks, or even months. I knew he was with his regiment in India, but not that he had been ordered to the front, and nothing had recalled him to my recollection. Within a few days I heard of his death from cholera on the morning I seemed to hear his call. The impression was so strong I noted the date and fact in my diary before breakfast."

In answer to inquiries, the narrator says :—

" I was never conscious of any other auditory hallucination whatever. I do not think I mentioned the subject to any one, as I believe we had friends with us. I still have my diary preserved."

The present writer has seen the page of the diary, and the reference to the strange experience, under the date of Monday, October 27th, 1879.

We find from the *East India Service Register* for January, 1880, that the death of Captain John B., Native Infantry (Bombay Division), took place on October 27th, 1879, at Jhelum. (This is the gentleman referred to in the account.) The *Times* obituary of November 4th, 1879, mentions that the death was due to cholera.

Our informant was requested to find out the exact hour of the death, and learnt that it took place, not in the morning, as she had supposed, but at 10 p.m. (about 5 p.m. in England). She adds : " So that would not make the time agree with the hour of hearing his call. The cry may have come, however, when the illness began first."

In the last-quoted visual example, the figure seen was unrecognised. I will now give a parallel auditory case, where the sound heard by the percipient suggested at the moment no particular person. The account is from a gentleman of good position, whom I must term Mr. A. Z. He is as far removed as possible from superstition, and takes no general interest in the subject. He has given us the full names of all the persons concerned, but is unwilling that they should be published, on account of the painful character of the event recorded.

" May, 1885.

(34) " In 1876, I was living in a small agricultural parish in the East of England, one of my neighbours at the time being a young man, S. B.,¹ who had recently come into the occupation of a large farm in the place. Pending the alteration of his house, he lodged and boarded with his groom at the other end of the village, furthest removed from my own residence, which was half a mile distant and separated by many houses, gardens, a plantation, and farm buildings. He was fond of field sports, and spent much of his spare time during the season in hunting. He was not a personal friend of mine, only an acquaintance, and I felt no interest in him except as a tenant on the estate. I have asked him occasionally to

¹ These are not the right initials of the name.

my house, as a matter of civility, but to the best of my recollection was never inside his lodgings.

"One afternoon in March, 1876, when leaving, along with my wife, our railway station to walk home, I was accosted by S. B. ; he accompanied us as far as my front-gate, where he kept us in conversation for some time, but on no special subject. I may now state that the distance from this gate, going along the carriage drive, to the dining and breakfast room windows is about 60 yards ; both the windows of these rooms face the north-east and are parallel with the carriage drive.¹ On S. B. taking leave of us my wife remarked, ' Young B. evidently wished to be asked in, but I thought you would not care to be troubled with him.' Subsequently—about half an hour later—I again met him, and, as I was then on my way to look at some work at a distant part of the estate, asked him to walk with me, which he did. His conversation was of the ordinary character ; if anything, he seemed somewhat depressed at the bad times and the low prices of farming produce. I remember he asked me to give him some wire rope to make a fence on his farm, which I consented to do. Returning from our walk, and on entering the village, I pulled up at the cross-roads to say good evening, the road to his lodgings taking him at right angles to mine. I was surprised to hear him say, ' Come and smoke a cigar with me to-night.' To which I replied, ' I cannot very well, I am engaged this evening.' ' Do come,' he said. ' No,' I replied, ' I will look in another evening.' And with this we parted. We had separated about 40 yards when he turned around and exclaimed, ' Then if you will not come, good-bye.' This was the last time I saw him alive.

"I spent the evening in my dining-room in writing, and for some hours I may say that probably no thought of young B. passed through my mind. The night was bright and clear, full or nearly full moon, still, and without wind. Since I had come in slight snow had fallen, just sufficient to make the ground show white.

"At about 5 minutes to 10 o'clock I got up and left the room, taking up a lamp from the hall table, and replacing it on a small table standing in a recess of the window in the breakfast-room. The curtains were not drawn across the window. I had just taken down from the nearest book-case a volume of ' Macgillivray's British Birds ' for reference, and was in the act of reading the passage, the book held close to the lamp, and my shoulder touching the window shutter, and in a position in which almost the slightest outside sound would be heard, when I distinctly heard the front gate opened and shut again with a clap, and footsteps advancing at a run up the drive ; when opposite the window the steps changed from sharp and distinct on gravel to dull and less clear on the grass slip below the window, and at the same time I was conscious that someone or something stood close to me outside, only the thin shutter and a sheet of glass dividing us. I could hear the quick panting laboured breathing of the messenger, or whatever it was, as if trying to recover breath before speaking. Had he been attracted by the light through the shutter ? Suddenly, like a gunshot, inside, outside, and all around, there broke out the most appalling shriek—a prolonged wail of horror, which seemed to freeze the blood. It was not a single shriek, but more prolonged, commencing in a high key, and then less and less, wailing away towards the north, and becoming weaker and weaker as it receded in sobbing pulsations of intense agony. Of my fright and horror I can say nothing—increased tenfold when I walked into the dining-room and found my wife sitting

¹ The position of the house, as I found on visiting it, is particularly retired and quiet.

quietly at her work close to the window, in the same line and distant only 10 or 12 feet from the corresponding window in the breakfast-room. *She had heard nothing.* I could see that at once; and from the position in which she was sitting, I knew she could not have failed to hear any noise outside and any footstep on the gravel. Perceiving I was alarmed about something, she asked, 'What is the matter?' 'Only someone outside,' I said. 'Then why do you not go out and see?' You always do when you hear any unusual noise.' I said, 'There is something so queer and dreadful about the noise. I dare not face it. It must have been the Banshee shrieking.'

"Young S. B., on leaving me, went home to his lodgings. He spent most of the evening on the sofa, reading one of Whyte Melville's novels. He saw his groom at 9 o'clock and gave him orders for the following day. The groom and his wife, who were the only people in the house besides S. B., then went to bed.

"At the inquest the groom stated that when about falling asleep, he was suddenly aroused by a shriek, and on running into his master's room found him expiring on the floor. It appeared that young B. had undressed upstairs, and then came down to his sitting-room in trousers and night-shirt, had poured out half a glass of water, into which he emptied a small bottle of prussic acid (procured that morning under the plea of poisoning a dog, which he did not possess). He walked upstairs, and on entering his room drank off the glass, and with a scream fell dead on the floor. All this happened, as near as I can ascertain, at the *exact time* when I had been so much alarmed at my own house. It is utterly impossible that any sound short of a cannon shot could have reached me from B.'s lodgings, through closed windows and doors, and the many intervening obstacles of houses and gardens, farmsteads and plantations, &c.

"Having to leave home by the early train, I was out very soon on the following morning, and on going to examine the ground beneath the window found no *footsteps* on grass or drive, still covered with the slight sprinkling of snow which had fallen on the previous evening.

"The whole thing had been a dream of the moment—an imagination, call it what you will; I simply state these facts as they occurred, without attempting any explanation, which, indeed, I am totally unable to give. The entire incident is a mystery, and will ever remain a mystery to me. I did not hear the particulars of the tragedy till the following afternoon, having left home by an early train. The motive of suicide was said to be a love affair."

In a subsequent letter dated June 12th, 1885, Mr. A. Z. says:—

"The suicide took place in this parish on Thursday night, March 9th, 1876, at or about 10 p.m. The inquest was held on Saturday, 11th, by —, the then coroner. He has been dead some years, or I might perhaps have been able to obtain a copy of his notes then taken. You will probably find some notice of the inquest in the — of March 17th. I did not myself hear any particulars of the event till my return home on Friday afternoon, 17 hours afterwards. The slight snow fell about 8 o'clock —*not later*. After this the night was bright and fine, and very still. There was also a rather sharp frost. I have evidence of all this to satisfy any lawyer.

"I went early the next morning under the window to look for foot-steps, just before leaving home for the day. Perhaps it is not quite correct to call it snow; it was small frozen sleet and hail, and the grass blades just peeped through, but there was quite enough to have shown any steps had there been any.

"I was not myself at the inquest, so in that case only speak from hearsay. In my narrative I say the groom was awoken by 'a shriek.' I have asked the man [name given], and cross-questioned him closely on this point; and it is more correct to say by 'a series of noises ending in a crash' or 'heavy fall.' This is most probably correct, as the son of the tenant [name given], living in the next house, was aroused by the same sort of sound coming through the wall of the house into the adjoining bedroom in which he was sleeping.

"I do not, however, wish it to be understood that any *material* noises heard in that house or the next had any connection with the peculiar noises and scream which frightened me so much, as anyone knowing the locality must admit at once the *impossibility* of such sounds travelling under any conditions through intervening obstacles. I only say that the scene enacted in the one was coincident with my alarm and the phenomena attending it in the other.

"I find by reference to the book of —, chemist, of —, that the poison was purchased by young S.B., on March 8th. I enclose a note from Mrs. A. Z., according to your request."

The enclosed note, signed by Mrs. A. Z., also dated June 12th, 1885, is as follows:—

"I am able to testify that on the night of March 9th, 1876, about 10 o'clock, my husband, who had gone into the adjoining room to consult a book, was greatly alarmed by sounds which he heard, and described as the gate clapping, footsteps on the drive and grass, and heavy breathing close to the window—then a fearful screaming.

"I did not hear anything. He did not go to look round the house, as he would have done at any other time, and when I *afterwards* asked him why he did not go out, he replied, 'Because I felt I could not.' On going to bed he took his gun upstairs; and when I asked him why, said, 'Because there must be someone about.'

"He left home early in the morning, and did not hear of the suicide of Mr. S. B. until the afternoon of that day."

An article which we have seen in a local newspaper, describing the suicide and inquest, confirms the above account of them.

Asked if he had had any similar affections which had *not* corresponded with reality, Mr. A. Z. replied in the negative.

The criticism made on Mr. Bee's case will of course apply again here; the percipient's failure to connect his impression with the agent is, *pro tanto*, an evidential defect. But the fact remains that he received an impression of a vividly distressful and horrible kind—of a type, too, rarely met with as a purely subjective hallucination among sane and healthy persons¹—at the very time that his companion of a few hours back was in the agony of a supreme crisis.

§ 8. Telepathic impressions of the sense of *touch* are naturally hard to establish, unless some other sense is also affected. In the cases in our collection, at all events, a mere impression of touch has rarely, if ever, been sufficiently remarkable or distinctive for purposes of evidence. The case, therefore, which I select to illustrate tactile impression is one where the sense of hearing was also concerned. And the example, as it happens, will serve a double purpose; for it will also illustrate the phenomenon of

¹ See Chap. xi., § 4.

reciprocity, which, as I have said, we make the basis of a separate class (F). The narrator is again the Rev. P. H. Newnham, of whose telepathic *rapport* with his wife we have had such striking experimental proof, and who describes himself as "an utter sceptic, in the true sense of the word."

(35) "In March, 1854, I was up at Oxford, keeping my last term, in lodgings. I was subject to violent neuralgic headaches, which always culminated in sleep. One evening, about 8 p.m., I had an unusually violent one; when it became unendurable, about 9 p.m., I went into my bedroom, and flung myself, without undressing, on the bed, and soon fell asleep.

"I then had a singularly clear and vivid dream, all the incidents of which are still as clear to my memory as ever. I dreamed that I was stopping with the family of the lady who subsequently became my wife. All the younger ones had gone to bed, and I stopped chatting to the father and mother, standing up by the fire-place. Presently I bade them good-night, took my candle, and went off to bed. On arriving in the hall, I perceived that my *fiancée* had been detained downstairs, and was only then near the top of the staircase. I rushed upstairs, overtook her on the top step, and passed my two arms round her waist, under her arms, from behind. Although I was carrying my candle in my left hand, when I ran upstairs, this did not, in my dream, interfere with this gesture.

"On this I woke, and a clock in the house struck 10 almost immediately afterwards.

"So strong was the impression of the dream that I wrote a detailed account of it next morning to my *fiancée*.

"*Crossing my letter*, not in answer to it, I received a letter from the lady in question: 'Were you thinking about me, very specially, last night, just about 10 o'clock? For, as I was going upstairs to bed, I distinctly heard your footsteps on the stairs, and felt you put your arms round my waist.'

"The letters in question are now destroyed, but we verified the statement made therein some years later, when we read over our old letters, previous to their destruction, and we found that our personal recollections had not varied in the least degree therefrom. The above narratives may, therefore, be accepted as absolutely accurate. "P. H. NEWNHAM."

Asked if his wife has ever had any other hallucinations, Mr. Newnham replied, "No, Mrs. N. never had any fancy of either myself or any one else being present on any other occasion."

The following is Mrs. Newnham's account:—

"June 9th, 1884.

"I remember distinctly the circumstance which my husband has described as corresponding with his dream. I was on my way up to bed, as usual, about 10 o'clock, and on reaching the first landing I heard distinctly the footsteps of the gentleman to whom I was engaged, quickly mounting the stairs after me, and then I as plainly felt him put his arms round my waist. So strong an impression did this make upon me that I wrote the very next morning to the gentleman, asking if he had been particularly thinking of me at 10 o'clock the night before, and to my astonishment I received (at the same time that my letter would reach him) a letter from him describing his dream, in almost the same words that I had used in describing my impression of his presence.

"M. NEWNHAM."

[It is unfortunate that the actual letters cannot be put in evidence. But Mr. Newnham's distinct statement that the letters were examined, and the coincidence verified, some years after the occurrence, strongly confirms his own and his wife's recollections of the original incident.]

In this case it would, no doubt, be possible to suppose that Mr. Newnham was the sole agent, and that his normal dream was the source of his *fiancée's* abnormal hallucination. But it is at least equally natural to suppose a certain amount of *reciprocal* percipience—a mutual influence of the two parties on one another. We shall meet with more conclusive examples of the mutual effect further on; and it need in no way disturb our conception of telepathy. For if once the startling fact that A's mind can affect B's at a distance be admitted, there seems no *à priori* reason for either affirming or denying that the conditions of this affection are favourable to a reverse telepathic communication from B's mind to A's. Indeed, if in our ignorance of the nature of these conditions any sort of surmise were legitimate, it might perhaps rather lean to the probability of the reciprocal influence; and the natural question might seem to be, not why this feature is present, but why it is so generally absent. Meanwhile it is enough to note the type, and observe that the telepathic theory, as so far evolved, will sufficiently cover it.

§ 9. Finally, the class of *collective* percipience (G) may be illustrated by an instance which (since visual cases have preponderated in this chapter) I will again select from the auditory group. It was received in the summer of 1885, from Mr. John Done, of Stockley Cottage, Stretton, Warrington.

(36) "My sister-in-law, Sarah Eustance, of Stretton, was lying sick unto death, and my wife was gone over to there from Lowton Chapel (12 or 13 miles off) to see her and tend her in her last moments. And on the night before her death (some 12 or 14 hours before) I was sleeping at home alone, and, awaking, heard a voice distinctly call me. Thinking it was my niece, Rosanna, the only other occupant of the house, who might be sick or in trouble, I went to her room and found her awake and nervous. I asked her whether she had called me. She answered, 'No; but something awoke me, when I heard someone calling!'

"On my wife returning home after her sister's death, she told me how anxious her sister had been to see me, 'craving for me to be sent for,' and saying, 'Oh, how I want to see Done once more!' and soon after became speechless. But the curious part was that about the same time she was 'craving,' I and my niece heard the call. "JOHN DONE."

In a subsequent letter Mr. Done writes:—

"In answer to your queries respecting the voice or call that I heard on the night of July 2nd, 1866, I must explain that there was a strong sympathy and affection between myself and my sister-in-law, of pure brotherly and sisterly love; and that she was in the habit of calling me by the title of 'Uncle Done,' in the manner of a husband calling his wife 'mother' when there are children, as in this case. Hence the call being 'Uncle, uncle, uncle!' leading me to think that it was my niece (the only other occupant of the house that Sunday night) calling to me.

"Copy of funeral card: 'In remembrance of the late Sarah Eustance,

who died July 3rd, 1866, aged 45 years, and was this day interred at Stretton Church, July 6th, 1866.

"My wife, who went from Lowton that particular Sunday to see her sister, will testify that as she attended upon her (after the departure of the minister), during the night she was wishing and craving to see me, repeatedly saying, 'Oh, I wish I could see Uncle Done and Rosie once more before I go!' and soon after then she became unconscious, or at least ceased speaking, and died the next day; of which fact I was not aware until my wife returned on the evening of the 4th of July.

"I hope my niece will answer for me; however, I may state that she reminds me that she thought I was calling her and was coming to me, when she met me in the passage or landing, and I asked her if she called me.

"I do not remember ever hearing a voice or call besides the above case."

On August 7th, 1885, Mr. Done writes :—

"My wife being sick and weak of body, dictates the following statement to me :—

"I, Elizabeth Done, wife of John Done, and aunt to Rosanna Done (now Sewill), testify that, on the 2nd of July, 1866, I was attending upon my dying sister, Sarah Eustance, at Stretton, 12 miles from my home at Lowton Chapel, Newton le Willows; when during the night previous to her death, she craved for me to send for my husband and niece, as she wished to see them once more before she departed hence, saying often 'Oh, I wish Done and Rosie were here. Oh, I do long to see Uncle Done.' Soon after she became speechless and seemingly unconscious, and died some time during the day following.

"ELIZABETH DONE."

Mr. Done adds :—

"Several incidents have come to my mind, one of which is that, feeling unsettled in my mind during the day after having heard the voice calling me, and feeling a presentiment that my dear sister-in-law was dead, I, towards evening, set off to meet a train at Newton Bridge, which I believed my wife would come by, returning home, *if her sister was dead as I expected*. There was an understanding that she was to stay at Stretton to attend upon Mrs. Eustance until her demise or convalescence.

"I met my wife some few hundred yards from the station, and could see by her countenance that my surmises were correct. She then told me the particulars of her sister's death, how she *longed* to see me and Rosanna. I then told her of our being called by a voice resembling hers *some time* in the night *previous*, when she (my wife) said she (Mrs. Eustance) often repeated our names during the night before becoming unconscious."

The niece, Mrs. Sewill, writes as follows :—

"11, Smithdown Lane, Paddington, Liverpool.

"August 21st, 1885.

"At my uncle's and your request, I write to confirm the statement of uncle respecting the voice I heard, as follows: I was awakened suddenly without apparent cause, and heard a voice call me distinctly, thus, '*Rosy, Rosy, Rosy!*'¹ Thinking it was my uncle calling, I rose and went

¹ Each of the percipients, it will be noted, heard his or her own name. This point receives its explanation in Chap. xii., § 5.

out of my room, and met my uncle coming to see if I was calling him.¹ We were the only occupants of the house that night, aunt being away attending upon her sister. The night I was called was between 2nd and 3rd of July, 1866. I could not say the time I was called, but I know it was the break of day. I never was called before or since.

“ ROSANNA SEWILL.”

[The last words—an answer to the question whether the narrator had ever experienced any other hallucination—perhaps need correction, as I learnt in conversation that on another occasion she (and two other persons in the same house) had been woke by a voice resembling that of a deceased relative. But she is by no means a fanciful or superstitious witness.]

The percipients in this case may perhaps have been in a somewhat anxious and highly wrought state. Now that is a condition which—as we shall see in the sequel—tends occasionally to produce purely subjective hallucinations of the senses. It is true that the impression of a call which was imagined to be that of a healthy person close at hand, and was in no way suggestive of the dying woman, does not seem a likely form for subjective hallucination due to anxiety about her to take; still, the presence of the anxiety would have prevented us from including such a case in our evidence, had only a single person been impressed. But it must be admitted as a highly improbable accident that *two* startling impressions, so similar in character, and each unique in the life of the person who experienced it, should have so exactly coincided.

§ 10. The above may serve as examples of the several groups classified with reference to the nature of the *percipient's* impression. But it will be seen that the *agent* has also been exhibited in a great variety of conditions—in normal waking health, in apparently dreamless sleep (pp. 83–8), in dream, in physical pain, in a swoon, in the excitement of danger, in dangerous illness, and *in articulo mortis*, the death being in one case accidental and instantaneous, in another the result of a sudden seizure, and in others the conclusion of a prolonged illness. And amid this variety the reader will, no doubt, have been struck by the large proportion of *death* cases—a proportion which duly represents their general preponderance among alleged cases of spontaneous telepathy. They constitute about half of our whole collection. Now this fact raises a question with respect to the interpretation of the phenomena which may be conveniently noticed at once since it bears an equal relation to nearly all the chapters that follow, while such answer as I can give to it depends to some extent on what has preceded.

We are, of course, accustomed to regard death as a completely unique and incomparably important event; and it might thus seem, on a superficial glance, that if spontaneous telepathy is possible, and the conditions and occasions of its occurrence are in question, no more likely occasion than death could be suggested. But on closer consideration, we are reminded that the actual psychical condition that immediately precedes death often does not seem to be specially or at all remarkable, still less

¹ Mrs. Sewill (who was 14 or 15 at the time) is certain that she is correct on this point; and in conversation with her uncle, I found that his memory agrees with hers.

unique ; and that it is this actual psychical condition—while it lasts, and not after it has ceased—that really concerns us here. Our subject is phantasms of the living : we seek the conditions of the telepathic impulse on the hither side of the dividing line, in the closing passage of life ; not in that huge negative fact—the apparent cessation or absence of life—on which the common idea of death and its momentous importance is based. And the closing passage of life, in some of the cases above quoted and in many others that are to follow, was, to all appearance, one of more or less complete lethargy ; a state which (on its psychical side at any rate) seems in no way distinguishable from one through which the agent has passed on numerous previous occasions—that of deep sleep. Nor are the cases which issue in death the only ones to which this remark applies ; in the more remarkable cases of Chapter III., the agent was actually in deep sleep ; Mrs. Bettany's mother was in a swoon (p. 138) ; and other similar instances will meet us. Here, then, there appears to be a real difficulty. For how can we attribute an extraordinary exercise of psychical energy to a state which on its psychical side is quite ordinary, and in which psychical and physical energies alike seem reduced to their lowest limits ?

It may, no doubt, be replied that we have no right to assume that the psychical condition is ordinary ; that the *nervous* condition in the lethargy of approaching death, and even in a fainting-fit, may differ greatly from that of normal sleep, and that this difference may be somehow represented on the psychical side, even though the *ostensible* psychical condition is approximately *nil*. But a completer answer may possibly be found in some further development of the idea of the “unconscious intelligence” which was mentioned above (pp. 56, 57). We there noted stray manifestations of psychical action that seemed unconnected with the more or less coherent stream of experience which we recognise as a *self* ; and a probable relation of these was pointed out to those curious cases of “double consciousness,” in which two more or less coherent streams of experience replace one another by turns, and the same person seems to have two selves. Many other cognate facts might be mentioned, which enable us to generalise to some extent the conceptions suggested by the more prominent instances. But since for present purposes the topic only concerns us at the point where it comes into contact with telepathy, I must ask the reader to seek those further facts elsewhere ; and to accept here the statement that the more these little-known paths of psychology are explored, the more difficult will it appear to round off the idea of personality, or to measure human existence by the limits of the phenomenal self.¹ Now the very nature of this difficulty cannot but suggest

¹ In addition to Dr. Azam's well-known case of *Félida*, I may refer specially to Professor Verriest's “*Observation de trois existences cérébrales distinctes chez le même sujet*,” in the *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Médecine de Belgique*, 3rd series, vol. xvi. ; the case of Louis V—, with his six different personalities, reported by various French observers (Camuset, *Annales Médico-psychologiques*, 1882, p. 75 ; Jules Voisin, *Archives de Neurologie*, September, 1885 ; Bourru and Burot, *Revue Philosophique*, October, 1885, *Archives de Neurologie*, November, 1885) ; and the hypnotic experiments described by Mr. Myers, in his paper on “*Human Personality*,” *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, Part x. A theory of the transcendental self, in its relation to various abnormal states, has been worked out at length in Du Prel's *Philosophie der Mystik* (Leipzig, 1885). [Many additions could of course now be made to this list of references.—ED.]

a deeper solution than the mere connection of various streams of psychic life in a single organism. It suggests the hypothesis that a single individuality may have its psychical being, so to speak, on different planes ; that the stray fragments of " unconscious intelligence," and the alternating selves of " double consciousness," belong really to a more fundamental unity, which finds in what we call life very imperfect conditions of manifestation ; and that the self which ordinary men habitually regard as their proper individuality may after all be only a partial emergence. And this hypothesis would readily embrace and explain the special telepathic fact in question ; while itself drawing from that fact a fresh support. By its aid we can at once picture to ourselves how it should be that the near approach of death is a condition exceptionally favourable to telepathic action, even though vital faculties seem all but withdrawn, and the familiar self has lapsed to the very threshold of consciousness. For to the hidden and completer self the imminence of the great change may be apparent in its full and unique impressiveness ; nay, death itself may be recognised, for aught we can tell, not as a cessation but as a liberation of energy. But this line of thought, though worth pointing out as that along which the full account of certain phenomena of telepathy may in time be sought, is not one that I can here pursue.

CHAPTER VI

TRANSFERENCE OF IDEAS AND OF MENTAL PICTURES

§ 1. THE advance-guard of cases in the last chapter has afforded a glance at the whole range of the phenomena. But I must now start on a methodical plan, and take the narratives in groups according to their subject-matter. The groups will follow the same order as the preceding specimens; but though theoretically the best, this order has the practical disadvantage that it puts the weakest classes first. Of the two great divisions, the *externalised* impressions are by far the most remarkable in themselves, and by far the most conclusive as evidence; but as they constitute the extreme examples of telepathic action, they are logically led up to through the *non-externalised* group, which presents more obvious analogies with the experimental basis of our inquiry. I must, therefore, beg the reader who may be disappointed by much of the evidence in this and the two following chapters, to note that it is no way presented as conclusive; and that though it is well worthy of attention if the case for spontaneous telepathy is once made out, it is only when we come to the "borderland" examples of Chapter IX. that the strength of the case begins rapidly to accumulate.

The great point which connects many of the more inward impressions of spontaneous telepathy with the experimental cases is this—that what enters the percipient's mind is the exact reproduction of the agent's thought at the moment. It is to this class of direct transferences, especially between persons who are in close association with one another, that popular belief most readily inclines—as a rule, without any sufficient grounds. Nothing is commoner than to hear instances of sympathetic flashes between members of the same household—cases where one person suddenly makes the very remark that another was about to make—adduced as evidence of some sort of supersensuous communication. But it is tolerably evident that a number of such "odd coincidences" are sure to occur in a perfectly normal way. Minds which are in habitual contact with one another will constantly react in the same way, even to the most trifling influences of the moment; and the sudden word which proves them to have done so would have nothing startling in it, if the whole train of association that led up to it could be exposed to view. Moreover, physical signs which would be imperceptible to a stranger, may be easily and half-automatically interpreted by a familiar associate; and thus what looks sometimes like divination may perfectly well be due to unconscious inference. It is very rarely that conditions of this sort can be with certainty excluded. Still, experimental thought-transference would certainly prepare us to encounter the phenomenon occasionally in ordinary

social and domestic life ; and one or two examples may be given which have a strong *primâ facie* air of being genuine specimens.

One frequent form of the alleged transferences is that of *tunes*. It is matter of very common observation that one person begins humming the very tune that is running in some one else's head. This admits, as a rule, of a perfectly simple explanation. It is easy to suppose that some special tune has been a good deal "in the air" of a house, half unconsciously hummed or whistled, as tunes often are, and that thus the coincidence is an accident which may very readily occur. At the same time, if the telepathic faculty exists tunes should apparently be a form of "thought" well calculated for transference. With many people the imagining of a tune is the sort of idea which comes nearest to the vividness of actual sensation. And, moreover, it contains not only the representation of sensory experience, but also a distinct *motor* element—an impulse to reproduction. A person with a musical ear can silently reproduce a tune, with such an inward force as almost produces the illusion of driving it into objective existence. Such an incident as the following therefore, where there is no question of a family knowledge of the tune, or of its having been in any way in the air, is of decided interest ; though, of course, the actual force of any single case of the sort is very small. We received the account from Sir Lepel Griffin, K.C.S.I.

" 53A, Pall Mall.

" February 14th, 1884.

(37) "Colonel Lyttleton Annesley, Commanding Officer of the 11th Hussars, was staying in my house some time ago, and one afternoon, having nothing to do, we wandered into a large unoccupied room, given up to lumber and packing cases. Colonel A. was at one end of this long room reading, to the best of my recollection, while I opened a box, long forgotten, to see what it contained. I took out a number of papers and old music, which I was turning over in my hand, when I came across a song in which I, years before, had been accustomed to take a part, 'Dal tuo stellato soglio,' out of 'Mosé in Egitto,' if I remember right. As I looked at this old song, Colonel A., who had been paying no attention whatever to my proceedings, began to hum, 'Dal tuo stellato soglio.' In much astonishment I asked him why he was singing that particular air. He did not know. He did not remember to have sung it before ; indeed I have not ever heard Colonel A. sing, though he is exceedingly fond of music. I told him that I was holding the very song in my hand. He was as much astonished as I had been, and had no knowledge that I had any music in my hand at all. I had not spoken to him, nor had I hummed the air, or given him any sign that I was looking over music. The incident is curious, for it is outside all explanation on the theory of coincidence."

Later, Sir L. Griffin wrote :—

" 28th April, 1884.

"I promised to write to you when I received a reply from General Lyttleton Annesley, to whom I had written, in the same words I had used to you, the little incident which struck you as noteworthy. I may mention that it had never formed the subject of conversation or correspondence between us from the day that it happened until now. He says : 'I perfectly recollect the incident you refer to about the song "Dal tuo stellato soglio." I had my back to you at the time you were taking out

the music, and did not even know what you were doing. I was close to a window and you were at the bottom end of the room. In fact your account is exact to the minutest point.' "LEPEL GRIFFIN."

We have other cases in which the transferred impression was not of a tune, but of a word or phrase, while still of apparently an auditory sort, conveying the *sound* of the word rather than its meaning. When the two persons concerned have been in close proximity, it is, of course, difficult to make sure that some incipient sound or movement of the lips, on the part of the supposed agent, did not supply an unconscious suggestion. But the following case cannot be so explained. We received it from Mr. J. G. Keulemans, who was mentioned above (p. 139) as having had a number of similar experiences.

"November, 1882.

(38) "In the summer of the year 1875, about eight in the evening, I was returning to my home in the Holloway Road, on a tramcar, when it flashed into my mind that my assistant, Herr Schell, a Dutchman, who knew but little English (who was coming to see me that evening), would ask me what the English phrase, 'to wit,' meant in Dutch. So vivid was the impression that I mentioned it to my wife on arriving at my house, and I went so far as to scribble it down on the edge of a newspaper which I was reading. Ten minutes afterwards Schell arrived, and almost his first words were the inquiry, 'Wat is het Hollandsch voor "to wit"?' (The words scribbled on the newspaper were not in his sight, and he was a good many yards from it.) I instantly showed him the paper, with the memorandum on it, saying, 'You see I was ready for you.' He told me that he had resolved to ask me just before leaving his house in Kentish Town, as he was intending that evening to do a translation of an English passage in which the words occurred. He was in the habit of making such translations in order to improve his knowledge of English. The time of his resolution corresponded (as far as we could reckon) with that of my impression."

[Unfortunately no corroboration of this occurrence is now obtainable; but the incident of the newspaper does not seem a likely one to have been unconsciously invented.]

[Case 39 is omitted.—ED.]

§ 2. [Omitted also are four examples—40, 41, 42, 43—illustrating the transference of ideas and images of a simple rudimentary sort. Perhaps the following case from the "Additional Chapter" may best be classed here as being an example of mere impressions, without any sensory affection.—ED.] The narrator is Mr. J. C. Grant, of 98, Cornwall Gardens, S.W.; from whose very full journal the records were copied by the present writer. Mr. Grant desires that the names of the persons mentioned shall not be printed; but says that "the fullest information is open to private enquiry." The instance which was second in date is given before the earlier one, as being more complete, and is the only one to which I have attached an evidential number.

(692) Entry in diary for April 11, 1882.

"A very strange thing happened to me last night. It has happened once before. After being asleep some little time, I was wakened up, quite quietly and with no dread or horror, but with the absolute and

certain knowledge that there was a 'presence' in my room. I looked everywhere into the darkness, implored it to appear, but to no effect; for though I have the gift of 'feeling,' I have not that of 'sight,' I felt certain, in fact was told by it, that it was to do with Bruce [Christian name]. I thought it was his father—I was sure it was: I thought he must be dead.¹ All this took place in about a couple of minutes or so; and as I saw I could *see* nothing, I got up, struck a match, lighted the candle at my bedside, and looked at my watch. It was just 14 minutes past 12 o'clock. I then put out the candle; but all feeling of the presence had gone. It had spoken as only a spirit² can speak, and then had passed away. I did not get to sleep for a long time, and was very unhappy for poor Bruce. . . . I have been quite out of sorts all day for poor old Bruce, to whom I wrote this morning. Told M. and R. of my feeling and experiences of the night."

[The entry for April 12 mentions a conversation with Mr. and Mrs. M., in which Mr. Grant remembers that he described the occurrence.]

Entry for April 13.

"In afternoon went over to my aunt M.'s, had a long talk with her, told her and J. and others all about my presentiment. I have not heard from poor Bruce yet."

Entry for April 14.

"Up early, at half-past seven—expecting a letter. The letter has come, as I expected—deep black edge; but it is not his father, but his brother, that has died, poor old E., date and all, on Tuesday. . . . I wrote to him this morning. I will not tell him of my strange meeting of Tuesday morning or Monday night. . . . Witnesses to this strange pre-knowledge of mine: Mrs. R., my housekeeper; Mrs. C., my aunt; J., my cousin (Captain C.); other cousins, Mrs. M. and Mr. M., Mr. H. R., and Mme. G. So you see³ I am not without my authorities, besides my written journal."

Entry for April 15.

"Wrote a long letter to my father, giving him what news there was, and telling him about my queer experience."

The following is a copy, made by the present writer, of a letter written to Mr. Grant by Mr. M., on June 3, 1886:—

"We distinctly remember your telling us about the strange circumstance that took place before⁴ the death of one of your friends. The details have escaped our memory, but we remember that it was a case of premonition, which was afterwards verified. "C. W. M."

The date of death appears in the *Times* obituary as April 10, 1882. This was Monday, not Tuesday; and probably Mr. Grant assumed that the day on which his friend heard of the death was the day of the death itself. The death, which took place in China, can only have fallen within

¹ Mr. Grant explains this sentence as follows:—"I knew his father to be very seriously ill, which no doubt was the reason why my thoughts took this direction."

² I must disclaim all responsibility for this and similar impressions on the part of informants.

³ The journal, though a private one, is in many parts written as if addressed to an imaginary reader.

⁴ The wording of this letter, and Mr. Grant's expressions above, illustrate what I have more than once remarked on—the common tendency to describe what are really telepathic impressions, coinciding with or closely following real events, as prophetic and premonitory.

12 hours of his experience if it occurred in the few hours preceding midnight.

Mr. E. T. R., who died, was an intimate friend of Mr. Grant's, but not so intimate as his brother Bruce.

Entry in diary for Wednesday, December 10, 1879. (Mr. Grant was at the time in Southern India.)

"Yesterday I had a peculiar sensation. When I say yesterday, I mean last night. . . . I have as it were an inner eye opened. I had a sort of unconscious feeling that, if I were to wish it, I could see some strange visitant in the chamber with me—someone disembodied. [Here follow some words of description which, though general and not distinctive, apply perfectly to the particular person who, as it turned out, died at the time, and would have applied equally naturally to only a small group of persons. Mr. Grant has what appear to me valid reasons for withholding the clause from publication.] I forced the idea from me, and fell into a troubled sleep."

Entry for December 11.

"Went in afternoon to the library; thence to C.'s. Hear by telegram, while there, of the death of my uncle, Mr. C., on Tuesday. Wonder if that had anything to do with my feelings the night before last."

We find in the obituary of a leading newspaper that the death took place on December 9th, 1879.

Mr. Grant states that he had had no idea that anything was the matter with his uncle.

I have studied in Mr. Grant's diary the full record of a third case, which was even more remarkable than the first, as it included the peculiarity that, for some time after his first impression, he felt forcibly impelled to *draw* the figure of the person who died. The case was made the more striking to me by the fact that Mr. Grant was so certain that the death (the time of which he had only very vaguely learnt) must have coincided in date with his impression, that he had actually not taken the trouble to verify the coincidence. He left it to me to find in the *Times* obituary—as he confidently foretold that I would—that the death (which was quite unexpected) occurred, thousands of miles from the place where he was, on the day preceding that on which the entry in his diary, relating his impression of the previous night, was written. The impression of that night did not, however, bear distinct reference to the particular person who died, but was a more general sense of calamity in the family. Certain reasons which at present make it desirable not to publish the details of this case may in time cease to exist.

Mr. Grant writes, on May 31st, 1886 :—

"Except on these three occasions, I have never, to the best of my recollection, had any feeling in the least resembling those described."

§ 3. I now come to cases where the impression was of a more definite sort, representing actual people and actual events. We sometimes encounter persons who allege that they have repeatedly experienced some occult sort of perception of what was happening to friends or relatives at a distance. As a rule their statements have no force at all as evidence for telepathy; partly because we have no means of judging how far the

idea of the distant event may have been suggested in some normal way ; partly because the impressions have not been recorded at the time, and it is specially easy to suppose that failures may have been forgotten, while a lucky guess has been remembered. We have, however, one example of marked correspondence where two witnesses were concerned, each of whom professes to have had other similar experiences, and where the particular incident narrated is adequately confirmed. The witnesses are Mr. and Mrs. L. H. Saunders, of St. Helen's, near Ryde. As to former experiences, Mr. Saunders says :—

“ I have mentally noted frequent ‘ vivid impressions ’ during many years past, and in the majority of instances, when such impressions have appeared to be spontaneous and intuitive, the facts have actually corresponded.”

Mrs. Saunders says :—

“ I have had other similar strong impressions at distant intervals, and as far as I can recollect they have corresponded with the reality. I cannot say if I have had any such impressions which have *not* corresponded with the reality, but my opinion is that I have had none such.”

Mr. Saunders' account of the particular incident is as follows :—

“ San Claudio, Sandown, Isle of Wight.

“ March 12th, 1883.

(44) “ On Thursday evening last (8th inst.) in the house of friends with whom we were staying at Tavistock, Devon, I suddenly asked my wife ‘ What she was thinking of ? ’ She replied, ‘ I cannot get M. R. and A. F. out of my head all day ; they *will* run through all my thoughts.’ I replied, ‘ What makes you think of them ? ’ She said, ‘ I don't know, but it seems just as if they were married,’ to which I asked, ‘ Have you any reason to suppose they would be married to-day ? ’ She replied, ‘ Oh, no ! I am *sure* Mary would not be married during Lent.’ I then allowed my mind to travel to the house where M. R. resided in London, when I became immediately conscious of receiving the strongest possible conviction that they were married that day, so that I quickly but firmly replied, ‘ *They are married to-day, and we shall see the wedding announced in the Times on Saturday,*’ at which there was a general titter. However, I was so convinced of the accuracy of our joint thoughts that I foolishly offered to wager the whole of my belongings on the truth of it, and until seeing the confirmation, I was anxious to risk anything in support of my belief. I may here mention that there were present, who could testify to the foregoing conversation, *three* independent witnesses, quite unknown to the persons referred to as M. R. and A. F. Neither of the latter had been seen nor communicated with by my wife for nearly six months, but I had seen them once about three months before. We knew they were to be married, but understood not until April or May. This knowledge and the question of Lent made my wife doubtful as to the fulfilment of her presentiment when I pressed her finally at noon on Saturday ; soon after which, on reaching Exeter station, I procured a copy of the *Times*, and before opening it again declared my conviction absolutely unshaken. As you may have guessed, there was the notice of marriage, as having taken place on the 8th inst., all right. [We have verified this fact independently.] I may conclude by saying this notice is all we know of the wedding, no

communication having passed between us and any member of the bride's or bridegroom's family, &c. Further, if you deem it of sufficient importance I will supply correct names and addresses of all parties interested, as I feel sure our Tavistock friends could not object to contributing to scientific truth by testifying to the facts."

The ladies who were present when Mr. and Mrs. Saunders had this impression corroborate as follows, in a letter written to Mr. Saunders from Harleigh House, Tavistock :—

"After a lengthy discussion you both emphatically concluded that she was married on that day. We were quite sceptical at the time, but on receipt of the *Times* the proofs were quite convincing.

"LILY SAMPSON.

"KATHLEEN SAMPSON."

Here the state of the supposed agent or agents was presumably excitement of a happy nature. This, however, is rarely the case—which may perhaps be taken as indicating the superior vividness of pains over pleasures. Impressions of death, illness, or accident are the almost unbroken rule. I will first quote cases where a distinct idea of the particular event was produced, without any distinct representation of the actual scene.

The following account is from Mrs. Herbert Davy, of 1, Burdon Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

"December 20th, 1883.

(45) "A very old gentleman, living at Hurworth, a friend of my husband's and with whom I was but slightly acquainted, had been ill many months. My sister-in-law, who resides also at H., often mentioned him in her letters, saying he was better or worse as the case might be.

"Late last autumn, my husband and I were staying at the Tynedale Hydropathic Establishment. One evening I suddenly laid down the book I was reading, with this thought so strong upon me I could scarcely refrain from putting it into words: 'I believe that Mr. C. is at this moment dying.' So strangely was I imbued with this belief—there had been nothing whatever said to lead to it—that I asked my husband to note the time particularly, and to remember it for a reason I would rather not state just then. 'It is exactly 7 o'clock,' he said, and that being our dinner hour, we went downstairs to dine. The entire evening, however, I was haunted by the same strange feeling, and looked for a letter from my sister-in-law next morning. None came. But the following day there was one for her brother. In it she said: 'Poor old Mr. C. died last night at 7 o'clock. It was past post time, so I could not let you know before.'"

Mr. Davy corroborates as follows :—

"December 27th, 1883.

"I have a perfect recollection of the night in question, the 20th October, 1882, when my wife asked me to tell her the time. I told her the time, as she 'had a reason for knowing it,' she said. She afterwards told me that reason.

"HERBERT DAVY."

The following is a copy of an obituary card, referring to the Mr. C. of the narrative :—

"In loving memory of John Colling, of Hurworth-on-Tees, who died October the 20th, 1882, aged 84 years."

Mrs. Davy has had one other experience which also corresponded with a death. With this exception, she states that the present case was quite unique in her experience.

In an interview with Professor Sidgwick, on April 15th, 1884, Mrs. Davy described the impression as strong and sudden, not emotional, but merely the sudden conviction that Mr. Colling was at that moment dying, though a strange feeling of sadness followed and remained during the evening. "She called it strange," says Professor Sidgwick, "meaning (as I understand) that her interest in Mr. C. was too slight to account for it; and she has no reason to suppose that he thought of her at the moment of death. In this case her recollection of the uniqueness and strength of her conviction is confirmed by her request to her husband to note the time; she was certain that she had never on any other occasion made a similar request in consequence of a similar impression. Her belief at the time was not the result of any reasoning process leading her to have confidence in her impression." More than two years later, in conversation with the present writer, Mrs. Davy mentioned the surprise which she herself afterwards felt at having made the request to her husband.

In this case the percipient was aware that the supposed agent was in a state where the event surmised was not wholly improbable, which reduces the force of the evidence. There are many cases of sudden-accident where this objection does not apply.

[Cases 46-48 and 50-53 are omitted.—ED. About No. 48, a case of a child of three having a coincidental impression of a cousin drowning, Mr. Gurney remarks:—]

The impression of a very young child, corresponding to such an accident as this, has far more force than that of an adult would generally have; for seasons when relatives are supposed to be skating or boating are likely times for nervous apprehensions, which will naturally now and then be fulfilled. The following case is a strong one of its kind; since the coincidence appears to have been close to the hour, while the ground for nervousness, such as it was, extended over a good many days. The impression, moreover, seems to have been of a peculiarly definite and startling kind, being almost if not quite externalised as actual sound. The account is from the Rev. A. W. Arundel, who wrote from Colorado Springs, U.S.A., in 1884.

(49) "In the fall of 1875, I took a trip to Madison, Ohio, to Johnson's Island, Kelly's Island, and neighbouring points. There were nine of us in all, and our conveyance was a small sailing vessel. One Sunday morning we crossed from Cedar Point to Sandusky, in order to attend church. During the service a heavy storm came up, and when we went down to the landing, on our return, we found a pretty rough sea. We ventured, however, to try and get across, and in the end succeeded; but in the trial we had a very narrow escape. We had gone about half-way, when a very heavy gust of wind struck our little vessel, and turned her over on her side. The water rushed in, and it seemed almost impossible to keep her afloat. There we were clinging to the side that was still out of water, and expecting every moment to be swamped. By dint of almost superhuman effort, those who had sufficient presence of mind cut away all the sail we were carrying, and the boat righted just enough to allow the men to bale out some of the water. We managed, after one or two almost hopeless

struggles, to get ashore. Now just at the moment of greatest danger, when escape seemed impossible, I thought of my wife and child a hundred miles away. I thought of them in a sort of agony, and felt that to leave them was impossible. If ever there was an unuttered cry for loved ones, it was at that moment. This was on the Sunday afternoon.

"I reached home on the following Saturday afternoon. Having to preach that Sunday, I held no conversation with my wife that morning, and it was not until Sunday after dinner that we had an opportunity for a chat. Just as I was about to commence an account of my trip, my wife said, 'By the way, I had a very peculiar experience last Sunday, just about this time. I was lying on the lounge, when all at once I had a startling impression that you wanted me, and even fancied I heard you call. I started up and listened, and went out on to the porch, and looked up and down the road, and acted altogether in a very agitated way.'

"This happened, as nearly as we could determine by comparing notes, at precisely the same hour that I was clinging to that side of the sinking boat, and facing what seemed to be the possibility of a watery grave. I do not believe it was coincidence. It must, I think, be explained in some other way.

"ALFRED W. ARUNDEL,

"Pastor 1st U.E. Church."

The following is a corroborative account from Mrs. Arundel, who wrote from Maniton, Colorado, on April 1, 1886 :—

"Not being very well, I was lying on the sofa (not asleep, for I had my baby sitting on the floor beside me, playing). Mr. Arundel was away on a sailing excursion with some friends, and I did not expect his return for some days. It seemed to me that I distinctly heard him call me by name, 'Maggie,' a slight pause and again 'Maggie.' The voice seemed far off and yet clear, but the tone such as he would use if needing me. The impression was so distinct that I rose and went out on to the porch with the thought, 'Can they possibly have returned sooner for some reason?' and I so fully expected to see him there that I went back into the house with a feeling of disappointment and some anxiety, too, feeling so *sure* I had heard *his voice*. No one was in the house, my servant being out. When my husband came home, he was much startled to find how exactly his experience on that Sunday afternoon corresponded with my vivid impressions. It could not have been mere coincidence. I must add that I mentioned *my* experience to Mr. Arundel before he had spoken to me of *his*.

"I have had impressions more than once, but never a *false one*. When Mr. Arundel first crossed to America he met with a severe storm. The night that the ship was in great danger (though it is impossible to define how), I knew and felt that it was so. I mentioned it to my friends, who ridiculed the fancy; nevertheless, the time corresponded precisely.

"MARGUERITE ARUNDEL."

§ 4. There is one interesting group of cases where the idea apparently impressed on the percipient has been simply that of the agent's approach. But here, again, great caution is necessary. Popular opinion is extremely apt to invest persentiments of this sort with a character to which they have no claim. Every day, probably, a large number of people have a more or less strong impression, for which they can assign no distinct reason, that some particular person is near them or is coming to see them. That with some people such an impression should prove correct often enough to be remarked on, is only what we should naturally

expect; and it is probable that the impression, when apparently confirmed in this way, would look to memory more definite and confident than it had really been. When it is always about the same person that the impression is felt, there is more *prima facie* ground for supposing that it may be telepathic. But still the circumstances may make it quite unavailable as evidence. For instance, Mr. Rowland Rowlands, of Brynceithin, Bridgend, tells us that when he was manager of the Pen-y-graig Collieries, a man who was acting under him as foreman (since dead) had constantly to come to his house on business in the middle of the night.

"I was invariably aware of his coming, in dream, before he actually appeared, and would leave my bed and watch for him at the window. He himself noticed this, and told the other men that he never came but he found me at the window watching for him."

But those who are in the habit of being waked at night for a special purpose know the way in which the expectation will often haunt their dreams; and in the absence of more definite assurance that the man was never expected when he did not come, and that he never came unexpected, accident is the reasonable explanation of the coincidences. [Two other instances omitted here.—ED.] We have, however, stronger cases, of which a couple may be worth quoting here. The first is remarkable from the extreme improbability of the visit; the second from the number of times in succession that the impression proved correct.

Miss M. E. Pritchard, of Tan-y-coed, Bangor, says:—

"January 30th, 1884.

(54) "One night, at 12 o'clock, I felt a conviction that a friend of ours, Mr. Jephson, was coming to see us very shortly. I mentioned it to my sister, who merely said it was very improbable, as he must be on his way to Canada, as such was his intention when we had last seen him.

"It was greatly to her astonishment when he actually arrived next morning at 9 a.m. When questioned as to the time of his arrival, we found it corresponded to the time of my remark, and, still more curious, he was then thinking of coming straight down to see us, but decided to wait till morning. This was in March, 1880, as far as I can remember."

In reply to inquiries, Miss Pritchard adds:—

"February 7th, 1884.

"In reply to your question as to whether any other previous impressions had *not* turned out true, I think, as far as I can remember, any deep impression I have ever had as to anyone calling has invariably been true."

The following corroboration is from Miss Pritchard's sister:—

"Tan-y-coed, February 8th, 1884.

"I distinctly remember my sister telling me (at the time) of her impression that a friend was on his way to see us, which turned out to be the fact.—E. B. PRITCHARD."

[About the second case (No. 55) omitted here, Mr. Gurney says:—]

Here real pains seem to have been taken to test the phenomenon fairly; but the case is rather remote, and it is very unfortunate that no notes were taken at the time. Some further specimens will be found in

the Supplement; and parallel cases where there was an actual sensory impression of the person about to arrive will be found in Chapter XIV., § 7.

§ 5. So far, the impressions that corresponded with real events have all been ideas of a more or less abstract kind; the *fact* was realised, but no image of the actual *scene* was called up in the percipient's mind. We now come to a series of more concrete impressions—still belonging, however, to the non-sensory family; for though they have evoked sensory images with more or less distinctness, they have not suggested to the percipient any actual affection of the senses. And they continue to present this marked point of analogy to the results of experimental thought-transference, that the images or the scene evoked before the percipient's mind reflected (either wholly or in great part) the images or scene with which the agent's attention was actually occupied.

In alleged transferences of this distinct and detailed sort, it is, of course, essential to the evidence that the scene with which the percipient is inwardly impressed should not be one that might, in the ordinary course of things, have been pictured correctly, or with sufficient correctness for the description to seem applicable. The tendency to make the most of such correspondences must here be carefully borne in mind. [An illustration is omitted.]

The following cases seem to be free from objections. The first shall be another specimen from the remarkable series of impressions which have been experienced by Mr. J. G. Keulemans (see pp. 140 and 175).

“ November, 1882.

(56) “ One morning, not long ago, while engaged with some very easy work, I saw in my mind's eye a little wicker basket, containing five eggs, two very clean, of a more than usually elongated oval and of a yellowish hue, one very round, plain white, but smudged all over with dirt; the remaining two bore no peculiar marks. I asked myself what that insignificant but sudden image could mean. I never think of similar objects. But that basket remained fixed in my mind, and occupied it for some moments. About two hours later I went into another room for lunch. I was at once struck with the remarkable similarity between the eggs standing in the egg-cups on the breakfast table, and those two very long ones I had in my imagination previously seen. ‘ Why do you keep looking at those eggs so carefully ? ’ asked my wife; and it caused her great astonishment to learn from me how many eggs had been sent by her mother half an hour before. She then brought up the remaining three; there was the one with the dirt on it, and the basket, the same as I had seen. On further inquiry, I found that the eggs had been kept together by my mother-in-law, that she had placed them in the basket and thought of sending them to me; and, to use her own words, ‘ I did of course think of you at that moment.’ She did this at 10 on the morning, which (as I know from my regular habits) must have been just the time of my impression.

“ J. G. KEULEMANS.”

Mrs. Keulemans tells us that she has almost forgotten the incident. “ All I can say is that my husband looked at some eggs and made the remark that he had seen them before. I know he told me my mother had sent them.”

Here the very triviality of this incident, as well as the smallness and

definiteness of the object visualised, makes the resemblance to cases of experimental thought-transference specially close.¹

In the examples which follow, the idea of something less circumscribed than a single object, and more of the nature of a complete scene, seems to have been transmitted.

[Case 57 is here omitted.] The next instance is from Mr. John Hopkins, of 23, King Street, Carmarthen.

" May 2nd, 1884.

(58) " One evening, in the early spring of last year (1883), as I was retiring to bed, and whilst I was in the full enjoyment of good health and active senses—I distinctly saw my mother and my younger sister crying. I was here in Carmarthen, and they were away in Monmouthshire, 80 miles distant. They distinctly appeared to me to be giving way to grief, and I was at once positive that some domestic bereavement had taken place. I said to myself, ' I shall hear something of this in the morning.' When the morning came, the first thing which was handed to me was a letter from my father in Monmouthshire, stating that they had, on the day of writing, had intelligence that my nephew had just died. The little boy was the son of my elder sister, living in North Devon. There was no doubt but that my mother and younger sister had both given way to grief on the day of my strange illusion, and it was in some mysterious manner communicated to my mind—together with a certain presentiment that I was on the eve of intelligence of a death in the family. I thought it most probable, though, that the imaginative faculty added—in a purely local manner—the idea of speedy intelligence to the communication which the mind received in some way from Monmouthshire.

" It was the only occurrence of the sort I have ever experienced.

" JOHN HOPKINS."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hopkins writes, on May 15, 1884 :—

" I, at Carmarthen, had news on the following morning, as I thoroughly expected to, of a death—that of a nephew. I had no opportunity of mentioning the circumstance to anyone before the letter came. I am sorry to say, too, that I have destroyed the letter.

" As to the reality of the scene in my mind—speaking as correctly as I can at this distance of time from the occurrence (about a year ago)—I don't think the affair did produce a picture on my mind *more* vivid than might have been summoned there by closing the eyes and putting some strain upon the imagination. It certainly did not make the outward

¹ Mr. Keulemans is a trained observer, and has made a careful study of his peculiar mental pictures, the subjects of which range from single objects, as in the above case, to complete scenes. He says: " They are always marked by a strange sensation. There is no attempt on my part to conjure them up—on the contrary, they come quite suddenly and unexpectedly, binding my thoughts so fixedly to the subject as to render all external influences imperceptible. Whenever I took the trouble to ascertain whether my impressions corresponded to real events, I found them invariably to do so, even in the most minute details." But his cases naturally differ in their evidential force. He tells us, for instance, that on New Year's Eve, 1881, he had a vivid picture of his family circle in Holland, but missed from the group his youngest sister, a child of 14, whose absence from home on such an occasion was most improbable. He wrote at once to ask if this sister was ill; but the answer was that, contrary to all precedent, she had been away from home. This may plainly have been an accidental coincidence.

eye fancy it saw something, as the Bishop of Carlisle has suggested may be the case in some instances. But there was this peculiarity. The scene was impressed upon my mind without closing of the eyes or any other inducement to absent-mindedness, and without the *imagination* from myself, so far as I can say, going out in that direction. It was also more firmly riveted upon my mind than any passing, or what one may term accidental, impression would be. It was *fixed* there. I could not get rid of it, and I felt certain it meant something, which it certainly did.

"Although the *locale* was familiar to me, I don't think there had been more wanderings of memory to it than to other places I knew, and the state of grief which my relatives were in may be said to have been the only exceptional feature."

In conversation with Mr. Hopkins, I learnt that his father, mother, and younger sister were the only three relatives at home; and that his impression as to the grief of the two latter resulted in apprehension about his father—led him, that is, to a wrong guess. On the other hand I am sure, from his account, that the impression itself was of a very strong and peculiar kind.

[Cases 59, 60, 61 are omitted.] The next case differs from most of the preceding, in that the condition of the agent was only slightly abnormal, and the probability that the impressions of the percipient were telepathic rests entirely on the exactitude of detail in the correspondence. The name of the narrator, Mrs. L., is only withheld from publication because her friends would object to its appearance. She has had other similar experiences, but the following is the only one that she can accurately recall.

"January, 1885.

(62) "Some years ago, the writer, when recovering from an illness, had a remarkable experience of 'second-sight.' It was thus:—

"A friend had been invited to dinner, whom the writer was most anxious to consult on a subject of grave anxiety. At 7 o'clock the servant came to ask, 'if dinner should be served or not, as the guest had not arrived.'

"The writer said at once, and without hesitation, 'No, put off the dinner till 8 o'clock. Mr. A. will arrive at — Station by 7.45 train; send the carriage there to meet him.'

"The writer's husband, surprised at this announcement, said, 'Why did you not tell us this before, and when did Mr. A. let you know of the delay in his arrival?'

"The writer then explained that there had been no intimation from Mr. A., but that as she had been lying there, on the couch, and anxiously hoping to see her guest, she had had a distinct vision of him, at a certain place (mentioning the name of the town); that she had seen him going over a 'House to Let'; that, having missed the train and also the ferry, he had crossed the river in a small boat and scrambled up the steep bank, tripping in doing so, and that he had run across a ploughed field, taking up the train at a side station, which would arrive at — at a quarter to 8 p.m.

"The writer gave all these particulars without any sort of mental effort, and felt surprised herself at the time that they should arise to her mind and tongue.

"Presently Mr. A. arrived full of apologies, and surprised beyond measure to find his friend's carriage awaiting him at the station. He then went on to explain that he had that morning quite suddenly taken it into

his head to leave town for —, and finding it so fresh and healthy a place, he had been tempted to look over some houses to let, hoping to be able to get one for a few weeks in the season ; that he had lost time in doing this, and missed both train and ferry ; that he had bribed a small boat to row him over ; that in getting up the side bank, he fell, which delayed him again, but that he had just contrived to catch the train at a siding, by running breathless over a field ; that he had intended to telegraph on arriving at the station, but, meeting the carriage there, he had felt bound to come on, to explain and apologise, in spite of delay, and ‘ morning dress,’ &c., &c.”

The following is a letter from Mr. A. to Mrs. L. :—

“ February 16th, 1835.

“ DEAR MRS. L.,—Anent that Indian incident, your seeing me, and what I was doing at Barrackpore one evening, you yourself being in Calcutta at the time.

“ It is now so long ago, 13 years, I think, that I cannot recall all the circumstances, but I do remember generally.

“ I left home one morning without the intention of going from Calcutta during the day, but I did go from Calcutta to Barrackpore and spent some time in looking through the bungalows to let.

“ I remember I crossed in a small boat—not by the ferry, and my impression is that I did not land at the usual jetty, but, instead, at the bank opposite the houses which I wished to see.

‘ I missed the train by which I would ordinarily have travelled, and consequently arrived in Calcutta considerably later than your usual dinner-hour.

‘ I cannot remember distinctly that I found any gharry at the Barrackpore train, Calcutta Station, but you may probably remember whether you sent the gharry ; but I do remember my astonishment that you had put back dinner against my return from Barrackpore by that particular train, you having had no previous direct knowledge of my having gone to Barrackpore at all.

“ I remember, too, your telling me generally what I had been doing at Barrackpore, and how I had missed the earlier train. And on my inquiry ‘ How on earth do you know these things ? ’ you said, ‘ I saw you.’ Expecting me by that train, I can quite understand your having sent the carriage for me, although that particular item is not clearly on my memory.

“ I can well remember that at the time of the incident you were in a very delicate state of health.

“ Do you remember that other occasion in Calcutta, a holiday, when Mrs. — called, I being out, and on her inquiring for me your informing her that I had gone to the bootmaker’s and the hatter’s, you having had no previous intimation from me of any such intention on my part ? and our astonishment and amazement when I did a little later turn up, a new hat in my hand, and fresh from registering an order at the bootmaker’s ?

“ These have always appeared to me very extraordinary incidents, and the first, especially, incapable of explanation in an ordinary way.”

Mrs. L. recollects the other incident referred to, but she is not inclined to think it of much importance.

She adds :—

“ The river crossed was the Hooghly from Serampore to Barrackpore, where the house was situated which Mr. A. looked over. The station he arrived at was in Calcutta, I think called the South Eastern, but of this I am not sure.”

The next account is from a lady who is an active philanthropist, and as practical and unvisionary a person as could be found. She has no special interest in our work, and withholds her name on the ground that her friends would dislike or despise the subject. This is one of the ways in which the present state of thought and feeling often prevents the facts from having their legitimate force.

" May 9th, 1883.

(63) " It happened one Tuesday last January. I was going to start for one of my usual visits to Southampton. In the morning I received a letter from a friend saying he was going to hunt that day, and would write next day, so that I should get the letter on my return home. In the train, being tired, I put down my book and shut my eyes, and presently the whole scene suddenly occurred before me—a hunting field and two men riding up to jump a low stone wall. My friend's horse rushed at it, could not clear it, and blundered on to his head, throwing off his rider, and the whole scene vanished. I was wide awake the whole time. My friend is a great rider, and there was no reason why such an accident should have befallen him. Directly I arrived at Southampton I wrote to him, simply saying I knew he had had a fall, and hoped he was not hurt. On my return late on Wednesday night, not finding the promised letter, I wrote a few lines, merely saying I should expect to hear all about his *spill* next day, and I mentioned to two people that evening on my return what I had seen; also that Tuesday evening, dining with friends, I spoke of what had happened in the train, and they all promptly laughed at me. On Thursday morning I received a letter from my friend, telling me he had had a fall, riding at a low stone wall, that the horse had not been able to clear it, and had blundered on to his head, that he was not much hurt, and had later on remounted. He had not, when he wrote, received either of my letters, as my Tuesday one only arrived in Scotland on Thursday morning, and my Wednesday one on Friday. When he received my letters, he only declared I must have been asleep. Nothing of the sort ever happened to me before or since. It all seemed very natural and did not alarm me.

" H. G. B."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. B. adds :—

" My friend, who is a hard-headed Scotchman, declined to say another word about it. All I know is that there were two horsemen riding up to the same spot."

In a personal interview, Mrs. B. told the present writer that her vision took place about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and that she had heard from her friend that his accident took place " after lunch." She had no idea of *disaster*, and felt sure he was not much hurt. She cannot say whether her eyes were open or shut, but is certain that the experience was an altogether unique one.

[Case 64 is omitted.] We received the next account through the kindness of Mr. J. Bradley Dyne, of 2, New Square, Lincoln's Inn. The incident took place in his house at Highgate, and the narrator is his sister-in-law. The case brings us again to the very verge of actual sensory hallucination. It seems also to be an extreme instance of a *deferred* or a *latent* telepathic impression—the death of the agent (allowing for longitude) having preceded the percipient's experience by about 10 hours. This feature does not seem specially surprising, when we remember how actual impressions of sense

may pass unnoted, and yet emerge into consciousness hours afterwards, either in dream or in some moment of silence or *recueillement*. (See above, p. 144.)

" 1883.

(65) " I had known Mr. — as a medical man, under whose treatment I had been for some years, and at whose hands I had experienced great kindness. He had ceased to attend me for considerably more than a year at the time of his death. I was aware that he had given up practice, but beyond that I knew nothing of his proceedings, or of the state of his health. At the time I last saw him, he appeared particularly well, and even made some remark himself as to the amount of vigour and work left in him.

" On Thursday, the 16th day of December, 1875, I had been for some little time on a visit at my brother-in-law's and sister's house near London. I was in good health, but from the morning and throughout the day I felt unaccountably depressed and out of spirits, which I attributed to the gloominess of the weather. A short time after lunch, about 2 o'clock, I thought I would go up to the nursery to amuse myself with the children, and try to recover my spirits. The attempt failed, and I returned to the dining-room, where I sat by myself, my sister being engaged elsewhere. The thought of Mr. — came into my mind, and suddenly, with my eyes open, as I believe, for I was not feeling sleepy, I seemed to be in a room in which a man was lying dead in a small bed. I recognised the face at once as that of Mr. —, and felt no doubt that he was dead, and not asleep only. The room appeared to be bare and without carpet or furniture. I cannot say how long the appearance lasted. I did not mention the appearance to my sister or brother-in-law at the time. I tried to argue with myself that there could be nothing in what I had seen, chiefly on the ground that from what I knew of Mr. —'s circumstances it was most improbable that, if dead, he would be in a room in so bare and unfurnished a state. Two days afterwards, on December 18th, I left my sister's house for home. About a week after my arrival, another of my sisters read out of the daily papers the announcement of Mr. —'s death, which had taken place abroad, and on December 16th, the day on which I had seen the appearance.

" I have since been informed that Mr. — had died in a small village hospital in a warm foreign climate, having been suddenly attacked with illness whilst on his travels."

In answer to an inquiry Mr. Dyne says :—

" My sister-in-law tells me that the occasion which I mentioned to you is absolutely the only one on which she has seen any vision of the kind."

We learn from Mr. —'s widow that the room in which he died fairly corresponded with the above description, and that the hour of death was 3.30 a.m.

These latter narratives might suggest a sort of incipient *clairvoyance*.¹ But in the present state of our knowledge, it would be rash to ascribe any phenomenon to independent clairvoyance, which could by any possibility be regarded as telepathic ; for the simple reason that the phenomena on record which (if correctly reported) must beyond doubt have been due to independent clairvoyance, are extremely rare in comparison with those

¹ As regards the appearance of the agent's own figure in the scene, see the remarks on some parallel dream-cases, Chap. viii., part ii., end of § 5.

which, if correctly reported, can be accounted for by thought-transference. Thus in the last example—granting the possibility of deferred impressions—there is no difficulty in connecting the idea of the room, and even the idea of actual death, with the perceptions and thoughts of the dying man. It would be inconvenient, however, to refuse the term *clairvoyance* to cases where telepathic action reaches such a pitch that the percipient seems actually to be using the senses of some person or persons at the distant scene. And it will perhaps suffice to save confusion, if I note at once the difference between clairvoyance of this extreme telepathic type (which is still fairly within the scope of this book), and any supposed extension, for which no conditioning “agency” can be assigned, of the percipient’s own senses. [No. 66 is omitted.]

I had hoped to conclude this chapter with a case showing how a special condition of the percipient’s mind may open the door (so to speak) to a telepathic impression, and also exemplifying the occurrence of a series of these vivid mental pictures to a single percipient. On the occasions referred to, a deliberate effort on the percipient’s part seems to have been involved in receiving, or rather in obtaining, a true impression of the aspect and surroundings of absent persons; but unless we would assert (which we have no grounds for doing) that the continued existence of those persons, and their pre-established relation to the percipient, were not necessary conditions for the impression, we must still hold them to have been technically the *agents*. One of these agents, however—a medical man—while unable to resist the proofs which he has received of this sort of telepathic invasion, has so invincible a dread and dislike of the subject that for the present, in deference to his wishes, the account is withheld from publication. To “believe and tremble” is not a very scientific state of mind, and it is one for which we trust that there will be less and less excuse, as psychical research is gradually redeemed from supernatural and superstitious associations. Meanwhile, we must treat it with indulgence; merely noting how the very qualities which have so often operated to swell lists of spurious marvels may equally operate to hamper the record and recognition of facts.

CHAPTER VII

EMOTIONAL AND MOTOR EFFECTS

§ 1. WE come next to a class of cases which are characterised not so much by the distinctness of the idea as by the strength of the emotion produced in the percipient. In some of these the emotion has depended on a definite idea, and has been connected with a sense of calamity to a particular individual, or a particular household : in others it has not had reference to any definite idea, and has seemed at the time quite causeless and unreasonable. Sometimes, again, the analogy with experimental cases, in the direct reflection of experience from mind to mind, is distinctly retained,¹ the experience of the percipient seeming actually to reproduce that of a relative or friend who is in some physical or mental crisis at a distance ; while in other cases a peculiar distress on the one side is so strikingly contemporaneous with a unique condition on the other, that we cannot refuse to consider the hypothesis of a causal connection.

From the point of view of evidence, this class of emotional impressions clearly requires the most careful treatment. There is all the difference between a sensory impression, and even between the more distinct " mental pictures " of the last chapter, and a mere mood. We have no grounds for assuming that the news (for instance) of a friend's death will incite a man of sense and honesty to say that he saw, heard, felt, or strongly pictured, something unusual at or near the time of its occurrence, unless he really did so ; but it is easy to suppose that, having chanced to be slightly out of spirits at the time, he afterwards seems to remember that he was very much depressed indeed, and even filled with a boding of some

¹ The emotional class of impressions is, of course, a field peculiarly ill-adapted for deliberate experiment. Strong emotion cannot be summoned up at will by an experimenter even in his own mind ; while, if it exists, it probably betrays itself in ways beyond his control. Cases are, indeed, alleged where a secret grief or anxiety on a mesmeriser's part has been reflected in the demeanour of his " subject." But this would not necessarily prove more than that the " subject " was, so to speak, hyperæsthetic to slight physical signs of mental disturbance—which would be quite in accordance with the one-sided concentration of his mind that is shown in other ways, e.g., in his frequent deafness to any other voice than that of his operator. I may quote for what they are worth the following observations of Mr. H. S. Thompson (*Zoist*, v. 257) : " One patient who was highly sensitive, and whom I mesmerised for a nervous disorder, could, when awake, point out immediately whatever part of my head was touched by a third person. If I mesmerised her when I was in spirits, she was in spirits also ; if I was grave, she was grave ; and I never dared mesmerise her when I was suffering from any annoyance. I did not find that she often had *distinct thoughts* corresponding with my own, even when I tried to impress her by will with them. But she has experienced and shown a *feeling corresponding* with the thoughts I had."

impending calamity. Nay, since a person who is oppressed by gloom and apprehension will often embrace in mental glances the small group of persons with whom his emotional connection is strongest, he may recall, when one of these persons proves actually to have been passing through a crisis at the time, that this particular one was present to his mind, and may easily glide on into thinking that it was with him that the sense of apprehension was specially connected. In these cases, then, it is of prime importance that the percipient's impression shall be mentioned or otherwise noted by him in an unmistakable way, before the receipt of news as to the supposed agent's condition. And even when we have clear proof that the emotion was really of a strongly-marked character, it is necessary further to obtain some assurance that such moods are not of common occurrence in the percipient's experience. Failing this, it is safest to regard any unusual character that may afterwards be attributed to the emotion as the result of its being afterwards dwelt on in connection with the coincident event.

It need hardly be added that all cases must be rejected where there has been any appreciable cause for anxiety, however unmistakable and unique the impression may be shown to have been. Thus it cannot be regarded as usual for a lady who is at a friend's house, and intending to remain there for a week or two, to find herself suddenly and irrationally impelled, by the certainty of a domestic calamity, to pack her boxes and sit waiting for a telegram—which, (to borrow the phrase of a business-like informant) was shortly delivered “as per presentiment.” But the surmise which was thus confirmed related to a baby grandchild at home; and though she had not heard that it was ailing, those who watch over the health of young children are often, of course, in a more or less chronic state of nervousness.

§ 2. [Three cases—67, 68, 69—are here omitted.]

In the next example there can be no doubt as to the striking nature of the percipient's experience; which, indeed, was so distinctly physical in character as to suggest the actual sensory transference of which Mrs. Severn's case (p. 132) was our most precise example. The narrator is Mrs. Reay, of 99, Holland Road, Kensington.

“August 4th, 1884.

(70) “I will endeavour to write you an account of the incident, related for you by my friend, Mr. E. Moon. His sister was staying with me at the time. It was in February, but I don't remember what year. We were sitting chatting over our 5 o'clock tea; I was perfectly well at the time, and much amused with her conversation. As I had several notes to write before dinner, I asked her to leave me alone, or I feared I should not get them finished. She did so, and I went to the writing-table and began to write.

“All at once a dreadful feeling of illness and faintness came over me, and I felt that I was dying. I had no power to get up to ring the bell for assistance, but sat with my head in my hands utterly helpless.

“My maid came into the room for the tea things. I thought I would keep her with me, but felt better while she was there, so did not mention my illness to her, thinking it had passed away. However, as soon as I lost the sound of her footsteps, it all came back upon me worse than ever.

In vain I tried to get up and ring the bell or call for help ; I could not move, and thought I was certainly dying.

" When the dressing bell rang it roused me again, and I made a great effort to rise and go to my room, which I did ; but when my maid came in I was standing by the fire, leaning upon the mantelpiece, trembling all over. She at once came to me and asked what was the matter. I said I did not know, but that I felt very ill indeed.

" The dinner-hour had arrived, and my husband had not come home. Then, for the first time, it flashed upon my mind that something had happened to him when I was taken ill at the writing-table. This was the first time I had thought about him, so that it was no anxiety on my part about him that had caused my illness. The next half-hour was spent in great suspense ; then he arrived home with his messenger with him ; he was almost in an unconscious state, and remained so for about 24 hours. When he was well enough for me to ask him about his illness, he said he had been very well indeed all day, but just as he was preparing to leave his office he became suddenly very ill (just the same time that I was taken ill at the writing-table), and his messenger had to get a cab and come home with him ; he was quite unable to be left by himself.

" EMILY REAY."

Mr. Reay, Secretary of the London and North-Western Railway, confirms as follows :—

" September 18th, 1884.

" I perfectly well recollect, on the evening of my severe and sudden attack of illness, my wife asking me some questions about it, when, after hearing what I had to say, she told me that almost at the same instant of time (soon after 5 p.m.), when writing, she was seized with a fit of trembling and nervous depression, as if she were dying. She went to her room and remained there in the same state until the dinner hour, and as I did not arrive by that time she instinctively felt that something had happened to me, and was on the point of sending to the office to inquire when I left, when I was brought home in a cab. At the time of my seizure I was writing, and it was with much difficulty that I was enabled to finish the letter.

" S. REAY."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Reay adds :—

" I never at any other time in my life had the slightest approach to the sensations I experienced when the sudden illness came over me, under the circumstances mentioned to you. I never in my life fainted, nor have I any tendency that way. The feeling which came over me was a dreadful trembling, with prostration, and a feeling that I was going to die ; and I had no power to rise from the writing-table to ring for assistance. I have never had the same feeling since, and never before that time."

The uniqueness of the experience may be readily accepted as stated, in a case where its physical character was so distinct as this. But even judging of more doubtful cases, an inference which the percipient's description might hardly warrant may sometimes be fairly drawn from the permanent effect made on his mind.

[Cases 71 and 72 are here omitted.] The writer of the following narrative is the editor of a well-known northern newspaper, and was formerly special foreign correspondent of a London paper. A few weeks before the occurrence here described, he had a curious impression corresponding with the death of a friend [case 103—not here reproduced].

" December 11th, 1884.

(73) " On the 3rd of May in the same spring [1882], my wife, while taking tea with my daughter, was suddenly seized with an epileptic fit, and fell heavily to the floor, striking her forehead on the fender ; she was never conscious again, but died the next day. This accident happened between 3 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. For nearly 5 years my wife had intermittently suffered from epilepsy, but for some 3 months before her death seemed to have completely recovered, which apparent fact had caused much joy in our little family circle, as the poor dear had been a great sufferer. I set this down to show that her death or serious illness was not at all expected at the time it happened.

" On the morning of the 3rd of May I left for the City, and as my wife kissed her hand to me at the window, I thought how remarkably well and ' like her old self ' she appeared. I went to business in ' high spirits,' and left her in the same ; but *somewhere* about the time she fell—neither my daughter nor I have been able to fix the time within an hour—I suddenly fell into such a fit of gloom that I was powerless to go on with my work, and could only sit with my face between my hands, scarcely able to speak to my colleagues in the same office, who became alarmed as they had never seen me in any but a cheerful mood. I was at the time editing *England*, and as friend after friend dropped into my room, and wanted to know what ailed me, I could only explain my sensation in a phrase (which they and I well remember) which I kept repeating, namely, ' I have a horrible sense of some impending calamity.' So far as I am aware, my thoughts never once turned to my home. If they had, I think I should not have accepted, as I did, an invitation to dine with a friend at a restaurant in the Strand, pressed on me for the express purpose of ' cheering me up.'

" I was telegraphed for to our office in the Strand, but by an accident it was not forwarded to me to Whitefriars Street at my editorial room : so that I never saw my wife until after 12 at night, when my 8 or 9 hours of fearful depression of spirits (as it instantly struck me) were accounted for. I may add that I am naturally of a buoyant temperament, in fact I may say far above the average of people in that respect, and I was never to my knowledge ever so suddenly or similarly depressed before. My wife, in this case, you will observe, was not dead but simply unconscious when my fit of low spirits set in.

" There are several witnesses who can testify to these facts, for when it became known at the office that my wife was dead the strong coincidence of my suddenly ' turning so queer ' was a topic of conversation there. I have nothing to add but that we (my wife and I) had been married for 25 years, and were extremely fond of each other, and we were both, I should say, of a sympathetic temperament, perhaps more than ordinarily so."

Mr. Podmore writes on September 1st, 1885 :—

" I called to-day at Mr. ——'s house. He was out of town, but his son and daughter were at home.¹

" As regards Mr. ——'s depression on the day of his wife's fatal attack, they both assured me that he spoke of this immediately after his return home on the evening of that day, and has frequently mentioned it since. The son has also heard one of his father's colleagues, Mr. Green, describe the circumstance as something quite remarkable. Mr. Green told him

¹ Our informant has since this date removed to the North of England, where a personal interview with him might easily have been obtained, but was lately missed through an accident.

that both himself and others present in the office did all they could to rally Mr. — but failed."

[A full *vivâ voce* account of the incident has been given by the narrator to our friend and helper, Mr. A. G. Leonard.]

Mr. Green writes :—

" Netherworton House, Steeple Aston, Oxon.

" September 16th, 1885.

" DEAR SIR,—My friend, Mr. —, of *England*, has asked me to corroborate the fact that he suffered from a singular depression all the day of his wife's fatal seizure. I was in his company most of the day, and can fully corroborate his statement.—Yours truly,

" C. E. GREEN."

The next case is from a lady who is willing that her name should be given to any one genuinely interested in this case. She is known to the present writer as a sensible and clear-headed witness, as far from sentimentality or superstition as can well be conceived.

" October 27th, 1885.

(74) " On the Saturday before Easter, 1881, my husband left London for Paris. On the Saturday or Sunday evening he was taken ill, at the hotel, with congestion of the brain, and wandered about the place delirious. Subsequently he was put in a room, and although a man was in attendance, he was, in regard to medical advice, etc., quite neglected. He remained there some days, and by looking in his papers his name was discovered, and his family were communicated with.

" On the afternoon of Easter Monday, my sons and my daughter had gone out, leaving me at home. I fell into an altogether extraordinary state of depression and restlessness. I tried in vain to distract myself with work and books. I went upstairs and felt beside myself with distress, for what reason I could not tell; I argued with myself, but the feeling increased. I even had a violent fit of weeping—a thing absolutely alien to my character. I then put on my things, and, in the hope of ridding myself of the uncomfortable feeling, took a hansom cab, and drove about Hyde Park for about three hours—a thing which I should have considered myself stark mad for doing at any other time. I should have been the last person to spend eight shillings on cab fare for nothing. On receiving the news I went over to Paris, where I arrived on the Thursday, and my husband just knew me. The nurse engaged to nurse him told me that she was asked by the waiter if my Christian name was M. [Mrs. S.'s name, and a not very common one], as that was the name that my husband was constantly calling out during his delirium. He died some days afterwards.

" M. S."

I learn from both Mrs. S. and her son that she mentioned her remarkable experience to her family on the Monday evening. Her son writes as follows :—

" I beg to corroborate my mother's account of the circumstances mentioned. Her distress and the circumstances of the cab drive are entirely foreign to her character. My father was in delicate health, although seldom actually ill.

" E. S."

In answer to some questions addressed to Mrs. S., Mr. E. S. replies:—

“ My mother had no particular anxiety about my father’s health. He left on the Saturday for Paris, and was then in his usual health, and she did not particularly connect her feelings with him.”

[I suggested a difficulty as to the driving *about* Hyde Park, since it is only in a restricted portion of that park that cabs are permitted to pass. But Mrs. S. adheres to the word.]

[Case 75 is omitted.]

§ 3. On the supposition that a close natural bond between two persons is a favourable condition for telepathic influence, there is one group of persons among whom we might expect to find a disproportionate number of instances—namely, *twins*. As a matter of fact, we have a certain number of twin cases, which, though actually small, is indisputably disproportionate, if we remember what an infinitesimally small proportion of the population twins form. I will quote here the three examples which properly belong to this chapter. It may be of interest to compare them with the cases given by Mr. F. Galton (*Inquiries into Human Faculty*, pp. 226–31), of consentaneous thought and action on the part of twins. Mr. Galton attributes the coincidences to a specially close similarity of constitution. The pair may be roughly compared to two watches, which begin to go at the same hour, and keep parallel with one another in their advance through life. This theory seems fairly to account for the occurrence of special physiological or pathological crises at the same point of the two lives. The twins, though separated, have their croup or their whooping-cough simultaneously. The explanation, however, seems a little strained when applied to the simultaneous purchase in different towns of two sets of champagne glasses of similar pattern, owing to a sudden impulse on the part of each of the twins to surprise the other with a present. If it were possible—which it can hardly be—to make sure that there had been no previous mention of the subject between the brothers, and that the idea was really and completely impromptu, one might hint that the coincidence here was telepathic. And, at any rate, the cases to be now quoted seem outside the range of a pre-established physiological harmony; with them, the alternative is between telepathy and accident. [I omit two of these—76 and 78—ED.] The remaining case is from Mr. James Carroll, who, when he wrote, was in attendance on an invalid, under the care of Dr. Wood, The Priory, Roehampton. I have had a long interview with him, as well as a good deal of correspondence; and I have no doubt whatever that the facts are correctly recorded.

“ July, 1884.

(77) “ I beg to forward my experience of about six years ago, while living in the employment of Colonel Turbervill, near Bridgend, Glamorgan, and a twin brother in the same capacity with a lady at Chobham Place, Bagshot, Surrey.

“ I may mention that my brother and I were devotedly attached from children, and our resemblance to each other so remarkable that only one or two of our family then living, and oldest friends, could distinguish any

difference between us. Up to June 17th, 1878, I had not known my brother to have one day's illness, and in consequence of having about this time recovered heavy financial loss, there was this and other unusual cause for cheerfulness. But on the morning of the date given, about half-past 11, I experienced a *strange sadness* and depression. Unable to account for it, I turned to my desk, thinking of my brother. I looked at his last letter to see the date, and tried to detect if there was anything unusual in it but failed. I wrote off to my brother, closed my desk, and felt compelled to exclaim quite aloud, 'My brother or I will break down.' This I afterwards found was the first day of his fatal illness.

"I wrote again to him, but in consequence of his being ill I received no reply. We usually wrote twice a week. I tried to persuade myself his silence was due to being busy. On the following Saturday, the 22nd, while speaking to Mr. Turbervill, a sudden depression, which I had never before realised, and which I feel impossible to describe, came over me. I felt strange and unwell. I retired as soon as possible, thankful my state of mind had not been noticed. I would have gone to my room, but felt it might be noticed, and felt frightened too, as if something might suddenly happen to me.

"I went, instead, into the footman's pantry, where they were cleaning the plate, and sat down, suppressed my feelings, but alluded to a dulness and concern for my brother. I was speaking, when a messenger entered with a telegram to announce my brother's dangerous state, and requesting my immediate presence. He died on the following Monday morning. It is clearly proved that at the time I felt the melancholy described he was speaking of me in great distress. We were never considered superstitious, and I was never apt to feelings of melancholy.

"My brother and I were well known to Dr. Young, of 30, Westbourne Square, Paddington; and to Mr. Trollope, Solicitor, 31, Abingdon Street, Westminster.

"JAMES CARROLL."

In reply to inquiries Mr. Carroll says :—

"August 8th, 1884.

"I find it difficult now, after the lapse of time and many changes, to get the memory of friends to recall the subjects of our correspondence. I left South Wales on the death of my brother, and have been moving about among strangers ever since; circumstances on this part of the matter are singularly against me.

"You asked in your previous letter, was the impression of distress and apprehension which I described, rare to me in my experience? I never before felt anything like it, except in a milder form, before the death of my mother, about 14 years ago, while I was at Lord Roberts' seat in Arnhill, and my mother in London. The sensation then was about two or three days previous to her death. I have always been an opponent to ghost theory, and till my brother's death I never thought to entertain the idea that there could be any unseen power in the thought of apparitions.

"My brother's death was from a cold neglected, and inflammation rapidly setting in. We were twins, his age at time of death 39 about. From our extraordinary resemblance we were well known. I may mention my brother being the only near relation left.

"I sent to Ireland for signatures to a distant relative, who was with me as an adopted son shortly after my brother's death, for about two years. He is about 18 years of age; his name, too, is James Carroll. His corroboration comes very close to the time.

"An old friend, of 25 years, 30 I think, holding a good position in one

of our chief banking houses, also promised to corroborate, a day or two ago. I enclose now a note from him, just received. He remembers the subject. I often, just after my brother's death, spoke of it to him.

"J. C."

A nephew and namesake of Mr. Carroll's writes as follows:—

"Clonmel, Ireland.

"August 10th, 1884.

"I hereby certify that Mr. Carroll frequently, during the early part of my residence with him, about 5 years ago, spoke of the presentiment he describes in a letter written to you, a copy of which he has sent me.

"JAMES CARROLL."

The following is a letter to Mr. Carroll from Mr. James Martin, of 1, Oak Villa, Avenue Road, Acton.

"August 16th, 1884.

"DEAR JAMES,—From the time of your brother's death till the present, I have spent much time in your society. I remember well the account you gave me of the dreadful depression of mind you passed through just previous to his death. It was singular, but true.

"JAMES MARTIN."

Mr. Carroll showed me a letter written by Mrs. Benyan, his brother's employer, at the time when the brother was dangerously ill. The letter is to a solicitor, and expresses a desire that he, James Carroll, should be informed of the illness. It proves that the illness was sudden and that Mr. Carroll was unaware of it.

§ 4. We may now pass to a group of these cases in which the primary element of the emotional impression is a sense of *being wanted*—an impulse to go somewhere or do something.

The first example is from the Rev. E. D. Banister, of Whitechapel Vicarage, Preston.

"November 12th, 1885.

(79) "My father on the day of his death had gone out of the house about 2.30 p.m., to have his usual afternoon stroll in the garden and fields. He had not been absent more than 7 or 8 minutes when, as I was talking to my wife and sister, I was seized with a very urgent desire to go to him. (The conversation related to a visit which we proposed to pay that afternoon to a neighbour, and no allusion was made to my father.) The feeling that I ought to go and see him came upon me with irresistible force. I insisted upon all in the house going out to find my father. I was remonstrated with—my very anxiety seeming so unreasonable. My father's afternoon stroll was a regular habit of life in fine weather, and I had no reason to give why on that particular occasion I must insist on his being found. Search was made, and it was my sad lot to find him dead in the field, in a place which, according to the route he ordinarily adopted, he would have reached about 7 or 8 minutes after leaving the house.

"My idea is that when he felt the stroke of death coming upon him he earnestly desired to see me, and that, by the operation of certain psychical laws, the desire was communicated to me.

"E. D. BANISTER."

In reply to inquiries Mr. Banister adds :—

“ In reply to your letter I have to state :—

“ 1. Vivid impressions of the kind I have related are utterly unknown to me ; the one related is unique in my experience.

“ 2. There was not the least cause for anxiety owing to the absence of my father. It only seemed a short time since he had gone out of the room, and on this account my urgency was deemed unreasonable.

“ 3. The date was January 9th, 1883.”

We have confirmed this date by the obituary notice in the *Preston Chronicle*.

Mr. Banister's wife and sister supply the following corroboration :—

“ We have seen the statement which Mr. Banister has forwarded to the Psychical Research Society, relating to the strong impression by which he was irresistibly urged in search of his father on the afternoon of January 9th, 1883, and we are able to confirm all details given in that statement.

“ MARY BANISTER.

“ AGNES BANISTER.”

In conversation Mr. Banister informed me that his father was a remarkably hale old man, and there had never been the slightest anxiety about his being out alone. He further mentioned that the compulsion seemed to come to him “ from outside.”

The following instance is from Mrs. C., of 11, Upper Hamilton Terrace, N.W.

“ December 17th, 1883.

(80) “ On December 2nd, 1877, I was at church. My children wished to remain to a christening. I said, ‘ I cannot, somebody seems calling me ; something is the matter.’ I returned home to find nothing ; but next morning two telegrams summoned me to the death-bed of my husband, from whom I had had a cheerful letter on the Saturday, and who left me in excellent spirits the Thursday before. I only arrived in time to see him die.”

The following is the sons' corroboration :—

“ We remember, perfectly, our mother leaving the church, saying she felt she was wanted, someone was calling her. The next day our father died, December 3rd, 1877.

“ GEORGE C.

“ JOHN A. C.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. C. says :—

“ February 19th, 1884.

(1) “ I cannot say that the experience of some one calling me was unique. I have often had strong impressions of things occurring, and such things have happened, but not having set down the dates, I could not be sufficiently certain to satisfy myself.¹

(2) “ My husband wrote me a cheerful letter on the Friday, November 30th, and on the Saturday, December 1st, only mentioning that he was a little bilious, but that he was going to Leicester that afternoon. He was, however, so much worse that afternoon that he went to bed. In the night he was found by a gentleman to be out of bed, and unable to get in, and he mistook the gentleman for me. All Sunday he was dying, and my friends could not telegraph, and there was no train. On Monday I received two telegrams, early in the morning. As soon as I read your letter my

¹ One of these cases [No. 204, omitted here], however, seems to have been quite precise.

sons both said they remembered the circumstance quite well and signed the enclosed. George was 10 years old, John 12 years."

Asked whether she would have been certain to stay for the christening under ordinary circumstances, Mrs. C. replied in the affirmative; and that the boys were disappointed. She is without any theory on these matters; and simply reports an undoubted experience.

The following case is very similar. The narrator is Mr. A. Skirving, foreman at Winchester Cathedral.

"Cathedral Yard, Winchester.

"January 31st, 1884.

(81) "I respectfully beg to offer you a short statement of my experience on a subject which I do not understand. Let me premise that I am not a scholar, as I left school when 12 years of age in 1827, and I therefore hope you will forgive all sins against composition and grammar. I am a working foreman of masons at Winchester Cathedral, and have been for the last 9 years a resident in this city. I am a native of Edinburgh.

"It is now more than 30 years ago that I was living in London, very near where the Great Western Railway now stands, but which was not then built. I was working in the Regent's Park for Messrs. Mowlem, Burt, and Freeman, who at that time had the Government contract for 3 years for the mason's work of the capital, and who yet carry on a mighty business at Millbank, Westminster. I think it was Gloucester Gate, if I mistake not. At all events, it was that gate of Regent's Park to the eastward of the Zoological Gardens, at the north-east corner of the park. The distance from my home was too great for me to get home to meals, so I carried my food with me, and therefore had no call to leave the work all day. On a certain day, however, I suddenly felt an intense desire to go home, but as I had no business there I tried to suppress it,—but it was not possible to do so. Every minute the desire to go home increased. It was 10 in the morning, and I could not think of anything to call me away from the work at such a time. I got fidgety and uneasy, and felt as if I must go, even at the risk of being ridiculed by my wife, as I could give no reason why I should leave my work and lose 6d. an hour for nonsense. However, I could not stay, and I set off for home under an impulse which I could not resist.

"When I reached my own door and knocked, the door was opened by my wife's sister, a married woman, who lived a few streets off. She looked surprised, and said, 'Why, Skirving, how did you know?' 'Know what?' I said. 'Why, about Mary Ann.' I said, 'I don't know anything about Mary Ann' (my wife). 'Then what brought you home at present?' I said, 'I can hardly tell you. I seemed to want to come home. But what is wrong?' I asked. She told me that my wife had been run over by a cab, and been most seriously injured about an hour ago, and she had called for me ever since, but was now in fits, and had several in succession. I went upstairs, and though very ill she recognised me, and stretched forth her arms, and took me round the neck and pulled my head down into her bosom. The fits passed away directly, and my presence seemed to tranquillise her, so that she got into sleep, and did well. Her sister told me that she had uttered the most piteous cries for me to come to her, although there was not the least likelihood of my coming. This short narrative has only one merit; it is strictly true.

"ALEXANDER SKIRVING."

In answer to the question whether the time of the accident corresponded with the time when he felt a desire to go home, Mr. Skirving says :—

" I asked my wife's sister what time the accident occurred, and she said, ' An hour and a half ago '—that is from the time I came home. Now, that was exactly coincident with the time I wanted to leave work. It took me an hour to walk home ; and I was quite half an hour struggling in my mind to overcome the wish to leave work before I did so."

He adds : " You ask me if I ever had a similar impression on any other occasion. I never had. It was quite a single and unique experience."

Mr. Skirving's wife is dead. His sister-in-law, Mrs. Vye, is in New Zealand. Her husband, writing from Otago on July 1st, 1885, says that she cannot now give particulars of the occurrence, though she remembers the accident very well.

[Cases 82 to 85 are omitted.]

It is necessary, of course [in such cases], to be sure that the line of action adopted by the percipient was really an unlikely one. It may look so, without really having been so. For instance, Miss Lindsay, of 58, Lloyd Street, Greenhays, Manchester, has given us an account of an unusually long walk which she suddenly undertook against advice, with the view of seeing an aunt who was almost a stranger to her.

" The day was very unsuitable for a walk of a number of miles. It threatened to rain, and began before I had got far on my way. I took a wrong turning, too, in a brown study, and returned in a loop to the same road, so that I found myself, late in the afternoon, again near the tram terminus, by which I might have gone home, instead of near my destination. By this time my thin print dress was soaked through by the rain, for I had no cloak, yet I never thought of turning homewards. After walking some 14 miles, I arrived at the house, to find that my aunt had died suddenly of acute rheumatism that morning.

" Now, looking back on the matter, I see that native obstinacy might account for my starting in spite of counsel and weather, but it would *not* account for my visiting a relation I did not know well, and whom I did know to be particular about appearances, in a dripping dress. What I am particularly sure about is that it never once struck me that my proceeding was odd ; which, to my mind, proves conclusively that the initial impulse must have been stronger than an everyday freak."

Still, it may have been a freak, though not an " everyday " one. Miss Lindsay had just returned from the seaside " in excellent health, though in circumstances of considerable worry." Thus an excuse for a long walk may have been readily caught at, and the " native obstinacy " may have done the rest. The case, moreover, lacks the important evidential point which marked those that preceded it—the *desire* on the part of the supposed agent for the other person's presence. We have another case where a walk was suddenly taken, and pursued in torrents of rain, in spite of two attempts to return, under an idea that an acquaintance was on the point of death. She died the same evening. But she had been for some years an object of care to the person who visited her, and though the latter says, " I had not seen her for some weeks, possibly months before, and I did not know she was ill or likely to die," the case is one which we can hardly include.

The doubt as to what can be considered unlikely conduct on the per-

cient's part has relegated several alleged cases of this class to the Supplement. Among these are two of considerable interest. One of them is from Mr. Frederick Morgan, of Nugent Hill, Bristol, who records how he once made a sudden and unaccountable exit in the middle of a lecture, and walked home, unconscious of having done anything unusual, to find his house in imminent danger from fire, and his mother strongly desiring his presence. We have Mr. Morgan's assurance that he was thoroughly interested in the discourse, and had even noticed a friend with whom he had planned to walk home when it was over; otherwise the impulse to leave a lecture-room might not seem the best possible specimen of an abnormal experience. The second case is from the Dr. Fischer quoted [in p. 71 here omitted], who went to a jubilee dinner, and "had not been at table more than an hour," when he was forced to go out by an overpowering conviction that some one was in need of his assistance. This heroic step, taken on a comparatively empty stomach, was (as it turned out) fully justified. But we must remember that an impression of being wanted is a very deep and abiding element of a medical man's experience.

The following case is better worth quotation, for the very reason that the percipient was not a doctor. We received it from Mr. Rowlands, of Bryncethin, near Bridgend, mentioned above (p. 182).

" July 2nd, 1884.

(86) " There was a Calvinistic Methodist minister, named Thomas Howell, Kinffig Hill, near Bridgend. He was preaching at Pen-y-graig, and resided not far from my house. I was disturbed in my mind about him about 12 or 1 o'clock in the morning. I rose from bed, and put my clothes on, went to his lodgings and knocked at his door, and told them that I was disturbed about the minister. I went in and up to his bedroom, and found him sitting down on the side of the bed, sweating, and as ill and as painful as could be. This happened about 6 years ago. You can write to Mr. Howell if you wish. " ROWLAND ROWLANDS."

Mr. Howell writes to us as follows:—

" Longlands, Wyle.

" July 16th, 1884.

" I beg to inform you that the contents of the enclosed letter, which I received from you, sent to you from Mr. Rowland Rowlands, are quite true, and more than is stated in his letter. The night it took place, August 10th, 1879, I shall never forget, for, I believe, had it not been that some unknown agency sent me assistance, that I would have realised the mysteries of another world in a short time.

" The narrative is simply this. I was preaching at Pen-y-graig, the Sabbath referred to. I slept in a house near the chapel. After the service a few friends sat awhile with me conversing. After they left, about 10 o'clock, I took a little food, a cup of tea and a small bit of bread and butter, and retired to sleep about half-past 10, quite healthy, feeling no pain or uneasiness whatever. Somewhere between 12 and 1 o'clock I awoke with a severe attack of pain in the stomach,—remained a little in bed, but thinking death had struck me, I turned out on the bedside and attempted to call the landlady, but failed to do so. I could not move any further nor speak. In a few minutes I heard a voice at the door, outside, calling the landlady, who was in bed. He succeeded in awaking her and she replied from the landing—' Who is there ? ' To which Mr. Rowlands

replied, 'Open the door at once; I have been disturbed in bed; there is something the matter with the preacher.' To which she replied, 'I don't think so; he has not called.' I heard Mr. Rowlands speak again: 'Make haste, Mrs. Phillips,' which time I believe, Mrs. Phillips, the landlady, was dressing herself, and ran downstairs and opened the door. Mr. Rowlands and herself came to my bedroom at once and knocked at my door. Receiving no answer, Mr. Rowlands opened the door, and found me in the position mentioned in his letter to you. He asked me, 'What is the matter with you, Mr. Howell?' to which I could not reply. I was by this time speechless. He told me again, 'I was disturbed in my bed about you; shall we have a doctor?' to which I shook my head, meaning 'No.' I thought everything was almost over. A few moments again I was unconscious and for hours after knew nothing. When I came to myself, I saw Mr. Rowlands and Mrs. Phillips in the room. They remained with me till the morning. I gradually got better, and when Mr. Rowlands left me between 7 and 8 o'clock he remarked to me, 'I really thought you were going to die. How strange, was it not, that I was disturbed so! Can you account for it?' I replied, 'No, if it was not that the Almighty had sent you to save me.'

"I have no more to say nor explain, but I know the facts are true.

"THOS. HOWELL."

Another letter of Mr. Howell's explains that the illness consisted in painful spasms, from which he had occasionally suffered, and that Mr. Rowlands "held him quiet." It is not clear that Mr. Rowlands' presence had anything to do with his recovery, though it was a great support to him. But as the illness and pain seem to have been extremely sudden, the coincidence is striking.

And here I may recall what was said above (p. 74) on the subject of *will* in relation to telepathy. The remarks which were made *à propos* of experimental cases derive strong confirmation from the more recent evidence. It is clear, I think, that in the cases last considered the telepathic influence should be interpreted as primarily *emotional*, rather than controlling or directive. In none of them should I regard the determination of the percipient's motor-impulse as at all directly due to the strong desire of the agent that he should act in that particular manner. I doubt if any amount of the most determined "willing," on the part of the strongest-minded friend or relative, would have brought Mr. Skirving from his work, Mr. Rowlands from his bed, or Dr. Fischer from his dinner. But we may quite conceive that Mrs. Skirving's distress and agitation might set up in her husband's mind a disturbance associated with the idea that he was needed; and this might naturally affect his behaviour in the same way as an actual knowledge of the circumstances would have done, without the slightest abrogation of his normal power of choice. In Mr. Morgan's case the transferred impression (if it was one) did not reach the level of an idea at all, nor did the disturbance even take the form of distress, but only made itself felt in the complete distraction of his mind from its obvious and normal activities. But such distraction implies a genuine disturbance; and since the idea of the locality—home—would naturally have a permanent place at the background of his mind, it is not hard to see how the disturbance might be attracted into this obvious channel, and might thus transform itself into a motor-impulse by a process which quite eluded consciousness.

I will illustrate this view by a final and extreme case, where the movements produced in the percipient were not such as the agent can have desired, or even thought of. The narrator is Dr. Liébeault, of 4, Rue Bellevue, Nancy.

“ 4 Septembre, 1885.

(87) “ Je m'empresse de vous écrire au sujet du fait de communication de pensée dont je vous ai parlé, lorsque vous m'avez fait l'honneur d'assister à mes séances hypnotiques à Nancy. Ce fait se passa dans une famille française de la Nouvelle-Orléans, et qui était venue habiter quelque temps Nancy, pour y liquider une affaire d'intérêt. J'avais fait connaissance de cette famille parceque son chef, M. G., m'avait amené sa nièce, Mlle. B., pour que je la traitasse par les procédés hypnotiques. Elle était atteinte d'une anémie légère et d'une toux nerveuse contractée à Coblenz, dans une maison d'éducation où elle était professeur. Je parvins facilement à la mettre en somnambulisme, et elle fut guérie en deux séances. La production de cet état de sommeil ayant démontré à la famille G. et à Mlle. B. qu'elle pourrait facilement devenir médium (Mme. G. était médium spirite), cette demoiselle s'exerça à évoquer, à l'aide de la plume, les esprits, auxquels elle croyait sincèrement, et au bout de deux mois elle fut un remarquable médium écrivante. C'est elle que j'ai vue de mes yeux tracer rapidement des pages d'écriture qu'elle appelait des messages, et cela en des termes choisis et sans aucune rature, en même temps qu'elle tenait conversations avec les personnes qui l'entouraient. Chose curieuse, elle n'avait nullement conscience de ce qu'elle écrivait ; ‘ aussi,’ disait-elle, ‘ ce ne peut être qu'un esprit qui dirige ma main, ce n'est pas moi.’¹

“ Un jour—c'était, je crois, le 7 Février, 1868—vers 8 heures du matin, au moment de se mettre à table pour déjeuner, elle sentit un besoin, un quelque chose qui la poussait à écrire (c'était ce qu'elle appelait une *trance*)—et elle courut immédiatement vers son grand cahier, où elle traça fébrilement, au crayon, des caractères indéchiffrables. Elle retraça les mêmes caractères sur les pages suivantes, et enfin l'excitation de son esprit se calmant, on put lire qu'une personne nommée Marguerite lui annonçait sa mort. On supposa aussitôt qu'une demoiselle de ce nom qui était son amie, et habitait, comme professeur, le même pensionnat de Coblenz où elle avait exercé les mêmes fonctions, venait d'y mourir. Toute la famille G., compris Mlle. B., vinrent immédiatement chez moi, et nous décidâmes de vérifier, le jour même, si ce fait de mort avait réellement eu lieu. Mlle. B. écrivit à une demoiselle anglaise de ses amis, qui exerçait aussi les mêmes fonctions d'institutrice dans le pensionnat en question ; elle prétexta un motif, ayant bien soin de ne pas révéler le motif vrai. Poste pour poste, nous reçûmes une réponse en anglais, dont on me copia la partie essentielle—réponse que j'ai retrouvée dans une portefeuille il y a à peine quinze jours, et égarée de nouveau. Elle exprimait l'étonnement de cette demoiselle anglaise au sujet de la lettre de Mlle. B., lettre qu'elle n'attendait pas sitôt, vu que le but ne lui en paraissait pas assez motivé. Mais en même temps, l'amie anglaise se hâtait d'annoncer à notre médium que leur amie commune, Marguerite, était morte le 7 Février vers les 8 heures du matin. En outre, un petit carré de papier imprimé était interré dans la lettre ; c'était un billet de mort et de faire part. Inutile de vous dire que je vérifiai l'enveloppe de la lettre, et que la lettre me parut venir réellement de Coblenz.

“ Seulement j'ai eu depuis des regrets. C'est de n'avoir pas, dans

¹ I need hardly point out the fallacy of this argument. See the discussion and examples of automatic writing in Chap. ii., § 12.

l'intérêt de la science, demandé à la famille G. d'aller avec eux vérifier au bureau télégraphique si, réellement, ils n'auraient pas reçu une dépêche télégraphique dans la matinée du 7 Février. La science ne doit pas avoir de pudeur ; la vérité ne craint pas d'être vue. Je n'ai comme preuve de la véracité du fait qu'une preuve morale : c'est l'honorabilité de la famille G., qui m'a paru toujours au dessus de tout soupçon.

" A. A. LIÉBEAULT."

[Apart from the improbability that the whole family would join in a conspiracy to deceive their friend, the nature of the answer received from Coblenz shows that the writer of it cannot have been aware that any telegraphic announcement had been sent. And it is in itself unlikely that the authorities of the school would have felt it necessary instantly to communicate the news to Mdlle. B.]

This example, it will be seen, differs from the preceding in the distinctness of the idea which—albeit latent in the percipient's mind—we must hold to have been transferred. Its chief interest, however, lies in the completeness and complexity of the automatism evolved. It exhibits a spontaneous telepathic impulse taking effect through the motor-system of the percipient in the very way that M. Richet's or our own deliberate efforts took effect on the "medium" (pp. 57-63). The parallel could not well be closer ; and our view of the essential continuity of experimental and spontaneous telepathy¹ could hardly receive stronger support.

¹ See above, p. 129.

CHAPTER VIII

DREAMS. PART I—THE RELATION OF DREAMS TO THE ARGUMENT FOR TELEPATHY

§ 1. THE inward impressions of distant events with which I have so far dealt have all been *waking* impressions. They have visited the percipient in the midst of his daily employments, and have often caused emotions that seemed quite incongruous with the normal current of life in which they mingled. But there is another department of experience which we are accustomed to consider as *par excellence* the domain of inward impressions, and from which the normal current of life is altogether shut off—the department of dreams. And this department, where inward ideas and images dominate unchecked, is also one which covers so large a period of human existence as to make it *à priori* probable that a considerable number of “transferred impressions” (supposing such things to exist) would fall within it. It would naturally, therefore, suggest itself as our next field of inquiry.

But dreams not only fall in naturally at this point; they are a means of advance. They comprise in themselves the whole range of transition from *ideal and emotional* to distinctly *sensory* affections; and they thus supply a most convenient link between the vaguer sort of transferred impressions and the more concrete and definitely embodied sort. The telepathic communications of the last two chapters, even when connected with recognisable images of persons and things, did not affect sight or hearing in such a way as to suggest the physical presence of the objects. Now many dreams are of just this impalpable kind. The material objects which figure in them are often the very vaguest of images, not localised in any particular spot. It is the general idea, the generalised form, of a person that presents itself, not a figure in a special attitude or clad in a special dress; events pass through the mind clothed in the faintly represented imagery in which a waking train of memory or of reverie will embody its contents. Such a dream only differs from a waking reverie in that it has not to compete, on the field of attention, with any objective facts; it is not contrasted with the immediate experience which the external world forces at every moment on the waking senses; and it is, therefore, itself accepted as immediate experience. With some persons it is rare for their dreams ever to emerge into more concrete actuality than this; and telepathy often seems to act in dreams of just such a veiled and abstract kind. From this lowest stage the transition is a gradual one up to the most vivid and detailed dream-imagery, the features of which are engraved on the memory as sharply as those of

a striking scene in waking life¹; and at every step of the transition we find evidence (how far conclusive will be seen later) to the action of telepathy.

It is only, however, when we come to the most distinctly sensory class of all that the full theoretic importance of dreams can be realised. To make this clear, I must ask a moment's indulgence for a statement of some very obvious facts. Vivid dreams present themselves to us in *two* very different aspects. There is first the standpoint which we occupy when we are dreaming them. From that standpoint, the world with which they present us is often as external as the real one; and our perceptions in that world are perceptions of outward and abiding things, among which we live and move with as much sense of reality as if we had never known the disillusion of waking. To the dreamer, his more vivid and concrete images are actual *percepts*, calling his senses (in physiological language his sensory centres) into play just as external reality would. But there is of course a totally different standpoint from which to regard dreams, namely, the external and critical one that we habitually assume during waking life. We then think of them merely as that floating phantasmagoria-whose transience and unreality have been the theme of philosophers and poets; which has very singular relations to time, and no real relations at all to our familiar space—unless, indeed, we loosely identify it with its physical conditions, and localise it in the brain. Dreams, then, have this peculiarity: they are distinct affections of the senses, which yet, in reflecting on them, we rarely or never confound with objective facts; waking hallucinations, on the other hand—spectral illusions or ghostly visitants—are often so confounded. The sleeping experiences are marked off from external reality in the minds of all of us by the very fact that we wake from them; our change of condition makes their vanishing seem natural; and thus looked back on, they will often seem to have been mere vague representations, *i.e.*, something *less* than affections of the senses. The waking experiences cannot be woke from; their vanishing seems unconnected with the percipient and therefore *unnatural*; and thus looked back on, they will often seem to have been independent realities, *i.e.*, something *more* than affections of the senses.

Now it is as affections of the senses, and not as independent realities, that our Class A, the externalised sort of “phantasms of the living,” are

¹ Those whose dreams are habitually of the more ideal and impalpable sort have sometimes a difficulty in realising the extreme sensory vividness of dreams at the other end of the scale, dreamt often by persons who have no exceptional power of visualising when awake. I myself lately dreamt that, meeting a stranger in Bond Street, I was arrested by a certain familiarity in the face, which I continued to scrutinise with puzzled eagerness, till I at last identified it with a portrait in the Grosvenor Gallery of the preceding year. Awake, I can scarcely recall the portrait at all.

I have also heard it asserted that (apart from actual external sounds) the sense of *hearing* is never distinctly exercised in dreams. I never had a more vivid dream than one of a few nights back, where some rifle-shooting, in the midst of which I found myself, caused me again and again precisely the same dread before the sound came, and the same intense irritation when it came, as I associate with the firing of a pistol on the stage. I could distinctly trace this dream to a similar (though less acute) irritation which I had suffered from the cracking of whips in a foreign city on the previous day.

treated in this book. In the theory that the percipient is impressed *from a distance*, and in the very word *phantasm*, it is implied that what he sees or hears has no objective basis or existence in that part of the external world where his body is situated; and whether he be asleep or awake, his relation to what he perceives, and of this to reality, is the same. But I shall be proceeding by the easiest route if (so far as the evidence will allow) I first trace the occurrence of the telepathic phantasms in the region of experience where sensory phantasms of some sort are normal and familiar, and are habitually judged of rightly as affections of the *inner* sense,¹ before passing to the region where phantasms of any sort are abnormal and unfamiliar, and are perpetually judged of wrongly as affections of the *outer* sense. The *rapprochement* which will thus be established between the sleeping and the waking cases will receive further and interesting illustration in certain intermediate stages which we shall encounter on the way. We shall find that one set of phenomena merges into the other by gradual steps, and that this "borderland" is itself a region specially rich in the telepathic impressions.

§ 2. But though dreams thus present a logical point of departure, they also form in many ways the most assailable part of our case. They are placed almost in a separate category by their intimate connection with the lowest physical, as well as the highest psychical, operations. The grotesque medley which constantly throng through the gate of ivory thrust into discredit our rarer visitants through the gate of horn. And before proceeding further, it will be well to examine with some care the *general evidential value* of dreams, in relation to a theory of transferred impressions. The field may seem a fair one enough, as long as we keep to general expectations; if telepathy is a reality, here is a probable scene of telepathic events. But what opportunities does it afford for confirming these expectations by accurate and convincing evidence? This is a question which may rapidly convert our hopes into doubts.

The first objection to dreams, as evidence for transferred impressions of distant conditions or events, is this—that dreams being often somewhat dim and shapeless things, subsequent knowledge of the conditions or events may easily have the effect of giving body and definiteness to the recollection of a dream. When the actual facts are learnt, a faint amount of resemblance may often suggest a past dream, and set the mind on the track of trying accurately to recall it. This very act involves a search for details, for something tangible and distinct; and the real features and definite incidents which are now present in the mind, in close association with some general scene or fact which actually figured in the dream, will be apt to be unconsciously *read back* into the dream. They make part of the original, of which the mind conceives the dream to have been a picture; and the picture, when evoked in memory, will only too probably include details drawn from the original. After we have once realised the

¹ This term implies that sensation, from a physical point of view, is inverted; that the initial stimulation takes place in the higher tracts of the brain, and that the stimulation of the special sensory apparatus is produced by a downward centrifugal current. The point will be further noticed in connection with waking hallucinations (see pp. 311-12).

matter in its full distinctness, it becomes almost impossible to recall with due *indistinctness* the distant and shadowy suggestion of it. Dreams in this way resemble objects seen in the dusk ; which begin by puzzling the eye, but which, when once we know or think we know what they are, seem quite unmistakable and even full of familiar detail. For our purposes, therefore, it is of prime importance that the dream shall be told in detail to some one on whose memory we can rely ; or, better still, written down, or in some way acted on, at the time, and before the confirmation arrives. Nearly all the evidence to be brought forward has, at any rate, this mark of accuracy.

But there is a more general and sweeping objection. Millions of people are dreaming every night ; and in dreams, if anywhere, the range of possibilities seems infinite ; can any positive conclusion be drawn from such a chaos of meaningless and fragmentary impressions ? Must not we admit the force of the obvious *à priori* argument, that among the countless multitude of dreams, one here and there is likely to correspond in time with an actual occurrence resembling the one dreamed of ; and that when a dream thus “ comes true,” unscientific minds are sure to note and store up the fact as something extraordinary, without taking the trouble to reflect whether such incidents occur oftener than pure chance would allow ? Can the chances be at all estimated ? Are any valid means at hand for distinguishing between a transferred impression and a lucky coincidence ? What degree of exactitude of date and circumstance must be reached, before we consider even a striking correspondence as worth attention ? And what proportion of striking correspondences are we to demand, before we consider that the hypothesis of chance is strained in accounting for them ?

In the first place, it is to be noted that there has, so far, been a complete lack of the statistics which alone could form the basis for an answer to these questions. It has never been known with any certainty what proportion of people habitually dream, what proportion of dreams are remembered at all, in what proportion of these remembered dreams the memory is evanescent, and in what proportion it is profound and durable. This latter point may be specially hard to establish satisfactorily in a particular case, as it is affected by the question whether a person's attention is habitually directed to his dreams, and also by the question whether he has happened to recount a particular dream to others, and so to stamp it on his own memory. By making inquiries on a large scale, however, a considerable approximation to certainty may be attained on these and various other points of importance. A good deal has been done in this way during the last three years ; and though I cannot say that the results are such as would allow us to base a theory of telepathy upon the facts of dreams alone, I think that they do much to diminish the *à priori* plausibility of the theory of chance, as a sufficient explanation of all cases of marked correspondence between a dream and an external event.

§ 3. The points to be considered have to do both with the *intensity* and with the *content* of the dream ; let us consider them in order.

First as to *intensity*. An exceedingly small proportion of dreams are remembered with distinctness several hours after waking. Even of the

dreams which dwell in the memory, an exceedingly small proportion produce any appreciable amount of distress or excitement. And of these more impressive dreams, an exceedingly small proportion prove their intensity by being in any way acted on. What I have termed intensity may be indicated in another way, by the rapid repetition of a distinct dream two or three times on the same night; and this, too, when there is no apparent cause to prompt the dream, seems to be a comparatively rare occurrence. The dreams to be cited in this book will nearly all, I think, be distinguishable by one or other of these tests of exceptional intensity. And in proportion as the dreams which coincide with the event dreamed of are thus found to be in some other way exceptional—in proportion as the class to which they belong is found to form a small and sparse minority among the swarming multitude of unmarked dreams—in that proportion does it clearly become unreasonable to argue that the coincidences are sufficiently accounted for by the law of chances. The argument which might seem effective so long as we had the whole multitude of dreams to range over—that multitude seeming sufficient to give the law of chances ample scope—assumes quite a different aspect when we find ourselves limited to the comparatively small group of *intense* dreams.

Next as to content. Before we can give weight to a dream-coincidence as pointing to anything beyond the operation of chance, we should inquire whether the event dreamed of is distinct, unexpected, and unusual. If it combine all three characteristics in a high degree, its evidential value may be very considerable; in proportion as the degree falls short, or the combination fails, the evidential value sinks; and none of the characteristics taken alone, even though present in a high degree, would lead us to include a dream in the present collection. Thus, the dream-content must be neither a vague impression of calamity nor of happiness; nor a catastrophe on which the sleeper's mind is already fixed; nor some such ordinary event as has frequently occurred in waking experience. It may, indeed, be not the less significant for being trivial; but in that case it must be of a bizarre or unlikely kind. Then again, amount of detail, and the number of connected events, are of immense importance, as each subsequently verified detail tells with ever-mounting strength against the hypothesis of accidental coincidence. Once more, dream-content must be considered to some extent in relation to the dream-habits of the particular dreamer. Before estimating the value of the fact that a person has dreamt of the sudden death of a friend on the night when the death took place, we should have to ascertain that that person is not in the habit of dreaming of distressing or horrible events. In respect of these various points, the instances to be cited, here and in the Supplement, are the sifted survival of many less definite coincidences in which the popular imagination would find a marvel. And in the case of this residue, where we have complete fulfilment of some of the above conditions, over and above the close proximity in time, or (it may be) absolute synchronism, of the event and the dream, the question as to a causal connection between the two is, at any rate, not to be swept out of court by a mere general appeal to the doctrine of chances.

But there is a further point in the content of the dreams that correspond with real events—true dreams, as we may for brevity call them—

which cannot but strike the attention as soon as we begin to examine actual specimens. It is that, among true dreams, by very far the largest class is the class where the truth is *death*—i.e., where the event dreamt of as happening to another is of that most restricted kind which can only happen once in each individual's experience. Out of the 149 coincident dreams which are included in this book—as at least clearly finding in telepathy, if it exists, their most natural explanation—no less than 79 have represented or suggested death. This, it will be seen, is entirely in accordance with a theory of causal connection between event and dream, where the abnormal state of the person dreamt of is regarded as part of the cause; but it is not at all in accordance with what we should expect accident to bring about. Nor could this argument well be met by the assumption that it is only in the case of a very grave event that the accidental correspondence attracts attention and gets recorded. For this would mean that the dreams of death which happen to correspond with reality are one specially-remembered class among the total number of accidentally-true dreams. Now it will be admitted that dreams of death constitute a minute proportion of *all* dreams; it would follow, then, on the above assumption, that accidentally-true dreams of death constitute a similarly minute proportion of all accidentally-true dreams. But at this rate the total number of "true dreams"—in other words, the number of coincidences which the doctrine of chances will have to cover—swells to a most prodigious and unmanageable figure. It is just because a "true dream" is a very *exceptional* occurrence, that it was possible even to attempt to account for it as an accident; if the "accident" is for ever "coming off," so much the worse for that attempt.

§ 4. But the fact that a singular and marked event, such as death, is in so large a proportion of cases the central feature of the "true" dreams, supplies more than a general argument; it supplies the means for an actual numerical estimate whereby the adequacy of the chance-hypothesis may be tested. For dreams of so definite a character, and which admit of being so clearly and briefly described, are quite a fit subject for statistics; there is a possibility of finding out approximately what the actual frequency of a dream of this sort is; and we shall then have the first necessary datum for deciding whether the frequency of the cases where it coincides with reality, is, or is not, greater than chance would fairly allow. If it turned out that all of us about once a week had a marked and distressing dream of the death of some friend or other, then, since people who are somebody's friends are perpetually dying, the coincidence of such a dream with the real event might be expected to occur by pure accident in a large number of cases. But if only a small minority of us could recall ever having had such a dream at all, the case would be reversed. The object, then, is to ascertain from a number of people, large enough and promiscuous enough to be accepted as a fair specimen of the whole population, what percentage of them have had the experience in question. With this view, efforts have been made, dating from the winter of 1883, to obtain a large number of answers to the following question:—

Since January 1st, 1874, have you ever had a dream of the death of some person known to you, which dream you marked as an exceptionally vivid one,

and of which the distressing impression lasted for as long as an hour after you rose in the morning?

This question has been put to 5360 persons, as to whom it was not known beforehand whether their answer would be "Yes" or "No." Of these persons, 173 answered "Yes." Excluding 7 of these cases, in which the dreamer was at the time in a state of distinct anxiety as to the person whose death was dreamt of, we have a remainder of 166. These include a good many cases where it proved, on further inquiry, that the terms of the question had not been exactly met, as the impression had not endured in any vivid or distressing way. They also include 3 cases where the mind of the dreamer had been exceptionally directed to the person dreamt of; and 3 cases where the person dreamt of was in the same room as the dreamer, which may have had some tendency to produce the dream—one gentleman expressly stating his suspicion that his dream was caused by some sound made by his companion. We may, therefore, accept the 166 as a liberal estimate. But 18 of these persons professed to have had a dream of the sort inquired about more than once. It will be again a liberal estimate if we suppose each of these to have experienced 3 distinct examples within the specified time; and the most convenient way of taking account of these repetitions will be to add 36 to the 166, making 202. With this substitution, $\frac{1}{25}$ of the whole number of persons asked may be taken to have given an affirmative answer.¹ Now, the persons asked were a quite promiscuous body, and a body large enough to be safely regarded as a fair average sample of the population; just as a similar number of persons, taken at random, would be accepted as a fair sample for purposes of statistics on short sight, or colour-blindness. We may conclude, then, that the number of persons who can recall having had—during the twelve years 1874–1885, and without special assignable cause—the experience named in the question, amount to about 1 in 26 of the population of this country.

The question next occurs, ought we, in making our calculation, to assign any limit to the area of acquaintances from whom the person dreamt of may be drawn, and of whom a certain proportion will, in the natural course of things, die within a period of 12 years? On general grounds it may fairly be argued that the slightness of connection between two persons would diminish the chance that one would dream *accidentally*, no less than the chance that he would dream *telepathically*, of the death of the other²; and that therefore a vivid dream of the death of a stranger,

¹ Some further returns, received since this page was printed, have unaltered the proportion stated.

² It is not always easy to find out, from a brief description, the strength of the bond that has existed between two persons. But I think I am safe in saying that the dreams of death in which the person dreamt of is not linked to the dreamer by a rather close tie of kinship or affection, do not amount to 10 per cent. of the whole number. In other respects the dreams do not seem to follow any line of *a priori* likelihood—*e.g.*, they concern the death of young persons quite as much as of old ones.

I may point out that a different estimate would have to be made for dreams dreamt by several dreamers about the *same* person: *e.g.*, an accidental coincidence of dream and death is less improbable than usual where the person dreamt of is a prominent public character, because he is (so to speak) within the dream-horizon of an immense number of people. But the proviso has no practical importance, as no cases of the kind occur in my statistics.

or of a slight acquaintance, when it coincides with the death, tells neither more or less in favour of the action of something beyond chance than a similarly vivid and coincident dream of the death of a near relative. It will be seen, moreover, that, as far as the numerical estimate goes, it is unimportant how large or how small we take the area to be; because whatever number of persons we include, on the average the same proportion of the number will die within any given time. Thus assuming this proportion who die to be one-fourth of the whole number, then, if we took a very large circle of acquaintances, say 400—the death of any of whom, if dreamt of when it occurred, would count as one of our coincidences—we should have to reckon that 100 of them actually die in the course of the time; and if we took a very small circle of just the immediate relatives of the dreamer, say 4, we should have to reckon that 1 of them dies in the course of the time. And the chance of an accidental coincidence in the specified period between the single dream of death and the death itself is practically the same in both these cases. For though there will be, on the one hand, much less chance of its being the right individual that is dreamt of when the choice is among 400 than when it is among 4, on the other hand the 100 deaths will give 100 (or nearly 100) nights on which the coincident dream will have its chance of being dreamt, instead of only 1 night. Logically, therefore, there is no necessity for limiting the area in question. Let the number of any one's acquaintance be called x . Then, whether x be large or small, all that concerns us is the proportion of the x persons who die within the specified period of 12 years; and this proportion, since the death-rate per year is about .022, may be taken as .264, or a little more than one-fourth.

The estimate from the above data is as follows. The probability that a person, taken at random, will have a vivid dream of death in the course of 12 years is $\frac{1}{26}$; the probability that any assigned member of the general population, and therefore that any particular dreamt-of person, will die within 12 hours of an assigned point of time is $\frac{22}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$; hence the probability that, in the course of 12 years, a vivid dream of death, dreamt by any previously specified individual, and the death of the person dreamt of will fall within 12 hours of one another is $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{22}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365} = \frac{1}{431,363}$. (If x , the number of the dreamer's circle of friends, be taken into account, we then have, as the probability that *any* one of the dreamer's circle should die within the particular 24 hours defined by the dream, $x \times \frac{1}{26} \times \frac{22}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$; and as the probability that, if some one of the dreamer's circle dies within the particular 24 hours, it should be the *particular* one dreamt of, $\frac{1}{x}$; whence the probability of this double event = $\frac{1}{x} \times x \times \frac{1}{26} \times \frac{22}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$, *i.e.*, the result is unaltered.) That is to say, each group of 431,363 persons in the population of the United Kingdom will on an average, if chance alone rules, produce one such coincidence in the given time. Now let it be supposed for a moment that our appeal for evidence has effectively reached as large a section of the population as this: let it be supposed, that is to say, that the number of persons from whom we should, directly or indirectly, have received examples of such coincidences, if they had had them to communicate, amount to 431,363. In that case, then, the number of such coincidences which we ought, by the doctrine of chances, to have encountered is 1. The number which we have actually

encountered, of vivid dreams of death, narrated to us at first-hand,¹ dreamt since January 1st, 1874, by persons free from anxiety, and falling within 12 hours of the death of the person dreamt of²—is 24: that is, a number 24 times larger than the doctrine of chances would have allowed us to expect.³ And this number is very much below what we are justified in assuming. For while my colleagues and I are probably disposed rather to overrate than to underrate the extent to which the world is acquainted with our proceedings, we cannot suppose that the actual number of persons from whose collective experiences our examples are drawn really approaches half a million, as above supposed. Moreover, 7 of the 24 coincidences are represented as having been extremely close; in 3 other cases the interval was at any rate not more than 4 hours, and in another was from 3 to 6 hours; while in 9 more, where death and dream are merely stated to have fallen on the same night, the coincidence may have been exact, and is not likely to have been inexact to the extent of anything like 12 hours. Again, dreams are excluded where the actual *fact* of death was not in some way presented, even though the dying person was dreamt of in a remarkable way.⁴ But most markedly have I understated the case in this respect, that I have introduced nothing but the bare fact of death, and have neglected the points of detail which in some instances add indefinitely to the difficulty of regarding the coincidence as a chance.

The above is a tolerably clear computation; and its validity could only be rebutted in two ways—(1) by impugning, on evidential grounds, the cases of coincidence that are alleged; (2) by impugning the approximate accuracy of the initial *datum*—that within the last 12 years not more than 1 person in 26 has, without clear cause, had a markedly distressing and haunting dream of the death of an acquaintance.

¹ In three cases the evidence, though not actually from the dreamer, is of the sort described on p. 119, as on a par with first-hand.

² With 5 possible exceptions, where the 12 hours' limit may not have been nearly reached, but where it may have been exceeded. In 2 of these cases, the death took place in the afternoon and the dream followed the same night; in the 3 others, the death was either on the night of the dream or on a day contiguous to that night but its hour is not known. Two dreams are excluded which are known to have followed the death by a very little more than 12 hours, the death not having been heard of in the interval.

³ Of the 24 included dreams, 10 were of the deaths of near relatives; and 4 or 5 concerned persons who were outside the circle of intimate acquaintance.

⁴ I would draw special attention to this point. For when we come to deal with the *waking* cases, where a phantasm of a person is seen or heard at the time of his death, they may seem to present a marked difference from the *dreams* that will be quoted as having coincided with death,—these last being distinctly dreams of death, whereas it is only in a minority of the waking cases that any idea of death was conveyed. The waking percipient may have surmised the death, from the fact that he had seen or heard the phantasm; but the phantasm itself, more often than not, was simply the natural-looking appearance or natural-sounding voice of the "agent." We must remember, then, that for aught we know, telepathically caused dreams of just this type may occur; but unless they present specially remarkable features (as in case 23, p. 142 above) we should not cite them as having even a *prima facie* claim to be considered telepathic, just because of the immense scope for chance-coincidence that dreams afford. We demand *more* of a dream—that it shall suggest the right *event*, and not merely the right *person*—before we think it worth considering; and the dreams to be quoted correspond with the *rarer* type of waking cases, where the phantasmal representation has in some way distinctly suggested death.

The evidential value of the alleged coincidences will be better estimated when we consider some of the actual specimens. But as regards the initial datum, on which the calculation depends, there are objections the force of which must be at once admitted. Dreams in general, it may be said, fade away from our memory because there is nothing to stamp them there ; but if it happens that some real event recalls a recent dream, then, by the principle of association, this dream will obtain a more permanent lodgment in our mind. Now the death of relatives or friends is the sort of real event which it is practically certain that we shall hear of very soon after it occurs. A dream of such an occurrence is therefore practically certain to get stamped in the way described, if it has been at all synchronous with the fact. And it is thus allowable to suppose that a large number of such dreams may occur which lapse unnoted from the mind, but any one of which, had news of the real event been received immediately afterwards, would have been recalled and associated with it, and would have then added a case to the list of " remarkable coincidences."

This argument is to a considerable degree met by the terms of the question. What is asked is not merely whether people have had a dream of death ; but whether they have had one which has haunted them for at least an hour after rising in the morning ; and it will not be maintained that an experience of that sort is so likely to vanish utterly from the memory as an ordinary dream. But it might, no doubt, be rejoined that perhaps a good many of the *coincident* dreams were not marked at the time by any special vividness or impressiveness ; and that the dreamer came to imagine this peculiarity of character in his dream, *after* it had come to assume importance in his eyes from the discovery that it had coincided with the reality. And I most fully recognise that when the argument begins to turn on such a point as the degree of vividness which a dreamer, looking back to a dream through the medium of subsequent impressions, can swear that it possessed, anything like positive proof becomes impossible. A dream so looked back to may get charged with an emotional character, just as we saw above that it might get filled in with a precision of detail, which it did not really possess. But I must here draw special attention to the safeguards already mentioned. Our collection includes a remarkably high proportion of cases where the coincident dream was marked as exceptional in character—at the time, and *before* the real event was known—by being immediately narrated as such to someone else (who, if accessible, has of course been questioned as to his memory of the fact) ; or by being noted in writing ; or by being in some way acted on. [Figures are here given which I omit, as I have omitted many dream cases.—ED.] And I must further point out that, in order to explain away the result of the above computation in the way suggested, it would have to be assumed not only that *a great many* dreams of death pass unnoted and leave no impression, while still of such a nature that a vivid impression of them would revive if news corresponding to them were subsequently heard ; it would have to be assumed that such an experience befalls *very nearly every adult in the country* at least once within the 12 years. For our conclusion was that coincident dreams of death in this country were 24 times as numerous as the law of chances—according to

the *datum* which the census gave us—would allow. Therefore to make the law of chances applicable as an explanation, we must multiply our initial *datum* by 24; that is, instead of assuming 1 person out of every 26 to have had the required dream, we must assume 24 out of every 26—that is nearly every one—to have had it; nay, on the more probable estimate of our area of inquiry (p. 213), we must assume that on the average every one has had it as many as *four times* within the given period; though 96 per cent. of them forget all about it.¹ A good many of my readers, will, I think, altogether repudiate such a supposition in their own case. I believe, indeed, that a perfectly impartial census would have given a decidedly smaller proportion than 1 in 26. For it is practically impossible to carry out a census of the sort required without getting an unfair proportion of *Yeses*. Persons who have only *No* to say in answer to such a question as was propounded, are apt to think that there is no good in saying it; and if they receive a printed form, instead of writing their answer on it and returning it, they are apt to consign it to the waste-paper basket—probably often with a vague notion that what was wanted was a *Yes*, and that sensible people, who do not have exceptional experiences, ought not to encourage the superstitions of those who do.²

§ 5. As pointed out above, it is only where the coincident dream exhibits some sort of *unique* event, such as death, that we can obtain the statistical basis necessary for an arithmetical estimate of chances. A very few remarks, however, seem worth making on dreams which offer less hope of a definite conclusion.

Certain other marked events, such as unexpected dangers and accidents, are comparable to death, though standing much below it, in the two main points—the *comparative* infrequency of their forming the subject of a markedly distressing dream, and the *comparatively* large proportion (though *absolutely*, of course, a very small proportion) of cases in which such a dream, when it does occur, coincides with reality. And even when we come down to unusual events of a more commonplace type, or to a detailed *nexus* of more or less familiar incidents—where it is, of course, out of the question to get any sort of numerical basis for computation—the same sort of argument may still be cautiously applied. It is true that the coincidences do not now occur among any comparatively small group of *dreamers*, such as the dreamers of death—the order of dream which is now in question being common to all who dream at all; but they still occur among a comparatively small group of *dreams*. In the cases which form a considerable proportion of our collection, where the dream was at once narrated as an exceptionally odd or vivid one, the proof of its exceptional oddness or vividness is at once supplied. And further, an immensely large class, the purely fantastic dreams, to which no real

¹ If it be objected that such an extreme assumption would not be required, as persons who have the dream may have it repeatedly, I can reply that hardly any of the persons from whom we have received accounts of “coincidental” dreams of death recall having dreamt of death except on that one occasion; and it would be even odder that many of them should have completely forgotten a number of such vivid experiences than that they should have completely forgotten one.

² A further account of the census of which the above inquiry formed part will be found in Chap. xiii.

event could possibly be recognised as corresponding, are excluded; as also are the commonest class of all where the dreamer is not the spectator but the hero of the dream, and no unusual incident or precise series of incidents is presented as occurring independently to *others*—who, if present, merely make a necessary background, or take their share of speech and action in conjunction with the dreamer. The distant event, or series of events, with which the dream corresponds, must both be possible (for it actually occurs), and must centre round some one other than the dreamer; and the consequent necessity that the marked point or points of the dream shall both be possible and shall centre round some one other than the dreamer, immensely reduces the list of dreams which come into the reckoning; and to the same extent reduces the *prima facie* plausibility of the hypothesis that the coincidence is due to chance. No doubt, after all deductions, the number of dreams which remain to be taken into account, before we can decide as to the chances of accidental coincidences with reality, is here many times larger than our former restricted class, which was concerned with a single unique event: it may conceivably be many thousands of times larger. But, whatever the multiple, it is hard to believe that the number of events—even of more or less curious events—which it is *possible to dream of* as occurring to other people, does not bear an even larger ratio to the single event of death. For what limit can we so much as conceive to the sum of the details of circumstance which the whole dreaming population of the country can connect in imagination with the various members of their respective acquaintance?

Such considerations do not, of course, amount to an argument for telepathic correspondences on this wider ground—the *data* are far too indefinite for that. But they at least suggest that the adequacy of the chance-theory is not quite so obvious as is sometimes assumed.

This preliminary sketch of the evidential aspect of dreams may, perhaps, prevent misunderstanding. Among considerations so complex and data so uncertain, it is not easy to sum up a view in very precise terms; but our general position has been made sufficiently clear by my statement that we should not, with our present evidence, have undertaken to make out a case for telepathy on the ground of dreams alone. The question whether a case could be completely made out on that ground, though it may be worth debating, seems incapable of final settlement, until a very large section of the population takes to keeping a daily record of their dream-experiences. A much larger number of examples is needed for which, even taken in isolation, a high evidential rank could be claimed—whether from the amount of detail in the coincidence, as in cases 134 and 138, or from some such exceptional features as marked Mr. Wingfield's case (p. 142). But meanwhile an argument of a quite different sort can be imported from the department of evidence on which we mainly rely—the evidence of telepathic impressions of distant events received in the waking state. The probabilities of some real causal connection between event and impression in the *less* conclusive cases cannot be fairly weighed without regard to the existence of the *more* conclusive; and that dreams form, on the whole, the less evidentially conclusive class can be no ground for tabooing them, unless we can assign special reasons why

sleep should be a condition adverse to telepathic influence. In the conception of telepathy which it is hoped that the reader will by degrees come to share, no such reasons appear; while the resemblances and the transition-cases, already referred to, between the sleeping and the waking phenomena, make it practically impossible to reject in the one class an explanation which we admit in the other. The examples which I shall proceed to give require no further justification. They are not needed to prove our theory; but many of them almost inevitably fall under it as soon as it is proved; and we have no right to disregard any light which they may throw on it.

DREAMS. PART II.—EXAMPLES OF DREAMS WHICH MAY BE REASONABLY REGARDED AS TELEPATHIC

§ 1. On surveying a large number of cases where a dream has corresponded in time with the real occurrence of the event or events which it represented, in such a way as strongly to suggest that it had its source in a telepathic impulse, we find that they at once fall into distinct classes. In the first class, the agent is in a normal state, or is himself also dreaming: the external event here is simply the occurrence to the agent of a particular thought or dream; and the percipient's impression is concerned simply with the content of that thought or dream, not with the agent himself. In all other classes the agent is in some condition or situation which is more or less abnormal; and the percipient has an impression of the agent as in this situation, but an impression which may take various forms. Not infrequently the central fact is dreamt of merely as a fact—as something the dreamer hears of, or becomes aware of, as having occurred, without himself in any way coming into contact with it. In another class of cases, he perceives the principal actor in the matter dreamt of—the dying person, if death is the occasion—in such a manner as to suggest the actual catastrophe; this suggestion being often connected with some special imagery or symbolism. And in yet another class, he seems himself transported into the actual scene—to be an actual spectator of the event.

I will begin then with some specimens of the first class, where the dream has close relation to something that is in the agent's mind, but the agent's own personality does not specially figure in it.¹ These are, of course, the cases which come nearest to experimental thought-transference; and an additional point of resemblance is that they are especially apt to occur when the agent and percipient are in tolerably close proximity. One marked group of these cases is the simultaneous occurrence of the same dream to two persons. Such an occurrence would not be

¹ We must insist on the fulfilment of at least one of two conditions: either the *thought*, or the *personality*, of the agent must be distinctly represented in the dream. This is, of course, a mere evidential rule; but, owing to the immense scope for accidental coincidences that dreams afford, it must be strictly applied. For example, Mrs. Sidney Smith, of 7, The Terrace, Barnes, tells us of an extraordinary and indescribable horror which she experienced in sleep, on the night of a brother's very tragic death; but as she did not connect the impression with her brother till she heard that he was missing, the case cannot be even provisionally admitted.

likely to be heard of except when the two dreamers were nearly related or were living in the same house ; indeed, unless the correspondence were extraordinarily close and detailed, it is only the fact of the dreamers belonging to a narrowly restricted circle that could justify one in attaching the slightest importance to it. In a wider circle, coincidences of the sort might obviously happen, and perhaps often do happen, by pure accident. But relationship or habitual propinquity involves, of course, the chance that some item of joint waking experience has been the independent source of both dreams ; and no case would be admissible where any recent cause of this sort could be traced. [No. 88 is omitted.]

The following case is from the Rev. J. Page Hopps, of Lea Hurst, Leicester.

“ September 15th, 1884.

(89) “ Last week I dreamt of a ‘ dead ’ friend, and of this friend doing an exceedingly strange thing. It impressed me very much, but I said not a word concerning it to any one. Next morning, at breakfast, my wife hastened to tell me that she had dreamt a singular dream (a very unusual thing for her to say anything about), and then she staggered me by telling me what she had dreamt. It was the very thing that I had dreamed. We slept in different rooms, she having to attend to a sick child, and I not being very well. I do not care to tell you the dream ; but the special *action* in *both* dreams was something extremely curious and monstrously improbable. My wife ended her description by saying, ‘ Then she tried to say something, but I could not make it out.’ I heard and remembered what was said, and that was the only difference in our dreams. We had not been in any way talking about our ‘ dead ’ friend.

“ J. PAGE HOPPS.
“ MARY HOPPS.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hopps says :—

“ I would rather not go into details, especially in writing, though I think Mr. Gurney is right in wishing for them. Some day I may give them, but what I told him in my first letter is *literally* true. The dream was an intensely improbable one. One curious thing about it was that, while looking at the appearance, I knew perfectly well I was lying in the particular bed I was in, and on the left-hand side, with my head towards the door. When I awoke, I was in precisely that position.”

Mrs. Fielding, of Yarlington Rectory, near Bath, writes :—

“ November, 1885.

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

“ JANE E. FIELDING.”

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*. 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.”

The enclosure was :—

" 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."

Asked as to the detail of the woodman, Mrs. Fielding replies, " We both saw the woodman in our dream."

[Compare an experience of the same agent and percipient below, No. 700, p. 222. Nos. 91, 92, 93 are here omitted.]

The next case is perhaps best regarded as one of simultaneous dreams, though the one of the two parties who would most naturally be regarded as the percipient feels positive that she was awake. It belongs in one respect to a later class, since the agent's personality and presence distinctly figured in the percipient's experience.

Miss Constance S. Bevan, of 74, Lancaster Gate, W., says :—

" February 18th, 1884.

(94) " On June 10th, 1883, I had the following dream. Someone told me that Miss Elliott was dead. I instantly, in my dream, rushed to her room, entered it, went to her bedside and pulled the clothes from off her face. She was quite cold ; her eyes were wide open and staring at the ceiling. This so frightened me that I dropped at the foot of her bed, and knew no more until I was half out of bed in my own room and wide awake. The time was 5 o'clock a.m. Before leaving my room I told this dream to my sister, as it had been such an unpleasant one.

" CONSTANCE S. BEVAN."

Miss Elliott says :—

" February, 1884.

" I awoke on the morning of June 10th, and was lying on my back with my eyes fixed on the ceiling, when I heard the door open and felt some one come in and bend over me, but not far enough to come between my eyes and the ceiling ; knowing it was only C., I did not move, but instead of kissing me she suddenly drew back, and going towards the foot of the bed, crouched down there. Thinking this very strange, I closed and opened my eyes several times, to convince myself that I was really awake, and then turned my head to see if she had left the door open, but found it still shut. Upon this a sort of horror came over me, and I dared not look towards the figure, which was crouching in the same position, gently moving the bedclothes from my feet. I tried to call to the occupant of the next room, but my voice failed. At this moment she touched my bare foot, and a cold chill ran all over me and I knew nothing more till I found myself out of bed looking for C., who must, I felt, be still in the room. I never doubted that she had really been there until I saw both doors fastened on the inside. On looking at my watch it was a few minutes past 5.

" E. ELLIOTT."

The following corroboration is from Miss C. S. Bevan's sisters :—

" Before leaving our room, my sister Constance told all about the dream she had had in the early morning.

" C. ELSIE BEVAN."

" The first thing in the morning, Miss Elliott told me all about her unpleasant dream, before speaking to anyone else.

" ANTONIA BEVAN."

In answer to inquiries, Miss C. S. Bevan says :—

“ This is the first experience I have ever had of the kind, and I have not walked in my sleep more than three times in my life ; the last time was about a year ago ; on no occasion have I left the room. I do not have startling or vivid dreams as a rule. I did not look at my watch after waking, but the clock struck 5 o’clock.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Elliott says :—

“ Although I am accustomed to have very vivid dreams, I have never had one of this kind before. When I found my friend was not in the room, and that the doors were securely fastened on the inside, I looked at my watch ; it was a few minutes past 5.

“ I have never, I believe, walked in my sleep. There are two doors to my bedroom. One was locked on the inside ; the handle was broken off the other on the outside. Thus it was impossible for anyone to open it except from the inside.”

[No one, probably, will regard this as an accidental coincidence ; but the hypothesis of sleep-walking had to be carefully considered. I have seen the rooms, and examined the door of which the handle is described as having been broken off. Miss Bevan had been (as was often the case) in Miss Elliott’s room over-night, and on her shutting the door at her departure, the outside handle fell off. She remembers its doing so ; and Miss Elliott heard it fall, and saw it on the floor outside when she left her room in the morning. Miss Elliott says that it remained unscrewed, and so liable to be shaken off every time the door closed, for about two months that summer. I unscrewed it, and tried to move the latch by turning the stump, but found it utterly impossible ; and to fit the handle on again without pushing the stump inwards, and so losing all chance of opening the door, was a work of very considerable care. But even on the violent supposition that Miss Bevan left her room noiselessly in her sleep, picked up the handle, deftly adjusted it, turned it, and entered—there remains an additional difficulty. For, in departing, she must have shut the door after her in such a way as to jerk the handle off again. This would make a loud sound ; yet it was not heard by Miss Elliott, who, on the hypothesis in question, was awake ; nor did it wake Miss Bevan herself, nor an aunt of hers who was sleeping in a room with which Miss Elliott’s communicated. It seems almost incredible that she should have shut the door carefully after her, *taken off* the handle, and *deposited it on the floor*. Both the door of communication between Miss Elliott’s and the aunt’s rooms, and the free door of the latter room were locked, the former on Miss Elliott’s side. Miss Bevan has *never left her room*, or anything like it, on the three occasions on which she has walked in her sleep. Moreover, she was sleeping in the same room as a sister who is a very light sleeper, and she considers that it is absolutely impossible that she should have left her room without waking this sister. Her room is separated from Miss Elliott’s by a passage and a long staircase. Miss Bevan is not a “ dreamer,” and very rarely has a dream which she thinks it worth while to mention.]

Two points in this case deserve special notice. In the first place, whatever we call Miss Elliott’s experience, it was wholly unlike an ordinary dream ; it was in itself as unusual in character as a “ spectral illusion,” or distinct waking hallucination of vision. Evidentially, this is very important ; for it at once renders irrelevant the theory of accidental coincidence, so far as that theory depends on the scope for accident which the

vast *number* of dreams affords. The second point is the possibility, at any rate, that the two experiences were not only simultaneous but *reciprocal*; that is to say, that Miss Bevan's dream may not have been simply the independent source of Miss Elliott's impression, but may have itself been modified by that impression.

§ 2. Passing now to examples where the supposed agent was awake, but in a perfectly ordinary and unexcited state, we must still, of course, reject cases where any normal cause for the dream can be plausibly assigned. Thus Mr. F. J. Jones, of Heath Bank, Mossley Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, tells us how his little daughter astonished him by starting up from her sleep, saying, "Something has gone wrong with the 'Gogo's' boilers." The "Gogo" belonged to a firm with which Mr. Jones was connected, and it was afterwards discovered that the boilers had at that very time suffered an accident in the Bay of Biscay. The coincidence remains, therefore, an odd one; but we should certainly be inclined to refer the child's dream to some scrap of grown-up conversation that had been forgotten. Mr. E. W. P., of Barton End Grange, Nailsworth, describes how in a half-wakeful state he had been imagining himself to be reading "The Book of Days," till it seemed to become too dark to see—when all at once his wife said in her sleep, "You should not read in bed, it is so bad for the eyes." On inquiry, we find that Mrs. P. is not in the habit of talking in her sleep; but we find also that Mr. P. has often read in bed, and that his wife has often remonstrated with him about it. The following cases seem free from such objections.

Mrs. Crellin, of 62, Hilldrop Crescent, N., says:—

" August, 1884.

(96) "I mentioned to you my husband's awaking from sleep and repeating the line from Tennyson which I had been trying to remember [*i.e.*, No. 95, omitted]. That seemed to me a brain-wave, and it was immediate in its action; but what of a *deferred* brain-wave? Thus, three weeks ago, I was unable to sleep during the early hours of the night. I thought, amongst other things, of a rather comic piece of poetry which my husband used to repeat years ago. I stuck at one line and could not recall it. However, I fell asleep, and three or four hours after awoke, to find it was time to rise. My husband, after a good night's rest—undisturbed by poetry or prose—awoke also; he stretched out his hand towards me, and repeated the line I had failed to remember in the night, and which did not occupy my thoughts when I awoke in the morning. This seemed a strange delay in giving the response."¹

Mr. Crellin says:—

" 62, Hilldrop Crescent, N.

" August 20th, 1884.

"My wife has told you of an incident which I am able to confirm. I awoke one morning recently, and immediately said to her, 'And his skin, like a lady's loose gown, hung about him'—this being a line of some humorous verses learnt by me when a youth, and which I have occasionally recited for the amusement of my friends, but which I had not repeated or thought of for a long period. My wife at once said that whilst lying

¹ We need not regard it as specially strange. See p. 144.

awake during the night (I being asleep) she had been trying to recall this very line. I know of nothing that can have brought the line to my mind and lips at the moment.

“ PHILIP CRELLIN.”

The force of cases where a dream exactly reproduces the thoughts of a person in the dreamer's vicinity is so much increased by their multiplication in the experience of the same two persons, that the following additional instance, from the narrators of case 90, needs no apology. Mrs. Fielding writes :—

“ Yarlington Rectory, Bath, 19th May, 1886.

(700) “ I sleep badly, and on Monday night it was 2 o'clock when I slept. I had, for half an hour before going off, fixed my mind upon every turn and corner of my girlhood's home (where I have not been for above 20 years) in Scotland. My father, a squire, had a neighbour squire, called *Harvey Brown*. In my whiling away the night, I dwelt upon him, and his house and family, *particularly*. My husband knew him *only* by name, but, of course, knew my home, and loves it as much as I do. He and I awoke at 6. Before a word of any kind was said, he said to me, ‘ I have had such a strange dream about Harvey Brown, and been at the old home, wandering about it.’ What made it seem stranger is that Harvey Brown is a man we never spoke of in our lives, or for 20 years have ever thought of, till Monday night in idleness I went over old meetings with him ; and I was wide awake and my husband asleep ; he had slept heavily all the night after a 12-mile walk ; so there was no possibility of my leading his mind near Scotland, in any conversation even, before he slept.

“ JEAN ELEANORA FIELDING.

“ J. M. FIELDING.”

[To this may be added, as belonging to this section, another case from the Additional Chapter, where the transferred impression emerged in a dream, not remembered by the dreamer, but known to have occurred through his talking in his sleep.—ED.] Mrs. Lethbridge, of Tregear, Launceston, Cornwall, writes :—

“ Bella Vista, Corsier, Vevey, Switzerland.

“ April 10th, 1886.

(691) “ In December, 1881, my husband was slowly recovering from a severe illness ; and one afternoon, about 5 o'clock, I went into his study, where he had gone for 2 or 3 hours, to see if he wanted anything. Finding him asleep in his armchair, I left him, and, having some village lending-library books to sort, I went into the small room where they were kept, called the ‘ box-room ’ (in a distant part of the house), to do so. There, to my surprise, I saw our gamekeeper's dog, Vic, curled up. On seeing me she rose, wagged her tail, turned half round and lay down again. This dog had never been inside the house before, which was the reason of my surprise at seeing her where she was. However, I turned her out of doors, and there I thought the matter ended. I am *quite sure* I did not mention the matter to my husband.

“ He went to bed very early that evening, and had a most restless night, talking a great deal in his sleep. While fast asleep he related the whole occurrence of ‘ Hawke's dog, Vic,’ actually being found in the box-room, even describing the animal's behaviour, rising, turning half round and lying down again. Next morning I asked my husband if he had dreamt ? ‘ No, not that he knew of.’ If he had not dreamt of Vic ?

'No, why of Vic?' Then I asked him if by any chance he had heard where Vic had been found the previous evening? 'No. Where?' And when I told him, he was extremely astonished, just because the dog had never been known inside the house before, and the box-room was on an upper landing. Subsequently I related to him what he had said in his sleep, but he evidently had not the slightest recollection of it.

"MILLICENT G. LETHBRIDGE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Lethbridge adds:—

"I am glad my account interested you, and regret extremely that it cannot be corroborated, for I *fully understand* the necessity in investigations such as yours to obtain perfectly trustworthy evidence, and free from intentional or unintentional exaggerations or inaccuracies. My dear husband died about 16 months ago. On receiving your letter I tried to find out whether he mentioned the occurrence in his diary, but unfortunately the diary of that year (1881) was left behind in England.

"From *mine*, which I succeeded in finding, written at the time, I copy out the following brief notice, dated Dec. 14th, 1881. 'Baron talked a great deal in his sleep last night, and curiously enough he described how the terrier was found curled up on the mat in the box-room, which actually happened yesterday, probably for the first time in the terrier's life, for I was so amazed at finding the dog in so unusual a place that I called the children to see it. But the strange part is this, Baron was asleep in the study at that time, and no one had told him of the occurrence. Of this I am *quite sure*.'

"I mentioned the occurrence to several people at the time, but as it happened 5 years ago, I doubt if any of them would recall it quite accurately."

[Mr. Lethbridge's complete forgetfulness is clearly a strong indication that the news of the occurrence had not reached him in any normal way—*e.g.*, by overhearing the children speaking of it.]

§ 3. We come now to cases where the agent's mind was in a more or less disturbed state. [Case 97 omitted.]

The evidential force of the following case is not easy to estimate, without knowing how frequent dreams of conflagration are; but this particular dreamer, at any rate, can recall no similar experience, and has never in his life made a written note of a dream except on this occasion. Mr. D. B. W. Sladen, of 26, Campden Grove, Kensington, W., writes:—

"January 4th, 1886.

(98) "In December, 1881, we were living at 6, George Street (East), Melbourne, Victoria. My father resided then, as he does now, at Phillimore Lodge, Kensington, W. In those days I always went to bed about midnight. I awoke suddenly, tremendously startled by a dream that my father's house was on fire. The dream impressed me so vividly that I felt convinced that a fire had actually happened there, and, striking a light, I walked across the room to the dressing-table, on which my diary lay (I used generally to jot down the events of the day just before turning in), and made a brief entry of it there and then, first looking at my watch in order to be able to set down the time, which I found to be 1 a.m. I had, therefore, been in bed less than an hour, which of itself seems to add an extraordinary feature to the case (I refer to my sinking to sleep, dreaming,

and waking up, as after a long sleep, in so short a space of time). The entry in my diary is, as it was likely to be when standing out of bed, very brief : ‘ *At night I dreamt that the kitchen in my father’s house was on fire. I awoke and found that it was 1 a.m.*’ I kept my diary in a plain-paper book ; and the entry comes below what I did up to midnight on December 22nd. What I further still remember distinctly of the vision is this—that in it, the servants’ bedrooms (which are really at the top of my father’s house, while the kitchen, &c., are at the bottom) were adjoining the kitchen suite, all on one floor, and that the smoke and blaze seemed general. Further, I remember distinctly, though I just made a bare entry in my diary and hurried back to bed, that two of my father’s maids, named Coombes and Caroline respectively, were the only persons except myself present in the vision, and that I seemed to have no impulses and no power of moving, but was merely a spectator ; nor did the idea of any risk to myself form part of the impression.

“ Six or seven weeks afterwards (mail contract between London and Melbourne is 42 days) I received a letter from my father, dated December 22nd, 1881. He wrote, ‘ We had a fire on Sunday evening while we were at church. Coombes went with a wax-taper to tidy her room, and, I suppose, blew it out and put it down with sparks. Very soon after she left, a ring at the bell that the attic was on fire put Caroline on her mettle, while the other lost her head. She dashed it out with water before the window-frame was burnt through, and subdued it. Fifteen pounds will repair the damage—two chests of drawers much burnt, wearing apparel, &c. I gave her a sovereign for her pluck, as the roof would have been on fire in another five minutes.’

“ Now I wish to draw your attention to what has attracted my attention most. The Sunday before December 22nd, 1881, was December 18th. I had the communication, therefore, in my sleep, not on the actual day of the fire, but on the day on which my father wrote the letter. At Kensington, where my father was writing, Australian letters have to be posted in the branch offices about 5 p.m. My dream was at 1 a.m. Time in Victoria is 9½ hours ahead of English time. When I was having the communication, therefore, it was about 3.30 p.m. in Kensington. Now with the mail going out at 5 p.m., 3.30 would have been a very natural—I think I may say a most natural time for my father to be finishing a letter to me. [Mr. Sladen, sen., confirms this.] I, therefore, had my magnetic communication when he was at once focussing his mind on me, and focussing his mind on the fire, in order to tell me about it.

“ I have asked my wife, and she remembers perfectly my waking her up, and telling her that I had dreamt that my father’s house was on fire, and was so convinced of its betokening an actual occurrence that I should make a note of it in my diary there and then.

“ DOUGLAS B. W. SLADEN.”

[Mr. Sladen has kindly allowed me to inspect the diary and letter.]

In the next example the correspondence is of a more distinct kind. Mrs. Walsh, of the Priory, Lincoln, writes :—

“ February, 1884.

(99) “ The gentleman who teaches music in my house tells me that if anything sad or terrible happens to anyone he loves, he always has an intimation of it.

“ I am very fond of him, and I know he looks on me as a very true old friend, and one of my sons, now in India, is the dearest friend he has.

"I went out one morning about 9 o'clock, carrying books for the library, and, being very busy, took the short way to town. On some flags in a very steep part of the road some boys had made a slide. Both my feet flew away at the same moment that the back of my head resounded on the flags. A policeman picked me up, saw I was hurt, and rang at the Nurses' Home close by, to get me looked to. My head was cut, and while they were washing the blood away, I was worrying myself that I should be ill, and how should I manage my school till the end of the term. I told no one in my house but my daughter, and no one but the policeman had seen me fall. I asked my daughter to tell no one. I had a miserable nervous feeling, but I pretended to her it was nothing. The next morning after a sleepless night, I could not get up. It was my habit to sit in the drawing-room while the music lessons were given, so my daughter went in to tell Mr. — that I had had a bad night, and was not yet up. He said, 'I had a wretched night, too, and all through a most vivid dream.' 'What was it?' she asked. 'I dreamed I was walking by the Nurses' Home, and I came on a slide, both my feet slipped, and I fell on the back of my head. I was helped to the Home, and while my head was being bathed I was worrying myself how I should manage my lessons till the end of the term, and the worrying feeling would not go.'"

The percipient, Mr. T. J. Hoare, writes:—

"12, St. Nicholas Square, Lincoln.

"March 3rd, 1884.

"I shall be very pleased to relate the account of a dream, as described by Mrs. Walsh most accurately, which took place on a Tuesday evening early in November, 1882. The dream consisted of this: I supposed I was going down the Greystone Stairs, when I had a fall at the first flight, was picked up, and helped by a policeman to the Nurses' Institute, about 20 yards from the imaginary fall, being there attended by a nurse. I was much perplexed as to how I should manage to finish my work during the term. This was followed the next morning by a severe headache in the region of the imaginary blow.

"On seeing Miss Walsh the following morning, I was told by her that Mrs. Walsh was unwell, but not the cause. I replied I too felt unwell and accounted for it through the dream. Mrs. Walsh related to me the same evening her own adventure, which in every detail exactly coincided with my dream as happening to myself. I in no way knew of Mrs. Walsh's mishap till the evening after, when told by herself.

"In another instance, whilst staying in Devonshire, I received an impression, or felt a conviction, that something had happened to Mrs. Walsh. I think I wanted to write, so confident was I of something having taken place, but desisted because I had left Lincoln through an outbreak of small-pox in the house next my rooms, only the previous week, so was unwilling to correspond. On my return here, I found out that both my day [*i.e.*, the day of the impression] and the accident—a fall—were true.

"In many other instances have I received similar experiences, and so confident have I been always of their accuracy that I have written to the persons and places, and always received confirmation of my impressions. I have had, I think, 10 or 12 impressions. They are quite unlike fits of low spirits and indigestion, and I can easily distinguish them from such, as in every case I have been most conscious of outside action.

"T. J. HOARE."

In conversation Mr. Hoare stated that he undoubtedly had a positive

pain at the back of his head, as if from a blow, on the day following this experience.

[Cases 100 and 101 here omitted.]

§ 4. We come now to the larger family of cases, in which the agent's personality, and not merely his particular thought, is reflected, and the dream conveys a true impression of his state, or of some event connected with him. I will first give a few examples where the fact which is a reality is presented or suggested without the agent's visible appearance in the dream, and without any distinct sense on the percipient's part of being present at the scene.

[Cases 102 and 103 are here omitted.]

The next case, in its absurdity and precision, is a great contrast to the last [a death case]. We received it from the Rev. A. B. McDougall, now of Hemel Hempsted, and at that time a scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford.

"November, 1882.

(104) "On the night of January 10th, 1882, I was sleeping in one of the suburbs of Manchester in the house of a friend, into which house several rats had been driven by the excessive cold. I knew nothing about these rats, but during the night I was waked by feeling an unpleasantly cold something slithering down my right leg. I immediately struck a light and flung off the bed-clothes, and saw a rat run out of my bed under the fire-place. I told my friend the next morning, but he tried to persuade me I had been dreaming. However, a few days afterwards¹ a rat was caught in my room. On the morning of January 11th, a cousin of mine [Miss E. J. M. McDougall, since married], who happened to be staying in my own home on the south coast, and to be occupying my room, came down to breakfast, and recounted a marvellous dream, in which a rat appeared to be eating off the extremities of my unfortunate self. My family laughed the matter off. However, on the 13th, a letter was received from me giving an account of my unpleasant meeting with the rat and its subsequent capture. Then everyone present remembered the dream my cousin had told certainly 58 hours before, as having occurred on the night of January 10th. My mother wrote me an account of the dream, ending up with the remark, 'We always said E. was a witch: she always knew about everything almost before it took place.'

"A. B. McDUGALL."

Here the point, of course, is that an exceedingly improbable incident is associated in the dream with the right person. It is worth noting that we have no exact parallel to such an incident as this among our *waking* cases. Thus, if the dream was telepathic, its very triviality may illustrate in a new way the favourable effect of sleep on the percipient faculty.

Dreams happening at times when the person dreamt of is known to be in peril are, as a rule, inadmissible as evidence. Thus we have a case where the mother of a lieutenant in the army dreamt, on the night of the storming of the Redan, that her son was wounded in the *left* arm. The subsequent newspaper account described him as having been severely injured

¹ There is a slight apparent discrepancy between these words and the date of the letter in which the capture is afterwards said to have been mentioned. The letters are destroyed; and Mr. McDougall rightly prefers to leave the words as they stand. They, of course, in no way affect the central incident.

in the *right* arm ; but his mother persisted in her view that the dream was correct, and it proved to have been so. But a dream concerning a wound is a very likely one for a mother to have under the circumstances ; and the detail is quite insufficient. In the class we must include mothers' dreams of accidents to children, even apart from any special grounds of anxiety—the form of dream being not uncommon, and real accidents (if we include trivial ones) being frequent enough to make it certain that striking coincidences will every now and then occur by chance. Thus the wife of a rector in the West of England tells us how she once dreamt that one of her little girls, who was on a visit, had fallen down in the street and cut her forehead over the left eye, and how the morning's post brought the news of that precise accident. The rector (who is sceptical on these matters) testifies to the fact that his wife mentioned to him her dream " that the child had fallen down and cut her forehead " ; and also to the fact that " the next post brought the news." He says nothing about the *street* or the *left eye*—details which may have been read back into the dream afterwards. But in any case the accident is of a common type ; the amount of correct detail is small ; and moreover it came out in conversation with the lady that she dreams a good deal, and pays attention to her dreams. However completely telepathy were established, it might still be doubted whether such a coincidence as this ought to be referred to it.

As an interesting contrast, I may quote the following case, which is from Mrs. Hobbs (wife of the Rev. W. A. Hobbs, formerly a missionary at Beerbhoom, Bengal), now resident at Tenbury, in Worcestershire. The narrative was first written out for a friend, probably in 1877.

(105) " During our residence in India as missionaries, our children remained at home, either residing with my sister or at school, and about the year 1864 or 1865 our eldest boy was at school at Shireland Hall near to Birmingham. The principal was the Rev. T. H. Morgan, now Baptist minister at Harrow-on-the-Hill.

" One night, during the summer of one of the years I have mentioned, I was awakened from my sleep by my husband asking, ' What is the matter, J. ? Why are you weeping so ? I could let you sleep no longer, you were crying so much.' I replied that I was dreaming, but could not tell the dream for some minutes. It had seemed so like a reality that I was still weeping bitterly.

" I dreamed that the sister (who acted as guardian to our boys in our absence) was reading to me a letter giving a detailed account of how our Harry died of choking, while eating his dinner one day at school.

" When sufficiently composed I again went to sleep ; but when I awoke in the morning, the effect of my dream was still upon me. My husband tried to rally me, saying, ' It is *only a dream*, think no more about it.' But my heart was sad, and I could not shake it off.

" In the course of the day I called on a friend, the only other European lady in the station. I told her why I felt troubled, and she advised me to make a note of the date, and then I should know how to understand my dream when a letter of that date came to hand. Our letters at that time came to us *via* Southampton, and nearly six weeks *must* elapse before I could hear if anything had transpired on that particular date, even if a letter could have been dispatched at once ; but it might not have been the ' mail day,' and that would give some additional days for me to

wait. They were weary weeks, but at length the looked-for letter arrived, and it contained no reference to what I had anticipated. I felt truly ashamed that I had permitted a dream to influence me, and thought no more about it.

"A fortnight later another letter from my sister came in, bearing an apology for not having told me in her last what a narrow escape from death our Harry had experienced, and then went on to detail what I had dreamed, with an additional piece of intelligence that just as his head had dropped on the person supporting him, and he was supposed to be dead, the piece of meat passed down his throat, and he shortly after revived, and was quite well at the time of her writing."

"That boy is now a minister of the Gospel, and about a year ago I was talking with him about my strange dream, when a friend who was present said to him, 'Do you remember what you thought about when you were choking?' He replied, 'Yes, I distinctly remember thinking, I wonder what my mother will do when she hears I am dead.'"

In answer to our inquiries, Mrs. Hobbs says:—

"July 24th, 1884.

"I have not had any other dream of a like kind. I am not able to say how near in time the dream was to the event; but that it was very near to the event is clear from the fact that I reckoned up the earliest time when I could get any information from England, supposing that the dream really pointed to anything; and though no news came to the time expected, yet the *next* letter that came apologised for not having mentioned it in the *former* letter. So that the space between the event and the dream would be, at most, the space between the dream and the next mail leaving England for India."

Mr. Hobbs says:—

"So far as I am concerned in the above account, written by my wife, Jane Ann Hobbs, I declare it to be quite correct.

"WILLIAM AYERS HOBBS."

The following account is from the son, who is a Baptist minister at Tenbury.

"July 29th, 1884.

"I remember that I had a sharp, short struggle for breath, accompanied by a bursting sensation in the head and singing in the ears; then I rolled over; the pain in the head was succeeded by a drowsy, dreamy feeling; a mist gathered before my eyes, and I was just on the point of losing consciousness, when the persistent thumps, which were being administered to my back by the anxious spectators, jerked the beef out of my throat, and I revived. I had no direct thought of my mother, as I imagine, for this reason: I was left in the care of an aunt, when my parents went to India; and as the whole of my training since I was four years old had been undertaken by this aunt, prior to my going to Birmingham, it was to her that my thoughts reverted when I was choking; and I distinctly remember that the thought flashed through my mind, 'How ever will Aunt Maria write to India about this.' I quite believed I was dying.

"H. V. HOBBS."

[In conversation, Mr. Podmore ascertained that the family are in no way given to real or supposed "psychical" experiences.]

Here the unusualness of the accident, and the uniqueness and emotional vividness of the dream may, we think, be safely accepted. The

slight amount of discrepancy between the final sentences of the mother's and the son's account can hardly be held to affect the general trustworthiness of Mrs. Hobbs' narrative; and it will be noticed that the agent's account of his own thoughts harmonises specially well with the actual nature of the percipient's impression, which was that the news was conveyed to her by her sister—the very person on whom her son imagined that sad duty as devolving.

[No. 106, another dream of an accident to a son, is here omitted.]

Perils by sea are another very common subject of dreams; and where a large number of people are living a life of more than average risk, and a large number of relatives on land are living under a more or less constant sense of this risk, accidental coincidences between dreams and casualties are, of course, certain to occur. Especially will this be the case where the relatives live by the seaside, and where the very storm that destroys life on one element may disturb slumber on the other. We have quite a little collection of cases where wives or mothers of seafaring men have dreamt of fatal accidents which then proved to have actually occurred. Such incidents have not usually any claim to be considered as even *prima facie* evidence for telepathy. Every now and then, however, "sea-dreams" present an amount of correct detail that prevents us from rejecting them. [Such a case, No. 107, is here omitted.]

[The following case from the Additional Chapter belongs to this section in that the dream seems to have occurred within 12 hours of the fatal termination of the serious illness dreamt of; but the chief interest of the case is the appearance of a visual phantasm of the agent to the percipient on the following evening, but still prior to his having any knowledge of the facts.¹—ED.]

The account was obtained through the kindness of Mrs. Walwyn, of 9, Sion Hill, Clifton, Bristol, who has known the narrator from a boy.

" February 24th, 1886.

(701) " ' I dreamed that Maggie, my sister-in-law, had been taken seriously ill. The next evening, when I went into the dining-room to have my usual smoke previous to going to bed, just after I entered the room, Maggie suddenly appeared, dressed in white, with a most heavenly expression on her face. She fixed her eyes on me, walked round the room, and disappeared through the door which leads into the garden. I felt I could not speak; but followed her. On opening the door and outside shutter nothing was to be seen. I vouch for the truth of this.

" ' H. E. M.' "

Mr. M.'s mother writes to Mrs. Walwyn :—

" H. and his wife were in England in the autumn, and returned on the 9th November. They had been visiting the parents in L.—General and Mrs. R. They left the next younger sister apparently in her usual health. On Friday, the 20th, she was at the theatre with friends. At 1 a.m. she was seized with violent internal pains; these continued all day, but no danger was apprehended till 4.45 p.m., when she became insensible, and

¹ Compare case 283, where the hallucination preceded the dream. For cases where a hallucination has been itself repeated after an interval, see 184, 213, 240.

at 5.15 all was over. The cause of death, 'perforation of the stomach.' On the Saturday night H. dreamt that Maggie had been taken dangerously ill; the next evening when he went into the dining-room as usual to have his smoke previous to going to bed, just after he entered the room Maggie suddenly appeared to him. [Mrs. M.'s description of the appearance exactly coincides with her son's account.]

"He told me in the morning what had happened. I tried to persuade him it was only an optical delusion, but he knew better. Why the apparition should have come to H. is most extraordinary, for he was not in the least superstitious, nervous, or fanciful. The only way we can account for it is that the telegram which the General sent off on Sunday never reached us, and it was actually Wednesday, the day of the funeral, before we heard the sad news, and she might have known this and come to tell us that she was gone.

"R. L. M."

We find from an obituary in the *Leamington News* that Miss R. died on 21st November, 1885, and that she "remained perfectly conscious until 5 o'clock, when she suddenly collapsed and died in a quarter of an hour."

§ 5. In the following group the reality is not only presented in a pictorial way, but the dream-scene corresponds (in whole or in part) with what the eyes of the supposed agent are actually beholding. The majority, perhaps, of the alleged dream-cases are of this pictorial sort; but most of them have to be set aside, on the ground either of inaccuracy of detail, or of the connection of the dream with matters that have been recently occupying the waking mind. Thus a widow whose husband was killed by an accident at sea gives a circumstantial account of her coincident dream—"a vessel, like her husband's, wholly dismasted—the bare hull merely—being lowered by ropes down a beach, and all the crew assisting"; and declares that the scene of her dream was *exactly what was described* in the letter which afterwards brought her the news. It appears, however, that the narrator had never seen the actual ship; and inspection of the letter shows that, except the dismasting, the details of the dream had no counterpart whatever in reality. Thus all that remains is the simple coincidence of the dream and the death; and such coincidences, in the case of casualties at sea, must, as we have seen, be generally excluded. We apply this rule even where the date of the dream has been immediately noted in a diary, and where we have every assurance that it was unique in the dreamer's experience. Again, Mrs. Barter, of Careystown, Whitegate, Co. Cork, has kindly given us an account of a dream which she had at the time of the Indian Mutiny. She seemed to see her husband, then adjutant in the 75th Foot, wounded, and in the act of binding up his leg with his puggeree, when four men of his regiment lifted him up and took him into a battery. "I at once wrote it to him and, in reply to my letter, heard that such an event had actually taken place." The coincidence was extremely close, and Colonel Barter, C.B., has confirmed the account. He was carried into a battery by four sergeants; and he is nearly sure that his wife mentioned *sergeants* in her first account of her dream. But, on being specially asked as to the puggeree, he stated that he bound up his leg not with a puggeree, but with a black silk necktie. This defect, combined with the fact that Mrs. Barter was in a nervous state, and had another disturbing and quite unveridical dream about her

husband during the same campaign, prevents us from allowing weight to the correspondence. So, again, Mrs. Powles, of Wadhurst, West Dulwich, has given us an account of a dream which her late husband narrated to her at the time, in which he saw his brother, Dr. Ralph Holden, who was exploring in the interior of Africa, lying under a large tree, supported by a man, and either dead or dying. They learnt from another explorer, Mr. Green, that Dr. Holden had died at just about that time, under a large tree, in the arms of his native servant; and Mr. Holden recognised the scene of his dream in a sketch of the spot which Mr. Green had taken. But—to say nothing of the indefiniteness of the time-coincidence—the *entourage* is such as the idea of the death of an African traveller might readily enough suggest, quite apart from telepathy; and the sight of the sketch would be precisely calculated to give spurious retrospective definiteness to the dream-scene. And once more, a most vivid dream (with a remarkable amount of correct detail, as well as several important discrepancies) in which a coachman, sleeping at a distance from his stables, saw a pony taken out, harnessed, and then after a time brought back, on the one single night on which this ever actually happened, has been dismissed, as too much connected with the dreamer's normal train of ideas; though his master (Mr. J. S. Dismorr, of Thelcrest Lodge, Gravesend) and another witness both testify to the fact that the dream was described before the reality was known.

The following cases seem free from these objections, there having been no cause for anxiety on the percipient's part, and nothing to suggest the scene.

[Of the three cases then quoted two, 108 and 110, are here omitted.]

For the next case we are indebted to Mrs. Swithinbank, of Ormleigh, Mowbray Road, Upper Norwood, who is well acquainted with Mrs. Fleming, the narrator.

“October 17th, 1882.

(109) “Three years ago when staying at Ems for my health, one morning after having my bath, I was resting on the sofa reading. A slight drowsiness came over me and I distinctly saw the following:—

“My husband, who was then in England, appeared to me riding down the lane leading to my father's house. Suddenly the horse grew restive, then plunged and kicked, and finally unseated his rider, throwing him violently to the ground. I jumped up hastily, thinking I had been asleep; and on my going down to luncheon I related to a lady who was seated next to me what I had seen, and made the remark, ‘I hope all is well at home.’ My friend, seeing I was anxious, laughed and told me not to be superstitious, and so I forgot the incident, until 2 days afterwards I received a letter from home saying my husband had been thrown from his horse and had dislocated his shoulder. The time and place of the accident exactly agreed with my vision.

“LAURA FLEMING.”

[Asked whether she can recall other dreams of a similarly vivid and realistic kind, Mrs. Fleming answers in the negative.]

Such incidents as these really belong to the class which may be described as *clairvoyant*, and which I am reserving for the end of the chapter; but I have brought forward these few examples for the sake of a special

observation. In all the earlier dream-cases of this chapter, the rôle of the percipient was purely *passive*; the impression received by him was apparently a direct and literal reproduction in whole or in part, of what was, or had been, consciously in the agent's mind. But these last narratives have introduced the same difference as appeared in the concluding cases of Chapter VI: though the scene which the dreamer pictured was the very one in which the agent was, the agent's own figure, with which his own attention was certainly not occupied, appeared in the dream. If, therefore, this part of the percept was transferred ready-made (so to speak) from the agent's mind, it must have been from a subconscious part of his mind. Such a view would present no serious difficulty; for probably every one, after early childhood, retains at the background of his mind a dim realisation of his own personality in connection with his outer aspect; and we have had proofs that a person may transmit an idea of which he is at the moment quite unaware.¹ At the same time, the cases where the agent's figure appears are equally suggestive of another explanation, and one which will prove of the highest importance in the sequel. They bring us to the point where we may suppose that the percipient is often *himself* the source of a great part of what he seems to perceive; that he is no longer passively receptive of the impression which comes to him from without, but actively modifies and elaborates it. Thus, granted an idea of the agent to be transmitted, the appearance of the agent's figure in the telepathic picture will be no more remarkable than that, on reading a friend's name in a letter, I should be able instantly to project his image on my mental camera. It is only, however, in the next group of cases that this new rôle of the percipient becomes obvious.

§ 6. It will be useful at this juncture to recall the more familiar ways in which dreams are shaped. We all know that physical disturbances—whether of sound, or light, or cold, or touch—will excite dreams, in which the disturbance appears as an element, sometimes without undergoing any change, sometimes in some transfigured but still quite recognisable form. Now in such cases we of course trace the dream to the externally-produced impression; but the impression is a mere nucleus, which the dreaming mind embodies, it may be, in a long and complicated series of self-spun fancies, and which twenty dreaming minds would embody in twenty different ways. So with mental disturbances; a recent sorrow, or exciting work overnight, is as effective a nucleus as a knock at the door or an uncomfortable posture. The established idea works on, amid the floating crowd of images which are the potential material of dreams, and attracts a certain number of them into a more or less grotesque connection with itself.

There will thus be little difficulty in supposing that a percipient whom a strong "transferred impression" invades in his sleep may similarly combine it with his own dream-imagery. We have no reason to imagine his own activity to be suspended, or his mind made a *tabula rasa* for foreign images. We should not, therefore, demand of telepathic dreams any sober and literal transcription of actual events. We should rather expect

¹ See pp. 63, 67-8, 82-92, 362-3

to find the ordinary dream elements, the medley of images, the impossibilities and incongruities, no less prominent here than elsewhere. The root idea being given by the "transferred impression," it may then become the sport of irresponsible fancy, which develops it either in some haphazard way, or in accordance with the dreamer's habitual lines of thought or emotion; so that the real event is announced either in a manner typically dream-like and fantastic, or oftener, perhaps, in a manner which is to some extent symbolic.

I will begin with cases where the element thus supplied is of the slightest possible amount. In the following three examples [111, 112, 113] the dreamer may be supposed simply to give the most obvious auditory form to the impression received; though in the second and third it is, no doubt, equally possible to suppose a direct auditory transfer, as in some of the experimental cases. [Only the second of the three examples is here quoted. It is] from the late Mr. George Gouldrick, of 16, Union Street, Hereford.

" 1883.

(112) " In the month of April, 1876, I dreamt that an invalid, named Mary Scaffull, widow, an inmate of Johnson's Hospitals, Commercial Road, Hereford (and whose husband had been an officer in the gaol of which I was governor), was crying out for water; it appeared to have been a long dream, and the cry seemed to be kept up for some time. When I was sitting at breakfast with my family next morning, I asked my wife when she had seen Mrs. Scaffull last; she replied, 'Some 9 days ago. I took her a rice pudding; I could not get into the house, the door being locked. I therefore had to leave it at her sister's, who was living in the neighbourhood, with a request that when she went to see her she would take it to her; the dish has been returned, therefore I conclude she had the contents. Why, what is the matter, you seem troubled about her?' I then told her my dream, and said, 'I have determined to go after breakfast and see what state she is in.' She answered, 'I am glad to hear you say so.'

" As I approached the house, I could hear a cry of distress proceeding from some one of the inmates of the hospitals. I put my finger on the latch of the door occupied by Mrs. Scaffull, when I heard the following supplication proceed from her in the most distressing tone: 'Will some kind Christian friend give me some water?' I took a jug from her lower room, went to the pump and filled it, and then took it with all haste to her bedside. When she saw me there with the water she said, 'Oh, Mr. Gouldrick, the Lord has sent you here, God Almighty bless you for bringing me this water.' She then drank copiously of it, and said, 'It's the sweetest water I ever tasted all my life long.' She died the same week, at the age of 77 years.

" GEO. GOULDRICK."

Mr. Gouldrick's daughter corroborates as follows:—

" December 11th, 1883.

" I was present at the breakfast-table when my father related his dream. I remember all that happened, and can therefore corroborate all he has written. My mother has since died. She was present also, and we expressed our astonishment when he returned home and told us what had happened. The only reason I am aware of that the neighbours (who heard all) did not attend to her cry, was that she was in receipt of 7s. per week more than they were, and that caused an ill-feeling towards her.

" HANNAH GOULDRICK."

And now we come to the large and important group where the perceptive forms a very distinct picture of the agent, whose figure and aspect (sometimes with the addition of speech) is not a mere element in a scene, but the one thing prominently represented. I will still keep for a time to simple cases, where the mental image that is conjured up corresponds pretty closely to the reality. [No. 114, a death case, is omitted.]

The next case is from Mrs. Fielding, of Yarlington Rectory, Bath, who was also the narrator of cases 90 and 700, above.

“ January, 1884.

(115) “ I some time ago had rather a remarkable vision, but it was of the living. I have an only son, about 20, always in robust health, then in lodgings in London. Never were mother and son more to one another than we are. One night I awoke heartbroken by seeing him in bed very ill. I stood weeping by his bed, lifting his white face in my two hands, and saying he must be dying. On my husband waking I told him it all, and those at breakfast next morning, and said, ‘ Let us see if it’s only a dream.’ A week passed, and my usual letter did not come from my son. After a time one came saying he had been ill in bed a week, too ill to let me know, and the landlady had nursed him through it.

“ JANE E. FIELDING.”

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Fielding adds :—

“ I found my son’s letter telling of the illness I spoke of, and find it was written on the 15th July, 1882, a Saturday, and my *vision-dream*—for it was too distinct for a common dream ; yet I was not wide awake, and could not vouch I had seen the picture *consciously*, yet it was most real—took place either on the night of 12th or 13th July, and I find both my husband and son-in-law remember my speaking of it, though the dates escape them. I now quote from my son’s letter : ‘ I go back to the City on Monday, but I thought it was no use telling you, to make you anxious, of my attack of quinsy till I was better ; and the doctor and my landlady nursed me most carefully, and now I can swallow.’ It has much pain, this complaint, and it was that look of pain I saw on his face in my vision that gave me such pain. I can swear to the vision having been before the letter came. Were I in the *least* dubious, I should be the first to say so, having a glimpse of the meaning of the word *science*. I can’t recall any other such ‘ clear-seeing.’ I never had a dream like this before.”

I have seen Mrs. Fielding’s letter to her son, dated Monday July 24th, in which she says, “ On Thursday morning [*i.e.*, July 13th] when I came down to breakfast, I said to Tom and Arthur [her son-in-law with whom she now lives], ‘ I hope Charlie is well ; for I had such a queer dream of finding him lying in bed on his face, and when I turned it round, it was ghastly pale and ill-looking—and I was so sighing all day after, and expected to hear, as I did, you were ill.’ Now that’s funny ! Shows how our souls are closely united. Arthur is just saying to me he ‘ quite remembers my telling him my dream.’ ”

[This practically proves that Mrs. Fielding is accurate in saying that her dream was described before the news was known. But the force of the coincidence is of course weakened by the fact that the illness extended over several days.]

In the next case the form of a vision—a figure at the bedside—suggests not so much a genuine dream as the sort of semi-waking hallucination

which will be considered in the next chapter (compare also Mr. Wingfield's case, p. 142). The narrator is Mrs. L. H. Saunders, of St. Helen's, near Ryde, who was concerned in case 44.

" March 18th, 1885.

(116) " Towards morning of the 10th January, 1885, I was conscious of a young woman standing by my bedside clad in a grey dressing-gown, holding in her arms, towards me, a child. The woman was weeping bitterly, and said, ' Oh ! Mrs. Saunders, I am in such trouble.' I instantly recognised her as Mrs. C. R. Seymour, and was about to interrogate her as to her trouble, when I was awakened by my husband asking me what was the matter, as I seemed so distressed. I told him I had had such a sad dream about poor Fanny Goodall (maiden name of Mrs. C. R. S.), but it really was to me more than a dream—so much so, that after rising I communicated it to the governess, Miss Monkman, also to the nurse and servant. I decided to send to her mother, Mrs. Goodall, to inquire if she had received any tidings of her daughter, who was resident in New Zealand with her husband and two children, but as on after consideration I felt I might cause her alarm, I altered my intention. This dream or vision made so deep and lasting an impression that I constantly alluded to it to members of our household, until circumstances occasioned my calling on Mrs. Goodall about the beginning of this month, March, 1885, when I made particular inquiries for her daughter ; and on being assured that she was well, according to letters by the most recent mail, I ventured to express my gratification, giving, as my reason for such, a narration of the ' vision ' that had not even then ceased to haunt me ; which elicited from Mrs. Goodall and both of her daughters, who were present, fervent hopes that all was well with Mrs. Seymour.¹

" On March 12th I again called on Mrs. Goodall, who on receiving me, with much emotion said, ' Oh, have you heard the bad news of Fanny ? I have thought so much of what you told me ; her dear little Dottie has gone. I will read you her letters,' both of which, although coming by different mails, had only been received within the past 24 hours. I should mention that, although I have felt very interested in and thought much of Mrs. C. R. S. before and since her departure from this country, yet I have never corresponded with her ; but I now learn that she invariably mentioned me in her home correspondence, and felt much indebted to me for some trifling kindness I had been able to show her in the past. I am able to fix the date of my vision from circumstances which I need not here relate.

" BESSIE SAUNDERS."

The force of the coincidence seems not much affected one way or the other by the following addition :—

" In reply to your question, I have had distressing dreams relating to death at intervals, which have not corresponded with reality ; but those you are already cognisant of [*viz.*, this one and another which corresponded with reality²] are the only ones which impressed themselves sufficiently to induce me to take steps to discover if they did correspond with the reality, although I may have mentioned their purport casually at the time."

¹ This has been completely confirmed by letters from Mrs. Goodall and her two daughters.

² In this second case (as to which we again have Mr. Saunders's testimony to the fact that the dream was described before the reality was known) the dream was that a friend alighted from a hearse, and entered clad in deep mourning ; and it fell on the night on which that friend's mother, whom she was attending, unexpectedly died.

Mr. Latimer H. Saunders writes :—

“ March 18th, 1885.

“ I clearly remember on or about the 10th of January, 1885, early morning, suddenly awaking, and finding my wife leaning forward in bed. I asked her, ‘ What was the matter ? ’ She seemed agitated, and replied to the following effect : ‘ Oh, I have had such a horrid dream ! Fanny Goodall was standing here at my side, quite close, holding out the child in *such* distress, but I could not tell what she wanted ; it was so real, I could have touched her, but you awoke me.’ Before rising, my wife repeated the incident in detail. Late on March 12th, she told me the sequel.

“ Fortunately, I can safely fix the date as being the morning of either the 9th, 10th, or 11th of January, as during that month these were, owing to circumstances, the *only possible* occasions on which the incident, as related, could have occurred, while my mental impression, *independently* arrived at, strongly points to the 10th as the day.

“ LATIMER H. SAUNDERS.”

Miss E. A. Monkman, in a letter to Mrs. Saunders (dated 16, Castle-dine Road, Anerley, 16th March, 1885), of which I have seen a copy, gives exactly similar testimony as to Mrs. Saunders’s description of her dream at the time, and adds that it must have been on the 9th or 10th of the month. And on March 20th, a servant in the house, unprompted (as Mrs. Saunders assures us), dictated the following statement :—

“ I remember Saturday morning, the 10th of January last. The mistress came into the kitchen to speak about the flue. After doing so she told me of such a bad dream she had had of Mrs. Seymour, of New Zealand, coming to her bedside with her little child in her arms. Mrs. Seymour was crying so bitterly, and imploring her for help.—E. DAWSON.”

The following is an extract from a letter received from Mrs. Seymour by Mrs. Goodall, dated January 15th, 1885.

“ I do not know how to write it, mother. Dottie is dead ; a week ago this very Thursday evening she was taken ill, and on Saturday at 10 minutes to 10 in the evening she died.”

[Allowing for longitude, the dream must have preceded the death by a few hours.]

[Cases 117, 118, 119, 120, 121 are omitted.]

The next two cases are from Mrs. Freese, of Granite Lodge, Chislehurst. The occurrence of several such experiences to the same person is in itself a point of interest, provided that that person’s recollection as to their having been of an exceptionally vivid and disturbing character can be relied on.

[The first of these, 122, is omitted.]

“ March, 1884.

(123) “ In September, 1881, I had another curious dream, so vivid that I seemed to *see* it.

“ My two boys of 18 and 16 were staying in the Black Forest, under the care of a Dr. Fresenius. I must say here that I always supposed the boys would go everywhere together, and I never should have supposed that in that lonely country, so new to them, they would be out after dark. My husband and I were staying at St. Leonards, and on Saturday night I woke at about 12 o’clock (rather before, as I heard it strike), having just

seen vividly a dark night on a mountain, and my eldest boy lying on his back at the bottom of some steep place, his eyes wide open and saying, 'Good-bye, mother and father, I shall never see you again.' I woke with a feeling of anxiety, and the next morning when I told it to my husband, though we both agreed it was absurd to be anxious, yet we would write and tell the boys we hoped they would never go out alone after dark. To my surprise my eldest boy, to whom I wrote the dream, wrote back expressing his great astonishment, for on that Saturday night he was coming home over the mountains, past 11 o'clock; it was pitch dark, and he slipped and fell down some 12 feet or so, and landed on his back, looking up to the sky. However, he was not much hurt and soon picked himself up and got home all right. He did not say what thoughts passed through his mind as he fell.

"OCTAVIA FREESE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Freese adds:—

"Before my son wrote about his fall in the Black Forest, I related my dream to my husband, and as he seemed a little moved by it, I wrote an account of it to my boy, saying his father did not wish them to be out after dark alone. I had not told my boy *when* it was, deeming that immaterial, but when in his letter, received days after, he said, 'Was it Saturday night?' because then so-and-so, I remembered what I should not otherwise have noted, that it was Saturday night; for on the Sunday morning my husband, being much worried about some business matter, elected to spend the morning with me in the fields instead of going to church, and as much to divert his mind as anything I related to him my dream of the night before."

Mrs. Freese sent us the letter from her son, which contained the following passage:—

"With regard to your dream: did you dream it on September 3rd? if so it was on that night, coming home rather late, that I fell down a precipice of 8 feet, or perhaps more, in the dark, and might have broken my neck, but didn't. However, I don't think you will find me walking about after dark more than I can help, as the roads are very dark, and the fogs in the village awful.

"FRED E. FREESE."

[September 3rd, 1881, was a Saturday.]

Mr. Freese writes:—

"March 17th, 1884.

"Mrs. Freese has read to me the paper she has sent you, and I feel bound to say that both the dreams she refers to concerning myself [*i.e.*, No. 122], and our eldest son I well remember, and noted them at the time she described them, together with the circumstances that strangely accompanied them.

"J. W. FREESE."

In answer to the question whether he noted them *in writing*, Mr. Freese replies that he did not. "It *struck* me at the time as very remarkable, but life was then with me too busy to leave time to dwell upon the subject."

§ 7. In the foregoing examples the elements with which the dreamer may be supposed to have invested the telepathic impression have been few and simple. We now come to cases where definitely new elements have been introduced, and the impression which corresponds with reality acts as the germ of a quite imaginary dream-picture. [The first two, 124, 125, are omitted.]

In the next case, a definite scene is depicted, suggestive of death and appropriate to the person who had actually died ; but everything beyond the true impression of the death is supplied by the dreamer. The narrator is Mrs. Herbert Bolland (*née* Cary, granddaughter of the translator of Dante), of 7, Cranbury Terrace, Southampton. The experience was quite unique in her life, and exemplifies—what will be suggested by other cases—a possible effect of illness in heightening the percipient faculty.

“ July, 1884.

(126) “ In September, 1879, I was in B——s, and laid up with a rather sharp attack of fever, kept to my room, and seeing no one. In the middle of one night I was awoke, as was my husband also, by a most piercing shriek ; he knew it was I who had cried aloud, whilst I had then no idea of it. But I began to tell him that I had been dreaming his sister was teasing me, and I looked up and saw (and as I came to that point I was again seized with horror) a tall man, dead, being carried, with his hair, which was very thick, falling back from his face. The figure impressed me with the idea of being upheld by four men, but I did not see any of them. I knew the figure at once, and kept saying, ‘ The Colonel’s dead, the Colonel’s dead,’ and it was an hour or two before my husband could calm me, and I could go to sleep again. At last I did so, however, and the next sound we heard was the servant knocking at our door, and calling out, ‘ Get up, sir, the Colonel’s dead ; you’re wanted.’

“ Colonel F. had died after a short illness, of which I knew nothing at all. My husband thought he had a cold, but had not named it to me or been anxious about it himself, and, as far as I was concerned, my acquaintance with him was of the slightest, so that if I had been told he had a cold, I should not have thought about it again.

“ I may add that I have said many times, when asked to explain it, I believe it was caused by Major White, who was with the F.’s, thinking of us, and what a shock it would be, as my husband was the only other R.E. officer there, and would have to arrange for the funeral next day. That was what seemed to me likely, because I have noticed all my life that I frequently speak of the subjects which are in the thoughts of my friends and companions without any apparent cause, and have been accustomed to speak of it as the result of ‘ my sixth sense,’ because I did not know what else to call it. It has often been a subject of annoyance to me in one way, which was that, with one very dear friend, our letters invariably crossed (though very infrequently written), so that we never felt as if we had an answer. She complained, and so did I, but we could not alter it.

“ KATE E. BOLLAND.”

We find from the Army List that Colonel F. died on September 7th, 1879.

The following is from Lieut.-Colonel Bolland, R.E. :—

“ July 20th, 1884.

“ With regard to Colonel F., I cannot say I remember that Mrs. Bolland mentioned his name, though she may have done so ; but having awoke me with a terrific scream at about 1 a.m., on the 8th September, 1879 (which I think was the date), she told me she had been dreaming of my sister, and when looking up to speak to her, she saw a tall man, dead, being carried by four other men, his head dropping, and long, thick hair falling back.

“ She was terribly frightened, and it was some time before we again

got to sleep. The next sound I heard was the servant knocking at my door, and calling out, 'Get up, sir, you are wanted; the Colonel is dead!' I had known Colonel F. was ill, but had not thought seriously of it, nor had I named it to my wife, who had herself been ill some days with denzie fever. If I had thought of his illness at all, it would have been without any anxiety, as I had heard he was better, and able to lie on the sofa. It is now some years since these things happened, and I may not be correct in my remembrance of all details; but as to both the waking¹ and the sleeping impressions being named to me before the events which they seemed to have indicated were known, or could be known to us in any ordinary way, I am positive.

"G. HERBERT BOLLAND."

In conversation with the present writer, Colonel Bolland spontaneously referred to the extraordinary character of the scream.

Colonel Bolland's account suggested some doubt in his mind as to whether his wife had actually *identified* the dead man before the news of the death was known, and this point was accordingly inquired about. In his reply, Colonel Bolland mentioned that for some time past his hearing has been somewhat imperfect and uncertain, and he continues:—

"I can safely say that Mrs. Bolland, from the time of the event, has always said she said, 'It is the Colonel,' and I have never told her that I did not hear her, never doubting but that she said it. She, however, is much surprised that I never mentioned the fact of not having heard it. Her description at the time left no doubt in my own mind that it was Colonel F. She said she saw a long (or perhaps tall) man being carried, with his long hair falling back. Colonel F. wore his hair long for a military man of the present day, so the short description she gave me identified the man, as long hair is so rarely worn by military men. We may even have discussed whether it was he, but I don't remember her saying almost at once, 'It is the Colonel.' My wife has a very much better memory for conversations than I have, so that I will not undertake to say that we did not discuss, between 1 a.m. and 6 a.m., whether or not it was Colonel F.; but I am certain I did not hear my wife say at once, immediately after her short description of the dream, 'It is the Colonel,' but she may have said it without my hearing it. Mrs. Bolland is so minutely accurate in repeating a conversation that I feel sure her version is much more to be relied on than my own."

And Mrs. Bolland adds:—

"July 27th, 1884.

"As regards my own opinion of what happened after my dream about Colonel F., I have not, nor ever had, any doubt that it was he I saw. I can see the whole scene before me now, as I saw it then, and I cannot get over my impression that I mentioned his name at once, or rather, as soon as I came upon the recollection of what had made me scream. I think I have told you that although my own scream awoke me, I did not at once know that I had been frightened, or that I had cried out. But in describing my dream to my husband, I suddenly came upon the picture again, and then I was so frightened it was some time before I could get over it."

[I received by pure accident a confirmation of the fact that Mrs. Bolland mentioned Colonel F. at the moment. I was sitting at tea with Colonel and Mrs. Bolland; and the conversation turning on telepathy, but

¹ This refers to another case, No. 201, below.

no mention having been made of the above case, a sister of Colonel Bolland's, who was present, suddenly said to Mrs. Bolland, "Do you remember about that time when you called out, 'There's the Colonel?'" It turned out that she remembered these words as having occurred in a letter from Mrs. Bolland, which described the incident immediately after its occurrence; and neither of them could recall that the subject had been afterwards talked of between them.]

We come now to cases where a distinctly fantastic element appears; the reality is bodied forth in a dream-scene which has no relation to actual possibilities.

The following case is remarkable in that there were *two* percipients, for one of whom the distant event was embodied in a fantastic, and for the other in a more normal, manner. The doubling of the experience of course enormously increases the improbability that the coincidence was accidental; but it is open to us to suppose that only one of the dreams was directly connected with the absent friend, and that this dream produced the other, on the analogy of some of the cases of simultaneous dreaming already given.¹ Miss Varah, of 40, James Street, Cowley Road, Oxford, writes:—

"January, 1885.

(127) "A friend of mine, Mr. Adams, was seriously ill, and we were expecting his death. I had a dream that I saw the corpse of his wife laid out upon a bed, though we had no reason to suppose that she was even ill. A friend with whom I was staying also dreamed that she saw Mrs. Adams a corpse. [This is not accurate.] The morning's post brought news of her dangerous illness, and a telegram during the morning announced her death. My friend and I told each other our dreams in the morning at breakfast. My friend had called for her letters before coming down in the morning, fearing bad news.

"MARIANNE VARAH."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Varah tells us that Mrs. Adams died between 11 and 1, on the night of February 25th, 1876, and we find the 25th given as the date in an obituary notice in the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*; but she does not know the exact hour of her dream. She adds, "The dream described is the only one I believe I ever had of the kind."

Miss Varah's friend, the late Mrs. Muller, wrote as follows:—

"8, Bevington Road, Oxford.

"January, 1885.

"I dreamed that I was at Hastings, on the shore. I saw my friend, Miss Adams, running towards me. She passed me by, and then took off her hat and bent her head down into the sea. I tried to grasp her by her clothes, but she cried out, 'Don't stop me, for my mother is dying.' In the morning I jumped out of bed on hearing the post, and said to Marianne Varah, 'Have you had a letter from Miss Adams? There must be something the matter with her mother.' Miss Varah answered, 'I have a letter, but have not opened it. I have had a very strange dream, but I thought nothing of it, because Mr. Adams is so ill.' Miss Varah then opened her letter, and called out, 'You are right.' There were a few lines, 'My mother is dangerously ill: doctors say no hope. We will send a telegram.' The telegram came during the morning of

¹ This alternative will be considered in Chap. xviii., on "Collective Cases."

February 24th [clearly a mistake for 26th], 1876, saying she was dead. She had been in perfect health the day before.

"Neither Miss Varah nor myself are at all given to dreams, and had not till then believed in them at all.

"EMILY E. MULLER."

[In case 128, which is omitted] the dreamer's mind embodied the idea of death in the figure of a long deceased relative. More commonly the imagery in such cases is drawn from the familiar earthly symbols of death—coffins, funeral processions, and graves. A few examples may be given here [129 and 130 omitted].

In the following cases the imagery of death is still more elaborately developed. Mrs. Hilton, a lady actively engaged in most practical work, and not in the least a "visionary," has given us the following accounts:—

"234, Burdett Road, E.

"April 10th, 1883.

(131) "The dream which I am about to relate occurred about 2 years ago. I seemed to be walking in a country road, with high grassy banks on either side. Suddenly I heard the tramp of many feet. Feeling a strange sense of fear, I called out, 'Who are these people coming?' A voice above me replied, 'A procession of the dead.' I then found myself on the bank, looking into the road where the people were walking, five or six abreast. Hundreds of them passed by me—neither looking aside nor looking at each other. They were people of all conditions and in all ranks of life. I saw no children amongst them. I watched the long line of people go away into the far distance, but I felt no special interest in any of them, until I saw a middle-aged Friend, dressed as a gentleman farmer. I pointed to him and called out, 'Who is that, please?' He turned round and said in a loud voice, 'I am John M., of Chelmsford.' Then my dream ended. Next day, when my husband returned from his office he told me that John M., of Chelmsford, had died the previous day.

"I may add that I only knew the Friend in question by sight and cannot recollect ever speaking to him."

We find from a newspaper obituary that J. M.'s death took place on January 14th, 1880.

(132) "About a year ago, I had a dream very similar to the preceding one. The locality was the same. The only difference was that I was standing in the road, trying to prevent a little girl from joining the procession. The lady, in whose charge the child was and who was standing by me in the road, said, 'I am giving her into the charge of Charles P., of Darlington,' mentioning the name of a well-known member of the Society of Friends. I replied, 'That is not Charles P.' I called out as before, 'Who are you, please?' A young man in the procession turned round and said, 'I am J. G.' Next morning I heard that J. G. had died rather suddenly in the night. I knew this young man, but not intimately, and I had not seen him for months.

"Again, a third time, I found myself in the same place, but my terror was so extreme, that I kneeled on the bank and prayed that I might not witness the march of the dead. Instantly I was removed, and the tramp of the terrible procession ceased. I never discovered that anyone whom I knew died at the time of this last dream.

"In each of these three dreams I seemed to be under the influence and dread of some unseen power.

"MARIE HILTON."

In answer to inquiries as to the first of these cases, Mrs. Hilton says :—

“ I did not know that John M. was ill, and had not even heard his name mentioned ; I could not trace any reason why he should have been in my thoughts.”

In answer to inquiries as to the second case, she says :—

“ I recognised the little girl as the child of a friend. I had not heard anything about the child to make me dream of her. Charles P. had been dead for some years at the date of the dream.”

The absence of any ascertained coincidence on the third occasion might be represented as an argument for regarding the correspondence on the two previous occasions as accidental, but it would be a very weak one ; since even if the dream had recurred a thousand times, the chances against the accidental occurrence of two such coincidences would still remain enormous. The tendency on the dreamer's part to symbolise death in one particular way is neither against nor in favour of the telepathic explanation.¹

While on the subject of symbolic dreams, I may observe that many persons profess to have a particular recurrent dream, which in itself has no obvious relation to death, but which proves in fact to coincide more or less closely with deaths or other calamities that affect them. I need hardly say that such statements have no evidential value, unless we can be sure that they are more than the loose assertions of persons who see no importance in noting misses as well as hits, and to whom it is no difficulty in the way of the supposed correspondence that the two events were separated perhaps by a month's interval. In most of such cases, indeed, the dream precedes the event and is professedly taken as a “ warning ” ; so that, however well attested, they could have no place in this book.

§ 8. I pass now to the final class of cases, where the dreamer seems, as it were, to be transported to the actual scene of the event. These cases, like the final cases of the 6th chapter, cannot but suggest certain phenomena of the waking state which are other than those of thought-transference—the phenomena of so-called *clairvoyance*. But I must again draw attention to the radical differences in the phenomena which that word may be made to cover. There are certain alleged facts of waking clairvoyance which, if true, would drive us to the conclusion that the percipient's powers of vision were independent of the thoughts, either actually passing or latent, in the minds of others. No doubt very many facts have been loosely ascribed to clairvoyance, which we should now regard as simple examples of thought-transference. This has been owing partly to the blindness of writers on clairvoyance to the enormous difficulties which the assumption of such a faculty involves ; but still more to the lack, until lately, of accurate experiments in thought-transference. But there remain facts which—if the testimony of Robert Houdin and other

¹ It is worth noting that these dreams—for all their *bizarrie*—seem to belong to a known type. Our friend, Mr. J. A. Symonds, has given us an account of a Swiss *Todten-Volk-Seher*, who sees a procession of the dead going along a path with a high bank on one side.

experts can be trusted—no possible extension of the theory of thought-transference will cover; and in which, though the particular result obtained depended in some manner on the particular person who sought to obtain it, the range of perception altogether transcended the past or present contents of that person's mind. Now with such cases as these we have nothing to do in the present work. Even should some of the examples to be adduced seem to take us beyond the confines of *thought-transference* in any literal sense, they will still not take us beyond the confines of *telepathy*—of a theory which implies *some* sort of influence of the mind of an agent on the mind of a percipient. The percipient may observe a scene, into the midst of which he finds himself mentally transported, with such completeness of detail, and for such a length of time, as at any rate to suggest some actual exercise on it of his own independent perceptive powers; but it will still be a scene with some principal actor in which he is in some way linked. He may see a death-bed and the surrounding mourners; but we have no sort of reason to suppose that he could similarly see *any* death-bed. There has, at any rate, been an *agent*, in the sense of a particular person whose *actual* presence in the scene has to be accepted as a condition of the percipient's *imagined* presence; and however novel and exceptional the way in which the percipient's range of knowledge may seem to be extended, these further glimpses still take place apparently not in any chance direction, but in a direction marked out by his previous affinities with other minds. But in fact the process need not seem so exceptional, if we recall once more the right which experiment has given us to draw on parts of the agent's mind which are below the level of ostensible consciousness. For in none of the cases to be here cited do the percipient's impressions extend beyond what has been before the *mind*—though certainly beyond what has been before the *attention*—of persons actually present at the scene. We may perhaps be led sometimes to conceive *several* of these minds as contributing to the impression. But some of the experimental results have already introduced on a small scale the notion of joint agency,¹ and may thus enable us to maintain the analogy between experimental and spontaneous telepathy in a manner which least of all might have been expected.

I may cite at once the two cases which seem the furthest removed from any of the preceding, inasmuch as the "agency" in them is specially hard to conceive. They happen to be at the two extremes of the trivial and the tragic. The first is reported by a witness—Miss Busk, of 16, Montagu Street, W.—who is strongly adverse to the telepathic theory, and holds the view that all the alleged coincidences are accidental, and that the more numerous they are, the more clearly accidental must they be.

" 1884.

(133) " I dreamt that I was walking in a wood in my father's place in Kent, in a spot well known to me, where there was sand under the firs; I stumbled over some objects, which proved to be the heads, left protruding, of some ducks buried in the sand. The idea impressed me as so

¹ See Professor Lodge's experiment, p. 41; and the remarks on M. Richet's later results, p. 64.

comical that I fortunately mentioned it at breakfast next morning, and one or two persons remember that I did so. Only an hour later it happened that the old bailiff of the place came up for some instructions unexpectedly, and as he was leaving he said he must tell us a strange thing that had happened: there had been a robbery in the farmyard, and some stolen ducks had been found buried in the sand, with their heads protruding, in the very spot where I had seen the same. The farm was underlet, and I had not even any interest in the ducks, to carry my thoughts towards them under the nefarious treatment they received. "R. H. BUSK."

Miss Busk's sister, Mrs. Pitt Byrne, who was present when this dream was told, corroborates as follows:—

"I distinctly remember, and have often since spoken of, the circumstance of Miss R. H. Busk's relating to me her dream of ducks buried in the wood, before the bailiff who reported the incident came up to town.

"J. PITT BYRNE."

The next case is remarkable for the number of points of correspondence, though the dream is typically fantastic and confused. The narrative is from Mrs. Storie, of 8, Gilmour Road, Edinburgh. It was written by her, she tells us, the day, or the day after, the news of the fatal accident arrived, merely as a relief to herself, and without an idea of any further use. She prepared an account for us in a more finished form; but it seems preferable to give the original rough notes, which she has kindly allowed us to copy. The brother in this case was a twin with herself (see p. 195).

"Hobart Town.

"July, 1874.

(134) "On the evening of the 18th July, I felt unusually nervous. This seemed to begin [with the occurrence of a small domestic annoyance] about half-past 8 o'clock. When I went to my room I even felt as if someone was there. I fancied as I stepped into bed that someone *in thought* tried to stop me. At 2 o'clock I woke from the following dream. It seemed like in dissolving views. In a twinkling of light I saw a railway and the puff of the engine. I thought, 'What's going on up there? Travelling? I wonder if any of us are travelling and I dreaming of it.' Someone unseen by me answered, 'No; something quite different—something wrong.' 'I don't like to look at these things,' I said. Then I saw behind and above my head William's upper half reclining, eyes and mouth half shut; his chest moved forward convulsively, and he raised his right arm. Then he bent forward, saying, 'I suppose I should move out of this.' Then I saw him lying, eyes shut, on the ground, flat. The chimney of an engine at his head. I called in excitement, 'That will strike him!' The 'someone' answered, 'Yes—well, here's what it was'; and immediately I saw William sitting in the open air—faint moonlight—on a raised place, sideways. He raised his right arm, shuddered, and said, 'I can't go on, or back, No.' Then he seemed lying flat. I cried out, 'Oh! Oh!' and others seemed to echo, 'Oh! Oh!' He seemed then upon his elbow, saying, 'Now it comes.' Then, as if struggling to rise, turned twice round quickly, saying, 'Is it the train? *the train, the train,*' his right shoulder reverberating as if struck from behind. He fell back like fainting; his eyes rolled. A large dark object came between us like panelling of wood, and rather in the dark something rolled over, and like an arm was thrown up, and the whole thing went away with a *swish*. Close beside me

on the ground there seemed a long dark object. I called out, 'They've left something behind, it's like a man.' It then raised its shoulders and head and fell down again. The same *someone* answered, 'Yes, sadly.' [?' Yes,' sadly.] After a moment I seemed called on to look up, and said, 'Is that *thing* not away yet?' Answered, 'No.' And in front, in light, there was a railway compartment in which sat Rev. Mr. Johnstone, of Echuce. I said, 'What's he doing there?' Answered, 'He's there.' A railway porter went up to the window asking, 'Have you seen any of —?' I caught no more, but I *thought* he referred to the *thing* left behind. Mr. Johnstone seemed to answer, 'No'; and the man went quickly away—I thought to look for it. After all this the *someone* said close to me, 'Now I'm

a tall dark figure at my head going.' I started, and at once saw William's back at my side. He put his right hand (in grief) over his face, and the other almost touching my shoulder, he crossed in front, looking stern and solemn. There was a flash from the eyes, and I caught a glimpse of a fine, pale face like ushering him along, and indistinctly another. I felt frightened, and called out, 'Is he angry?' 'O, no.' 'Is he going away?' Answered, 'Yes,' by the same *someone*, and I woke with a loud sigh, which woke my husband, who said, 'What is it?' I told him I had been dreaming 'something unpleasant'—named a 'railway,' and dismissed it all from my mind as a dream. As I fell asleep again I fancied the 'someone' said, 'It's all gone,' and another answered, 'I'll come and remind her.'

"The news reached me one week afterwards. The accident had happened to my brother on the same night about half-past 9 o'clock. Rev. Mr. Johnstone and his wife were actually in the train which struck him. He was walking along the line which is raised 2 feet on a level country. He seemed to have gone 16 miles—must have been tired and sat down to take off his boot, which was beside him, dozed off and was very likely roused by the sound of the train; 76 sheep-trucks had passed without touching him, but some wooden projection, likely the step, had touched the *right* side of his head, bruised his right shoulder, and killed him instantaneously. The night was very dark. I believe now that the *someone* was (from something in the *way* he spoke) William *himself*. The face with him was white as alabaster, and something like this [a small sketch pasted on] in profile. There were many other thoughts or words seemed to pass, but they are too many to write down here.

"The voice of the 'someone' unseen seemed *always above* the figure of William which I saw. And when I was shown the compartment of the carriage with Mr. Johnstone, the *someone* seemed on a line between me and it—*above* me."

In an account-book of Mrs. Storie's, on a page headed July, 1874, we find the 18th day marked, and the words, "Dear Willie died," and "Dreamed, dreamed of it all," appended.

The first letter, from the Rev. J. C. Johnstone to the Rev. John Storie, announcing the news of the accident, is lost. The following are extracts from his second and third letters on the subject :—

"Echuce, 10th August, 1874.

"The place where Hunter was killed is on an open plain, and there was consequently plenty of room for him to escape the train had he been conscious; but I think Meldrum's theory is the correct one, that he had sat down to adjust some bandages on his leg and had thoughtlessly gone off to sleep. There is only one line of rails, and the ground is raised about 2 feet—the ground on which the rails rest. He had probably sat

down on the edge, and lain down backwards so as to be within reach of some part of the train. It was not known at the time that an accident had occurred. Mrs. Johnstone and myself were in the train. Meldrum says he was not very much crushed. The top of the skull was struck off, and some ribs were broken, under the arm-pit on one side. His body was found on the Sunday morning by a herd-boy from the adjoining station."

"August 29th, 1874.

"The exact time at which the train struck poor Hunter must have been about 9.55 p.m., and his death must have been instantaneous."

The above corresponds with the account of the inquest in the *Riverine Herald* for July 22nd. The *Melbourne Argus* also describes the accident as having taken place on the night of Saturday, the 18th.

The following remarks are taken from notes made by Professor Sidgwick, during an interview with Mrs. Storie, in April, 1884, and by Mrs. Sidgwick, after another interview in September, 1885 :—

Mrs. Storie cannot regard the experience exactly as a dream, though she woke up from it.¹ She is sure that it did not grow more definite in recollection afterwards. She never had a series of scenes in a dream at any other time. They were introduced by a voice in a whisper, not recognised as her brother's. He had sat on the bank as he appeared in the dream. The engine she saw behind him had a chimney of peculiar shape, such as she had not at that time seen ; and she remembers that Mr. Storie thought her foolish about insisting on the chimney—unlike (he said) any which existed ; but he informed her when he came back from Victoria, where her brother was, that engines of this kind had just been introduced there. She had no reason to think that any conversation between the porter and the clergyman actually occurred. The persons who seemed to lead her brother away were not recognised by her, and she only saw the face of one of them.

Mr. Storie confirms his wife having said to him at the time of the dream, "What is that light?" Before writing the account first quoted, she had just mentioned the dream to her husband, but had not described it. She desired not to think of it, and also was unwilling to worry him about it because of his Sunday's work. This last point, it will be observed, is a confirmation of the fact that the dream took place on the Saturday night ; and "it came out clearly" (Mrs. Sidgwick says) "that her recollection about the Saturday night was an independent recollection, and not read back after the incident was known." The strongly nervous state that preceded the dream was quite unique in Mrs. Storie's experience. But as it appeared that, according to her recollection, it commenced at least an hour before the accident took place, it must be regarded as of no importance evidentially. The feeling of a presence in the room was also quite unique.

Here the difficulty of referring the true elements in the dream to the agent's mind exceeds that noted in some cases (but see pp. 171-2). For Mr. Hunter was asleep ; and even if we can conceive that the image of the advancing engine may have had some place in his mind, the presence

¹ In conversation with the present writer, Mrs. Storie mentioned that on one other occasion in her life she had had a sort of "borderland" hallucination (see the following chapter) ; and that this had corresponded, certainly to within a few days, but she did not discover exactly how closely, with the death of another brother in America. She knew him to be delicate, but was not apprehending his death.

of Mr. Johnstone could not have been perceived by him. But it is possible, of course, to regard this last item of correspondence as accidental, even though the dream was telepathic. It will be observed that the dream followed the accident by about 4 hours; such *deferment* is, I think, a strong point in favour of telepathic, as opposed to independent, clairvoyance.

To come, however, to less abnormal cases—the following account is from Mr. J. T. Milward Pierce, who has a cattle-ranche in Nebraska.

“Blyville P.O., Knox County, Nebraska, U.S.A.

“December 5th, 1885.

(135) “I have just, or rather a month ago, had a very unpleasant accident which has fortunately turned out all right and has given me the pleasure of forwarding to you a very complete and unmistakable case of ‘second sight.’ I think it better to enclose the two letters you will find herein, as I received them to-day. They are in answer to two of mine dated about the 2nd or 3rd, about a week after the accident.

“The accident occurred at 7 o’clock in the morning of the 26th of October. I fainted from loss of blood, and was lying for a few moments on the ground. I was walking towards a pair of French windows, with my hands in my pockets, when I stumbled over a chair and fell right through the lowest pane of glass, face foremost, cutting my nose off on one side, and nearly taking an eye out—so you will see my sister’s dream was pretty accurate. I also enclose a statement made by two residents here of this end of the case, which will, I hope, make it complete. I may say our time is 6½ hours ahead of [mistake for *behind*] England.

“JNO. T. M. PIERCE.”

Mr. Pierce enclosed the following statement:—

“On Monday, October 26th, about 7 o’clock a.m., Mr. J. T. M. Pierce fell through a French window, cutting his face badly, and lay on the floor insensible for several minutes.

“J. WATSON.

“C. J. HUNT.”

The enclosures, from Mr. Pierce’s sister and mother, are dated respectively November 15th and 17th, 1885. Miss Pierce, after condolences as to the accident, writes:—

“Do you know it is the oddest thing, but on the 26th of October I dreamt that I saw you lying on the ground quite unconscious, your face bleeding and looking so dreadful. I woke up calling to you. I told Kate directly I came down, and we both marked the date. I told mother, too, I had had a bad dream about you, but I did not describe it for fear of frightening her. Was it not strange? It was such a vivid dream, it struck me very much, but I did not mention it in my last letter to you; I thought you would laugh about it. But it *is* strange—on the very day too.”

In Mrs. Pierce’s letter, the following sentence occurs:—

“Was not May’s dream singular? She came down that morning you were hurt, and told Kate, every particular of it agreeing with the time you were hurt.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Pierce writes:—

“Frettons, Danbury, Chelmsford.

“December 31st, 1885.

“On the night of the 26th October (*i.e.*, 26-27), I dreamt I saw my

brother lying on the ground, his face bleeding and dark ; he was quite unconscious. I called to him, but he did not answer, and was stooping towards him, calling him by name, when I awoke. It was so vivid a dream that it produced a great impression upon me, and I felt as though some accident had befallen him. I cannot tell at all what time in the night it was. In the morning I told my sister, and put down the date, also mentioning it to one or two others ; but to my sister I described it in the same words that I have now used.

"I am not at all accustomed to having bad dreams about friends ; indeed, I never remember having had one before. Neither am I superstitious, but, nevertheless, I felt convinced that something untoward had occurred. So when the letter came, just three weeks after the accident, I knew it was the confirmation of my fears.

"M. PIERCE."

[The coincidence was not as close as Mrs. Pierce's words would imply ; and she seems to have mistaken the morning on which the dream was mentioned. When Mr. Pierce was lying on the floor as described, the time of day at Chelmsford would be between 1.30 and 2 p.m. Therefore the dream on the following night must have been at least 8 hours, and may have been more than 12 hours, after the event. See the remark on deferment made in connection with the last case.]

[Nos. 136 and 137 are here omitted.] The next case was sent to us by Miss Richardson, of 47, Bedford Gardens, Kensington, W., who says :—

(138) "The writer is a very worthy wife of a shopkeeper at home, who told me the occurrence some years ago, then with more detail, as it was fresh in her memory ; and her husband can vouch for the facts told him at the time, and the strange 'uncanny' effect of the dream on her mind for some time after."

From Mrs. Green to Miss Richardson.

"Newry, 21st First Month, 1885.

"DEAR FRIEND,—In compliance with thy request I give thee the particulars of my dream.

"I saw two respectably dressed females driving alone in a vehicle like a mineral-water cart. Their horse stopped at a water to drink ; but as there was no footing, he lost his balance, and in trying to recover it he plunged right in. With the shock, the women stood up and shouted for help, and their hats rose off their heads, and as all were going down I turned away crying and saying, 'Was there no one at all to help them ?' upon which I awoke, and my husband asked me what was the matter. I related the above dream to him, and he asked me if I knew them. I said I did not, and thought I had never seen either of them. The impression of the dream and the trouble it brought was over me all day. I remarked to my son it was the anniversary of his birthday and my own also—the 10th of First Month, and this is why I remember the date.

"The following Third Month I got a letter and newspaper from my brother in Australia, named Allen, letting me know the sad trouble which had befallen him in the loss, by drowning, of one of his daughters and her companion. Thou wilt see by the description given of it in the paper how the event corresponded with my dream. My niece was born in Australia, and I never saw her.

"Please return the paper at thy convenience. Considering that our

night is their day, I must have been in sympathy with the sufferers at the time of the accident, on the 10th of First Month, 1878.¹

"It is referred to in two separate places in the newspaper."

The passage in the *Inglewood Advertiser* is as follows :—

"Friday evening, January 11th, 1878.

"A dreadful accident occurred in the neighbourhood of Wedderburn, on Wednesday last, resulting in the death of two women, named Lehey and Allen. It appears that the deceased were driving into Wedderburn in a spring cart from the direction of Kinypanial, when they attempted to water their horse at a dam on the boundary of Torpichen Station. The dam was 10 or 12 feet deep in one spot, and into this deep hole they must have inadvertently driven, for Mr. W. McKechnie, manager of Torpichen Station, upon going to the dam some hours afterwards, discovered the spring cart and horse under the water, and two women's hats floating on the surface. . . . The dam was searched, and the bodies of the two women, clasped in each other's arms, recovered."

The following is an extract from evidence given at the inquest :—

"Joseph John Allen, farmer, deposed :—'I identify one of the bodies as that of my sister. I saw her about 11 a.m. yesterday. . . . The horse had broken away and I caught it for her. Mrs. Lehey and my sister met me when I caught the horse. . . . They then took the horse and went to Mr. Clarke's. I did not see them afterwards alive.' William McKechnie deposed :—'About 4 p.m. yesterday, I was riding by the dam when I observed the legs of a horse and the chest above the water.'"

Mr. Green confirms as follows :—

"Newry, 15th Second Month, 1885.

"DEAR FRIEND EDITH RICHARDSON,—In reference to the dream that my wife had of seeing two women thrown out of a spring cart by their horse stopping to drink out of some deep water, I remember she was greatly distressed about it, and seemed to feel great sympathy for them. It occurred on the night of the 9th of January.

"The reason I can remember the date so well is that the 10th was the anniversary of my wife and our son's birthday. As the day advanced she seemed to get worse, and I advised her to go out for a drive; when she returned she told me she was no better, and also said she had told the driver not to go near water, lest some accident should happen, as she had had such a dreadful dream the night before, at the same time telling him the nature of it. As my wife's niece did not live with her father, he was not told of it until the next morning, which would be our evening of the 10th, and which we think accounted for the increased trouble she felt in sympathy with him.

"THOS. GREEN."

Mrs. Green can recall no other dream of at all the same character.

[The amount of correspondence in detail here is considerable. The fact that the figures seen were merely recognised as "two females"

¹ The narrator has reckoned the difference of time the wrong way. The time in England which corresponded with the accident was the *early morning* of Jan. 9; and the dream which took place on the night of Jan. 9 must have followed the death by more than 12 hours. Thus, according to our arbitrary rule of limitation, the case ought not to have been included. [Except on the hypothesis that the father was the agent and the shock of the news to him the crisis on the agent's side.—ED.]

diminishes, of course, the force of the coincidence ; though perhaps one would hardly expect identification of persons unknown to the percipient.]

[The remaining cases in this section, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, are omitted.]

This may conclude, for the present, the subject of dreams. If with respect to some of the cases cited I have used expressions implying that we may regard them as pretty certainly telepathic, this is on the understanding, as I have explained, that telepathy is established independently of them. But though this branch of evidence can scarcely be in itself conclusive, the study of it will materially assist our future progress.

CHAPTER IX

"BORDERLAND" CASES

§ 1. IN the cases of the last chapter, the percipient, at the moment of percipience, was distinctly asleep. But the passage from sleep to waking admits of many degrees; and a very interesting group of cases remain which cannot properly be classed as dreams, and yet which do not appertain to seasons of complete normal wakefulness. The discussion of these experiences, which occur on the borderland of sleeping and waking, will form the natural transition to the waking phenomena with which we shall be occupied during the remainder of our course. The whole set of cases in which telepathic impressions take a sensory form really belong to one large *genus*; whatever the state of the percipient may be, percepts or *quasi*-percepts which are not originated by anything within the normal range of his sense-organs are and must be *hallucinations*. For convenience, however, that term is confined to *waking* experiences, for which there is no other designation. Accordingly, as I have before spoken of *veridical dreams* I shall in future have to speak of *veridical hallucinations*; and we are now to take the step which leads from the one class to the other.

There are certain reasons why this borderland might be expected to be rich in telepathic phenomena. An impression from a distant mind may or may not originate a sensory hallucination; but if it does so, this seems more specially likely to occur at any season, or in any state of the organism, which happens to be favourable to sensory hallucinations in general. Now the state between sleeping and waking has this character. Persons who have never had hallucinations of the senses at any other times, have experienced them in the moments which immediately precede, or immediately follow, actual sleep. And though neither form of experience is common, an examination of a number of instances seems to show that conditions which come nearest to those of sleep are more favourable than those of ordinary waking life, for the bodying forth of subjective phantasms.¹

Of the hallucinations which precede sleep, the best known class have received the name of "*illusions hypnagogiques*." They have been carefully described by Müller, Maury, and other writers, who have themselves experienced them. For the most part they seem to begin with an appearance of bright points and streaks, which then form a more or less compli-

¹ The same seems to hold good in distinctly morbid cases. (See Dr. Pick's remarks in the *Vienna Jahrbuch für Psychiatrie* for 1880, vol. ii., p. 50.) Dr. Maudsley says that, in recovery from chronic alcoholism, the hallucinations continue to occur between sleeping and waking, when they have ceased to occur at other times. (*The Pathology of Mind*, p. 485.)

cated pattern, or develop into a scene or landscape.¹ In these cases, it is probable that the origin of the phenomena is a slightly abnormal condition of the retina, and that elements of actual sensation from this peripheral source form the basis of the phantasmagoria which the mind elaborates. But there is another form, involving no peculiarity of the external organ, where some object that has been actually seen during the day seems to reappear before the eyes with all the vividness of reality. Maury gives a case of an "after-image" of the sort, which well exemplifies the stage between reality and dream. After a fatiguing day, his eyes had been gladdened by the sight of a beefsteak, which was to form his dinner. After dinner he became drowsy; and in this state he had a distinct vision of this very steak, apparently as real and palpable as ever. Lapsing then into actual sleep, he had a vivid dream, in which the steak again reappeared. Here it is clear that the "*hypnagogic*" hallucination was as truly the projection of the percipient's own mind as the dream.

The hallucinations which immediately follow sleep are not infrequently the result of a previous dream, some feature of which is prolonged into waking moments, and becomes temporarily located among the objects that meet the eye. An Oxford undergraduate tells me that, having had a very vivid dream of being chased by a figure in green, he woke and saw the green figure in the middle of his room. "I had no doubt that I was awake, for I saw the light from the street lamp shining on my door. The figure was not in this light but nearer the bed, and the green tinge was very perceptible." The Rev. E. H. Sugden, of Bradford, writes to me: "Once I had a most vivid dream about a man whom I knew well. On suddenly waking, I saw him, in the light of early morning, standing at my bedside in the very attitude of the dream. I looked at him for a second or two, and then, putting my foot out, I kicked at him; as my foot reached him, he vanished." Another informant had a dream, in the train, of looking at her watch, and on waking saw the dial before her eyes "larger than the real one, and blue: after a few moments it flickered and went out like a candle." In these cases the impression was scarcely more than momentary; but other informants—among them Professor Balfour Stewart—have told me of similar experiences of their own which lasted a good many seconds; and in the stock example of the books, the dream-baboon remained grinning in a corner even while the percipient was sufficiently himself to walk across the room—a striking illustration of the psychological identity of the dreaming and the waking image.

More striking are the cases where the images, though immediately following sleep, are not a continuance of a dream, or at any rate of a dream of which the slightest memory survives. Of course these experiences may not all have been hallucinations in the strict sense, but only misinterpretations of actual sensation—that is to say some article of furniture or real object in the room may have served as the basis for the delusive image; and momentary illusions of this sort are perhaps not very uncommon.² But even so, the mind has imposed its own creation

¹ See some excellent examples in the next chapter, p. 300, note.

² For instance, Mr. Paul Bird, of 39, Strand, Calcutta, tells me that some years ago he woke, and saw a native standing against the wall, who on being regarded sank into a squatting posture. "I jumped out of bed, caught the intruder by the throat,

from within on what met the eye from without ; and such cases, therefore, still bear out my point, that the tendency to externalise and objectify mental images is strongest at one special season of waking life. Of 302 cases of hallucinations of sight (exclusive of those given as telepathic evidence in this book), of which I have collected first-hand accounts during the last three years, as many as 43—that is, a seventh of the whole number—have taken place during the first few moments after waking. It is equally noteworthy that of the remainder, 66, making in all more than a third of the whole number, occurred to persons who were in bed—a proportion far in excess of that which the number of waking minutes spent in bed bears to the total number of waking minutes. Few of these cases, moreover, were of a character that would allow us to class them as *illusions hypnagogiques*. They did not visit persons who were familiar with such visions as sleep approached ; nor did they originate or develop in any way that suggests an unusual or fatigued condition of the retina. Nor again could by any means all of them be explained, like M. Maury's beefsteak, as "after-images"—revivals of past impressions ; for out of the 43 cases first mentioned only 23, out of the 66 other cases only 26, represented a face, form, or object that was recognised ; while in several even of these cases the person whose figure appeared was a deceased friend or relative who had not been actually seen for months or years. Similarly, of 187 first-hand cases of auditory hallucination in my collection, 63, or more than one-third of the whole number, took place in bed. Of these, 19 are described as either awakening the person, or occurring in the very first moment of waking, and in 10 of the 19 the sound was a recognised voice ; of the remaining 44, 17 were unrecognised voices, 11 were non-vocal sounds such as ringings and knocks, and only 16 represented recognised voices. It would seem, then, that the reasons which make bed a specially favourable place for such experiences are to be sought, not only in peculiarities of the sense-organs at the moments immediately contiguous to sleep, but in the more general conditions of quiet

and found he was a dirty-linen bag, with the neck tied. Not till I actually clutched the neck was I convinced." Mr. Merrifield, of 24, Vernon Terrace, Brighton—with whom figures seen on waking last long enough for him "to reason that though I have been mistaken before, there can be no mistake this time, and to insist upon this to my wife, who remonstrates"—says, "If there is any light object in the room or any dress or polished piece of furniture on which the light falls, my figure generally shapes itself about that." Even a persistent dream-image may attach itself to an external basis. Thus Miss I. Bidder, of Ravensbury Park, Mitcham, tells me of a nightmare from which a most distinct demon survived after she woke. She sat up to inspect its hand, which was clutching the bed-rail ; but "it faded into the ornaments over the mantelpiece."

We may regard as the lowest grade of such illusion the impression of waking among unknown surroundings. Thus one correspondent tells me that she has "watched the room gradually take its usual form, which on first waking had been some place quite different." And another informant writes : "The room I apparently woke in was a large room, with the chief space between the foot of the bed and the opposite boundary wall, which looked an immense way off, and the light did not appear to come in at the right place, though on the same side of the room as the window really was. I lay and pondered, feeling as if there was something inexplicable in the place, sure that I was wide awake. As I wondered, all the strangeness of the room and the added space vanished, and I found myself again in a small, narrow room, with the wall almost close to the bottom of the bed."

and passivity, of a comparatively anæmic brain, and of the partial lapse of the higher directive psychical activities. We cannot, I think, safely reckon *darkness* as among these conditions, as a large proportion of the cases have occurred when the room was light—for instance, in the early hours of a summer morning.

§ 2. At any rate, bed being—from whatever causes—a place favourable to phantasms, it is reasonable to surmise that it may be a place favourable to the phenomena with which we are concerned in this book—the phantasms that coincide with reality. And such, in fact, it proves to be. Considering how small a portion of our waking life is included in the few moments after waking from sleep, or even in the short periods of wakefulness that normal healthy persons pass in bed, it is remarkable how large a proportion of our veridical examples (a number little less than the total of dreams, and amounting to about a fourth of the externalised waking cases) fall within these seasons. And regarded as evidence of telepathy, it will be seen that these cases stand on an altogether different footing from the dream-cases proper with which they have seemed in one way so closely allied. Dreams, as we saw, are so frequent and various as to afford an immense scope for accidental coincidences; it is far otherwise with these borderland impressions, or, at any rate, with those of them which the perceiver himself is able clearly to differentiate from dreams. If I have called them the *commonest* form of waking hallucination among sane and healthy people, this is not to be understood as meaning that they are absolutely common; on the contrary, they are decidedly exceptional. Out of 5569 persons, taken at random, I find that only 18 are able to recall having within the last twelve years had a visual experience, and only 23 an auditory experience, of this kind.¹ If then we find a considerable number of cases where an experience of the sort has coincided with the death (or some distinct crisis in the life) of the person whose presence the hallucination suggested, the fact is at once noteworthy; and the number of such coincidences that we can adduce forms a strong and independent proof—far stronger, at any rate, than was afforded by our list of coincident dreams—that telepathy and not accident is the explanation of them. Nor is the comparatively small number of persons who have experience of distinct "borderland" hallucinations the only point wherein this class is superior in evidential force to dreams. We can here, as a rule, be far more certain that the particular impression recorded was really of a sort

¹ I may explain that the statistics about hallucinations, of which use was made on the preceding page, were not the result of inquiries addressed to a known and limited number of persons, but of testimony which has reached me in the more general course of psychological investigation. For the purpose then in view—namely, to ascertain the proportion which "borderland" hallucinations bear to hallucinations in general—statistics thus drawn from an unlimited circle are of course in place. But it is quite a different matter when we wish to discover how common the phenomena are, in the sense of discovering what proportion of people have had experience of them. The only way, then, is to make a definite inquiry on the subject, of a certain number of persons, large enough to be accepted as a fair sample of the population. This method of numerical inquiry was exemplified to some extent in the discussion on dreams; but I am reserving for a separate chapter (Chap. xiii.) the more detailed account of it, and of its bearing on the theory that the coincidences on which stress is laid in this book were due not to telepathy but to chance.

unique or highly exceptional in the particular percipient's experience. This unique character is, no doubt, as we have seen, often asserted of dreams proper which afterwards prove to have coincided with reality. But there we lacked complete assurance that similar dreams which did not coincide with reality had not slipped out of memory. The impressions to be described in this chapter, on the other hand, have a character and an intensity which would ordinarily ensure their being remembered, even if no coincidence were established. Many of them, indeed, seem to have been distinctly waking impressions, belonging to a state of open eyes and alert senses, which was continued into normal waking life without any break or any feeling of change whatever. Still, as they occurred to persons who were in bed, and at seasons when the faculties are apt to be in an unstable condition, and when the stages of consciousness from moment to moment may be hard to define, it is safest to distinguish them from similar phenomena occurring during active waking hours, no less than from those of sleep.

I may quote at once a case which illustrates the immense importance to the argument of distinguishing the experiences of the "borderland" from those of sleep. The following passage occurs in the *Life and Times of Lord Brougham*, written by himself (1871), pp. 201-3, and was originally an entry in his journal. The entry must apparently have been made very soon after the occurrence which it describes; as we can scarcely doubt that had the fact of his friend's death, which he learnt soon afterwards, been known to him at the time of writing, he would have included it in the account. In December, 1799, Lord Brougham was travelling in Sweden with friends.

(146) "We set out for Gothenburg [apparently on December 18th], determining to make for Norway. About 1 in the morning, arriving at a decent inn, we decided to stop for the night. Tired with the cold of yesterday, I was glad to take advantage of a hot bath before I turned in, and here a most remarkable thing happened to me—so remarkable that I must tell the story from the beginning.

"After I left the High School, I went with G., my most intimate friend, to attend the classes in the University. There was no divinity class, but we frequently in our walks discussed and speculated upon many grave subjects—among others, on the immortality of the soul, and on a future state. This question, and the possibility, I will not say of ghosts walking, but of the dead appearing to the living, were subjects of much speculation: and we actually committed the folly of drawing up an agreement, written with our blood, to the effect that whichever of us died the first should appear to the other, and thus solve any doubts we had entertained of the 'life after death.'¹ After we had finished our classes at the college, G. went to India, having got an appointment there in the Civil Service. He seldom wrote to me, and after the lapse of a few years I had almost forgotten him; moreover, his family having little connection with Edinburgh, I seldom saw or heard anything of them, or of him through them, so that all his schoolboy intimacy had died out, and I had nearly forgotten his existence. I had taken, as I have said, a warm bath, and while lying in it and enjoying the comfort of the heat, after the late freezing I had undergone, I turned my head round,

¹ As to compacts of this sort see pp. 414-15.

looking towards the chair on which I had deposited my clothes, as I was about to get out of the bath. On the chair sat G., looking calmly at me. How I got out of the bath I know not, but on recovering my senses I found myself sprawling on the floor. The apparition, or whatever it was, that had taken the likeness of G., had disappeared.

"This vision produced such a shock that I had no inclination to talk about it or to speak about it even to Stuart; but the impression it made upon me was too vivid to be easily forgotten; and so strongly was I affected by it that I have here written down the whole history, with the date, 19th December, and all the particulars, as they are now fresh before me. No doubt I had fallen asleep; and that the appearance presented so distinctly to my eyes was a dream, I cannot for a moment doubt; yet for years I had had no communication with G., nor had there been anything to recall him to my recollection; nothing had taken place during our Swedish travels either connected with G. or with India, or with anything relating to him or to any member of his family. I recollected quickly enough our old discussion and the bargain we had made. I could not discharge from my mind the impression that G. must have died, and that his appearance to me was to be received by me as a proof of a future state, yet all the while I felt convinced that the whole was a dream; and so painfully vivid, so unfading was the impression, that I could not bring myself to talk of it, or to make the slightest allusion to it."

In October, 1862, Lord Brougham added as a postscript:—

"I have just been copying out from my journal the account of this strange dream: *Certissima mortis imago*! And now to finish the story, begun about 60 years since. Soon after my return to Edinburgh, there arrived a letter from India, announcing G.'s death, and stating that he had died on the 19th of December!

"Singular coincidence! yet when one reflects on the vast numbers of dreams which night after night pass through our brains, the number of coincidences between the vision and the event are perhaps fewer and less remarkable than a fair calculation of chances would warrant us to expect. Nor is it surprising, considering the variety of our thoughts in sleep, and that they all bear some analogy to the affairs of life, that a dream should sometimes coincide with a contemporaneous or even with a future event. This is not much more wonderful than that a person, whom we had no reason to expect, should appear to us at the very moment we have been thinking or speaking of him. So common is this, that it has for ages grown into the proverb, 'Speak of the devil.' I believe every such seeming miracle is, like every ghost story, capable of explanation."

Lord Brougham's evidence in a matter of this kind cannot be fairly impugned on the ground that his character for public veracity was not always above suspicion. He clearly took no special pride or pleasure in the incident, and he advances a thoroughly rationalistic explanation of it. But of course the long interval which elapsed between his hearing of the date of the death and his recording it in writing greatly diminishes the evidential value of the case. I quote it rather for the sake of the important fallacy in the concluding remarks.

Lord Brougham, we see, rests his view that the coincidence in his case was accidental on the "vast number of dreams." But was his experience a dream? This is no mere question of a name. Let us make the supposi-

tion that no death had occurred, and that the experience remained one which there is not even a *primâ facie* excuse for surmising to be anything but purely subjective: does it thereby subside at once into the general ruck of dream-experiences? Is it indistinguishable in intensity and character from those countless multitudes, of which it would be true and relevant to say that the scope afforded by them for chance-coincidences is practically unlimited? We can but accept what Lord Brougham himself has told us, and answer these questions by an emphatic negative. The complete consciousness of the real place and time, the intention to get out of the bath, the percipient's sense of his own actual posture when he caught sight of the figure, and the whole detail of the account, are all very unlike ordinary dreaming. But apart from such points as these, is it a well-known result of an ordinary dream that the dreamer, on recovering his senses, finds himself "sprawling on the floor"? On waking from an ordinary dream, are we wont to remark, as a point of interest, that "the apparition has disappeared"? Is it characteristic of an ordinary dream to be so painfully vivid and unfading that the dreamer cannot bring himself to make the slightest allusion to it? Call such an experience a dream, or call it (as we should do) a "borderland" hallucination—the only relevant question is, how often does its like occur? In Lord Brougham's own long life, at any rate, it was unique and unparalleled. In arguing, therefore, that the coincidence was not so very remarkable after all, because "dreams" are so numerous and various that one of them here and there is likely by chance to strike on truth, he makes himself the slave of a word. The instance is instructive, as showing the tendency of prepossessions, however legitimate and scientific in themselves, to lead on to illegitimacies of procedure. Lord Brougham is rightly certain that his experience is not supernatural—is "capable of explanation"; and then, as the only natural explanation that occurs to him is *chance*, he becomes equally certain that that must be the right one, wrests facts into conformity with it, and refers a very uncommon thing to a class of very common things.

§ 3. To come, however, to our own collection—before introducing the characteristic sensory cases, I will quote a couple of "borderland" examples of the more ideal type which has been prominent in the preceding chapters. [147 and 148 omitted here.] In the first case [147] the transferred impression (if such it was) did not even suggest an idea to the percipient until it actually took shape in an exclamation of her own.

§ 4. [Passing to definitely sensory cases, Mr. Gurney first quotes one (149) which, as he says, is interesting as a perfect example of an "*illusion hypnagogique*," suggested apparently by the ideas in a neighbouring mind. It is omitted here as it is rather long and in some respects evidentially incomplete. The author continues:—]

This particular type is in any case unusual. Looking at the "borderland" impressions of the higher senses as a class, we at once observe the same important change as struck us in the course of our survey of dreams (pp. 232–3). The experience of the percipient is henceforth no longer (or only very rarely) a direct reproduction or embodiment of the idea or

sensation of the agent ; it is something in which his own creative faculties are at work. He is the author of his impression in the same sense as before he was the author of his dream. I merely note this in passing, reserving further discussion of this point till the subject of waking hallucinations can be treated as a whole.

I will first take examples where a single sense only is concerned, and will begin with the sense of *hearing*. There is a group of cases where what has been heard has suddenly awakened the percipient—not, however, as the climax of a dream, but with the vivid and instantaneous impressions of a sound externally caused. It may, no doubt, be suggested that in such cases the sound is the climax of a dream of which no memory survived. But if so, the immediate oblivion of the dream serves to set off the specially startling nature of the experience in the moment of waking ; and such instantaneous startings from apparently dreamless sleep, with a definite sound in the ears which has no objective reality, are at any rate sufficiently rare to justify us in regarding them, for purposes of evidence, as *borderland* and not as *dream* experiences. The cases, however, differ considerably in their evidential force. In some which have most powerfully impressed the imagination of the percipients, the sound has been inarticulate and of the nature of a scream, not identified with the person afterwards assumed to have been the agent. Now this of course diminishes the improbability that its synchronism with an exceptional state of that person was accidental. And again, it is difficult in such circumstances to prove conclusively that the sound may not have been due to some normal cause which was not discovered ; for odd sounds at night are not uncommon, and, till accounted for, may have a peculiarly exciting effect. As regards the first of these objections, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that screams are a very unusual form of purely subjective impression—my large collection of waking hallucinations of the sane does not include a single instance ; while they do not seem an unlikely form to be taken by an hallucination which is the sensory embodiment of a sudden undefined idea of death or calamity.¹

[Two instances follow, 150 and 151, but as they are remote they are omitted here. In case 151 the percipient's brother was lost in the "Royal Charter" in 1859. On the night of the wreck the percipient suddenly started out of her sleep and found herself seizing hold of her husband's arm, horrified at the most awful wail of agony, which appeared to fill the house.—ED.] Here, the vivid character of the impression, and the fact that it was unique in the percipient's experience, will probably be accepted without dispute. And if so, the coincidence—though easy enough to to regard as accidental if it stood alone or nearly alone—seems fairly admissible as an item in a cumulative proof of telepathy.

To come now to cases where distinct words are heard—[omitting 152] in the following example—received in 1883 from the Rev. Andrew Jukes—the voice, though recognised, was not that of the agent, but of a person some time deceased. In neither instance is there any reason to regard this feature as other than a purely subjective element supplied by the

¹ See the discussion and examples of "rudimentary hallucinations," Chap. xiv., § 4, and Chap. xv., § 6.

percipient's own brain—a piece of dream-like investiture in which the telepathic impression clad itself. (See above, pp. 232–3, and below, Chapter XII, § 5.) Mr. Jukes's case, however, differs from the preceding in the important evidential point that the words heard bore a distinct relation to the agent.

“Upper Eglinton Road, Woolwich.

(153) “On Monday, July 31st, 1854, I was at Worksop, staying in the house of Mr. Heming, the then agent there to the Duke of Newcastle. Just as I awoke that morning—some would say I was dreaming—I heard the voice of an old schoolfellow (C. C.), who had been dead at least a year or two, saying, ‘Your brother Mark and Harriet are both gone.’ These words were echoing in my ears as I woke. I seemed to hear them. My brother then was in America; and both were well when I had last heard of them; but the words respecting him and his wife were so vividly impressed upon my mind that before I left my bedroom I wrote them down, then and there, on a scrap of an old newspaper, having no other paper in the bedroom. That same day I returned to Hull, mentioned the circumstance to my wife, and entered the incident, which had made a deep impression on me, in my diary, which I still have. I am as certain as I can well be of anything that the entry is a transcript of what I wrote on the bit of newspaper.

“On the 18th of August (it was before the Atlantic telegraph), I received a line from my brother's wife Harriet, dated August 1st, saying that Mark had just breathed his last, of cholera; after preaching on Sunday, he had been taken ill with cholera on Monday, and had died on Tuesday morning; that she herself was ill, and that in the event of her death she wished their children should be brought to England. She died the second day after her husband, August 3rd. I immediately started for America, and brought the children home.

“The voice I seemed to hear, and which at first I thought must have been a kind of dream, had such an effect on me that, though the bell rang for breakfast, I did not go down for some time. And all that day, and for days after, I could not shake it off. I had the strongest impression, and indeed conviction, that my brother was gone.

“I ought perhaps to add that we had no knowledge of the cholera being in the neighbourhood of my brother's parish. My impression was that both he and his wife must, if the voice were true, have been taken away by some railway or steamboat accident. But you should notice that at the moment when I seemed to hear this voice my brother was *not* dead. He died early next morning, August 1st, and his wife nearly two days later, namely, August 3rd. I do not profess to explain it—I simply state the facts of the phenomena. But the impression made on me was profound, and the coincidence itself is remarkable.

“ANDREW JUKES.”

Mr. Jukes has kindly allowed me to inspect the record in his diary. I had hoped to be able to incorporate this *verbatim* in the account; but he has private reasons—quite unconnected with the present case—for desiring that this should not be done.

In conversation, I learnt from him that the words he heard formed, in fact, the continuation of a dream, but that the dream had not been about his brother and sister-in-law; and he has dictated to me the words, “My impression is that the remark passed *while I was awake*.” He has never on any other occasion in his life made a written note of a dream. Asked if he could recall having experienced an auditory hallucination on any other

occasion, he replied that he had "never experienced anything of the kind," except that on one occasion he had a subjective impression of hearing music.

Considering the uniqueness of the impression in this case, it is not evidentially important to decide at what exact stage of the waking process the auditory experience took place. That experience may fairly be assigned to the "borderland" on the ground partly of Mr. Jukes's conviction that he was more awake than asleep, and partly of the fact that the supposed agent or agents had not figured in the preceding dream. The time of its occurrence, however, was not that of either of the two critical moments of death in America. If it coincided with any special moment, it must probably have been with the first shock of alarm in the mind of Mrs. Jukes, at the idea of cholera in her household. But this is conjecture only; we do not know how early on the Monday it was that the first symptoms of illness were apparent; and the evidential force of the case is so far diminished.

The following example, where the voice was not recognised, presents the interesting point of immediate *repetition*. The narrator is Miss Thompson, now residing at 7, Place Vaugirard, Paris.

"106, Boston Street, Hulme, Manchester.

"January 12th, 1884.

(154) "In the autumn of 1873 my cousin Harry, to whom I was engaged, suddenly came to spend a few days with my family, then staying in London. We made a bet for some gloves at parting. After paying several visits in the country, he returned to his home in Yorkshire. During this time we had no letter from or news about him.

"On December 18th I awoke in the night, hearing someone earnestly calling me by name. I rose, and went down to my mother's room on the floor beneath, and asked her if she knew who had called me. She said I must have been dreaming, and told me to go back to bed. I did so, and again heard my name called distinctly. I went again to my mother, who was a little vexed with me, as she feared I should disturb my father, who was sleeping in the room adjoining. I therefore went back to bed, feeling ill at ease. I don't think that I fell asleep again, but am not quite sure, but shortly after heard the voice distinctly calling me for the third time. I was now thoroughly alarmed, and dared not stay upstairs alone, so went again to my mother, and stayed with her the rest of the night.

"The next day we heard that Harry Suddaby had died in the night, from a short attack of bronchitis. I asked if Harry had called me really, but no one remembered his doing more than sending his love.

"CHRISTINE THOMPSON."

The Register of Deaths gives the date of the death as December 19th, 1873. It no doubt took place in the early hours of the morning.

In answer to inquiries, Miss Thompson writes on April 27th, 1885:—

"I have never had any experience similar to that of which I sent you an account, and am too practical a mortal to believe in anything at all resembling 'visions' or 'hallucinations.' It was rather against my judgment that I was persuaded to send you the account."

Asked by her daughter to say "whether she remembered anything

particular taking place at home " on the night of the death, Mrs. Thompson wrote as follows, on June 30th, 1886 :—

" 82, Talbot Street, Moss-side, Manchester.

" I remember distinctly my daughter coming to my room several times asking me if I had called her, or if I knew who had called her, the night during which my nephew, Harry Suddaby, died.

" MARY THOMPSON."

Here the repetition during the night reminds us of several of the dream-examples [and some visual cases, *e.g.* 185]. The feature in waking cases is of special interest. For repetition after a short interval is an occasional feature of *purely subjective* hallucinations;¹ and this point may be added to many others which will occupy us hereafter, showing the fundamental identity, in relation to the percipient's senses, of subjective and telepathic phantasms.

[Cases 155, 156 are here omitted.] In the next two cases, the words that the percipient heard seem actually to have been uttered (and, therefore, to have been heard) by the agent; and we may, if we please, refer the examples to that rarer type where a sensation seems to have been quite literally transferred, as contrasted with the cases where the percipient supplies a sensory embodiment to a less definite telepathic impression.²

The first account was sent to us by the Rev. Augustus Field, Vicar of Pool Quay, Welshpool. He describes it as an " Extract of a letter received by me from my brother, Henry C. Field (Surveyor and Civil Engineer), resident at Tutatihika, Wanganni, New Zealand, in reply to letters we had written to him telling about our mother's death." A letter to us from Mr. H. C. Field himself, dated Wanganni, September 25th, 1886, gives a completely concordant account.

" March 7th, 1874.

(157) " I was deeply interested in the account of our mother's last illness, and was particularly struck by the circumstance of my name being called, because I heard it. I am not accustomed to dream, and am sure I speak far within the mark when I say that I have not dreamed a dozen times since my marriage, 23 years since. Dreams, too, are supposed to arise from something affecting one's mind, and producing some temporary strong impression, and in this case there was nothing which could affect me in *that* direction, but some quite the reverse.

" Our first horticultural show of the season took place on November 27th. I won several prizes; and after the show closed at 10 p.m. I had to take home some of my smaller exhibits, and arrange for getting the others home next morning. It was thus near midnight when I reached home, and the only things talked about by — and myself afterwards were the show and matters of local interest. If anything, therefore, were

¹ See Chap. xii., § 10. In Dr. Jessopp's experience (*Athenæum* for Jan. 10, 1880), the figure which he saw disappeared suddenly, and reappeared after about five minutes; and my own collection includes a very similar case, for which I am allowed to name Mr. J. Champ, of High Street, Chelmsford, as my authority. What he saw (after a fatiguing march) was a grotesque, parti-coloured figure about as wide as high, which appeared on the wall of the room, disappeared, and reappeared after an interval of a few minutes.

² Compare the dream-case No. 112 and examples in Chapters xiv. and xv.

likely to be on my mind when I fell asleep, it would probably be one or other of the above matters. I do not know how long I slept, but my first sleep was over and I was lying in a sort of half-awake, half-asleep state, when I distinctly heard our mother's voice say faintly, 'Harry, Harry!' and when daylight came and I thought the matter over, I wondered what could have possessed me to fancy such a thing. Our Uncle C. and his family called me Harry, and Uncle B. sometimes did so, and the D.'s also called me Harry, but with these exceptions I was called Henry by all our relations. It is possible our mother may have called me 'Harry' during my very early childhood, but so long as I can remember she always called our father, 'Papa' and me 'Henry.' It seemed to me, therefore, so utterly absurd that I should fancy her calling me by a name that I never recollected to have heard her use, that I mentally laughed at the idea and wondered how such a thing should have entered my head. Still the circumstance struck me as so strange that I underlined the date on the margin of my working diary, in order that if anything should occur to corroborate it I might be certain as to the time. Directly, therefore, after I reached home with S.'s and your letters, I turned to the diary and found the underlined date was November 28th. It was evidently during the afternoon of November 27th that our mother uttered my name (this would have been so, A. F.); and allowing for the difference of longitude, the time would be early morning of the 28th with us, so that I don't think there can be any question that the call actually reached my ear. I am only sorry that I was not sufficiently awake to note the *exact* time, but should fancy it to have been between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, which would represent a few minutes later on the previous afternoon with you."

The Rev. A. Field adds that in a subsequent portion of the letter his brother refers to a letter written a few weeks earlier, in which he had offered his sister a home, "and says that he believes he was led to do this partly in consequence of the idea which the circumstance he had described had left on his mind, viz., the probable death of our mother."

In his letter to us, Mr. H. C. Field says, "The voice, though not loud, was so distinct that, as I had not time to collect my senses, I started up in bed, expecting to see my mother beside it." His wife was aroused by this movement, and Mr. Field at once told her of his experience. He adds that he "is not superstitious," and "hardly knows what it is to dream," which he attributes to his active outdoor life.

Miss Field wrote to us in October, 1885 :—

"On 26th November, 1873, while sitting by my mother's bed, I heard her say most plainly, 'Harry, Harry.' On the following day she died. In course of time we heard from my brother in New Zealand that at a corresponding time (their night) he distinctly heard the same in his mother's voice, and noted the fact in his diary.

"SOPHIA HUGHES FIELD."

Later, the Rev. A. Field sent us the following extract from his diary :—

"November, 1873.

"Thursday, 27th, arrived in London at 5.30 a.m., by train, to 70, Bassington Road. Found mother conscious, &c.; read, &c., with her at frequent intervals through the day. K. and A. (my brother and sister) arrived. Gradually weaker, and at last, 5.45 p.m., she passed away."

"You will understand my object in giving you these full particulars. I myself heard (as I thought) my mother mention my brother's name, and

spoke of it to my sister and my aunt. I think they told me that she had mentioned his name several times during her last brief illness. She was seized with paralysis on Wednesday, 26th, and her speech became more and more affected. It was this that made me feel uncertain whether my brother's name was really mentioned in my hearing by my mother or not. In consequence of what my aunt and sister said, I could have no longer any doubt."

[It will be seen that the percipient's impression probably coincided closely with the death, but that Miss Field's written recollections do not confirm (though they do not contradict) her brother's idea that the name was uttered on the same afternoon.]

The next account is from Mrs. Stent, living at 14, Singapore Road, Ealing Dean, a former valued servant of Miss Craigie, of 8, McGill College Avenue, Montreal. I cite the account which she gave to Miss Craigie, rather than a later one (completely agreeing with it except in one detail) which she wrote for us on June 1st, 1885.

(158) "On the 18th of Oct., 1881, I was awakened by hearing myself called twice by an old servant, who was ill in an infirmary in Chelsea. I then heard 'Reggy' (one of the young gentlemen of the house we had lived together in) called once. It was half-past 4, but I could not sleep, so got up and dressed. [Here the later account adds, "I told the housemaid, E. Morris, and we wondered what it meant."] It was impossible for me to go that day to the infirmary, for my present mistress had company; but I went the next day. . . . She *had* called twice for me and once for 'Reggy' (so the patient in the next bed informed me) and *had* died at the hour, half-past 4 the morning before—the precise time I had heard myself called. [The later account adds, "I was not dreaming. I never had anything of the kind happen to me before, and she called us so plain."] "E. STENT."

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Stent says that she has lost sight of E. Morris, and adds:—

"Elizabeth Membrey [the deceased] was my dearest friend, and was more to me than a sister, but was no relation to me—only my dear friend. I think the bond of sympathy was very strong between us; only death could break it. We told our troubles to one another; for years past we did not do anything without talking about it first. Mr. Reggy was the son of the lady where we lived in service together, and she was very fond of him, and he went to the infirmary to see her as often as he could find time."

The medical superintendent of the Chelsea Infirmary writes to us:—"I find that Elizabeth Membrey was in this Infirmary from July 15th until October 18th, 1881, when she died."

In conversation, Mrs. Stent (a sensible and sober-minded witness) said that she marked the time of her experience as 4.30, as she heard the half-hour strike just after she got up, and did not sleep again. In her later written account she said that the porter told her the time of death was 20 minutes to 4. But this seems to have been a slip; as she has found and handed to us a post-card, written to her by Mr. R. W. Craigie (the "Reggy" of the narrative) on the day of the death, as shown by the post-mark—which gives the time as 4.30. Mrs. Stent further mentioned that she was not expecting the death—that her friend had seemed cheerful,

and it was thought that she would leave the hospital. She was suffering from an old injury to the base of the skull.

[Case 159 is here omitted.] The next case, from the Additional Chapter, is apparently one of direct reproduction of the agent's sensation. It is from Mr. J. G. F. Russell, of Aden, Aberdeenshire. The agent was a near relative who had been making a long stay with Mr. and Mrs. Russell.

" 32, Upper Brook Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

" December 18th, 1885.

(694) " On Wednesday, December 2nd, 1885, I was woke up at night between 12 p.m. and 2 a.m. (as far as I can recollect), by hearing myself distinctly called from a small passage outside my bedroom door; the voice seemed to come from just outside the door itself. I got up, fearing Mrs. Waller, in the adjoining room, was ill, but, as the calling of my name was no longer repeated, I did not then disturb her. (There is no door of communication between the rooms, the wall is solid, and a gigantic wardrobe is against it.) Next morning I asked her if she had called me during the night; but she declared she had slept 'like a top,' and had never thought of me or anyone else. I did *not* mention the incident to her sister (who had just left us after a long visit), but she (Mrs. Waller) did, on returning to the country. I enclose what Miss Young wrote to me, solely from her sister mentioning to her my having questioned her. The dates correspond exactly; it was the first night of Mrs. Waller's visit.

" J. G. F. RUSSELL."

The following is the extract from Miss Young's letter to Mr. Russell:—

" I will tell you something that has struck me rather. The two nights my sister was with you in London were very disturbed nights to me; you were continually in my dreams, and one of those nights I found myself sitting up in bed, having woke myself up by calling you loudly by name. When she came back she told me you had asked her one morning whether she had called you in the night, as you had distinctly heard your name. I wish I could remember which night it was. I have an impression it was the first.

" BLANCHE YOUNG."

Mr. Russell (who gave me the account *vivâ voce* on December 16th, a fortnight after the occurrence) has explained that the wall between his room and the next is so thick that even a very loud cry in one would be almost inaudible in the other. He has never had such an hallucination on any other occasion.

§ 5. I pass now to the cases where the sense of *sight* alone was concerned. [159 and 160 are omitted.]

The next example is from Miss Barr, of Apsley Town, East Grinstead.

" 1884.

(161) " On the night of January —, 1871, I awoke up with the idea that someone was moving by the bedside. I was a little frightened, and I saw the curtain at the side of the bed slightly pulled aside, and a hand, with the back turned towards me, appearing round the curtain. I recognised the ring on the hand as that of my cousin and dear friend [Captain C. M.]. I told my sister in the morning that I had seen a hand,¹ wearing

¹ On this fragmentary form of apparition, see Chap. xi., § 4, and p. 392, note.

a ring, but did not tell her that I had recognised the ring, as I did not care to make too much of the incident. On that day, as we learnt from a letter received a few days afterwards, my cousin died in Canada, from the effect of an accident.

"L. BARR."

Mrs. and Miss Harriet Barr also attest with their signatures the fact that the vision was narrated before the news of the death was received.

Miss L. Barr afterwards stated that she thought the death "must have been on or about the 6th of January, 1870"; and we find from the *Indian Army List*, and from the *Times* obituary, that it took place on that day, at Halifax, Nova Scotia. She tells us that she has experienced in her life only one other hallucination, which occurred in close connection with a bereavement (see p. 330).

[Cases 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167 here omitted.]

The next narrative is of a more uncommon character. There are reasonable grounds, in this instance, for withholding the name of the narrator, Mrs. T., from publicity.

"1883.

(168) "On November 18th, 1863, I was living near Adelaide, and not long recovered from a severe illness at the birth of an infant, who was then 5 months old. My husband had also suffered from neuralgia, and had gone to stay with friends at the seaside for the benefit of bathing. One night during his absence the child woke me about midnight; having hushed him off to sleep, I said, 'Now, sir, I hope you will let me rest!' I lay down, and instantly became conscious of two figures standing at the door of my room. One, M. N. [these are not the real initials], whom I recognised at once, was that of a former lover, whose misconduct and neglect had compelled me to renounce him. Of this I am sure, that if ever I saw him in my life, it was then. I was not in the least frightened; but said to myself, as it were, 'You never used to wear that kind of waistcoat.' The door close to where he stood was in a deep recess close to the fire-place, for there was no grate; we burnt logs only. In that recess stood a man in a tweed suit. I saw the whole figure distinctly, but not the face, and for this reason: on the edge of the mantelshelf always stood a morocco leather medicine chest, which concealed the face from me. (On this being stated to our friends, the Singletons, they asked to go into the room and judge for themselves. They expressed themselves satisfied that would be the case to anyone on the bed where I was.) I had an impression that this other was a cousin of M. N.'s, who had been the means of leading him astray while in the North of England. I never saw him in my life; he died in India.

"M. N. was in deep mourning; he had a look of unutterable sorrow upon his face, and was deadly pale. He never opened his lips, but I read his heart as if it were an open book, and it said, 'My father is dead, and I have come into his property.' I answered, 'How much you have grown like your father!' Then in a moment, *without appearing to walk*, he stood at the foot of the child's cot, and I saw *distinctly* the blueness of his eyes as he gazed on my boy, and then raised them to Heaven as if in prayer.

"All vanished. I looked round and remarked a trivial circumstance, viz., that the brass handles of my chest of drawers had been rubbed very bright. Not till then was I conscious of having seen a spirit,¹ but a feeling of awe (not fear) came over me, and I prayed to be kept from

¹ See p. 176. note 2.

harm, although there was no reason to dread it. I slept tranquilly, and in the morning I went across to the parsonage and told the clergyman's wife what I had seen. She, of course, thought it was merely a dream. But no—if it were a dream, should I not have seen him *as I had known him*, a young man of 22, without beard or whiskers? But there was all the difference that 16 years would make in a man's aspect.

"On Saturday my husband returned, and my brother having ridden out to see us on Sunday afternoon, I told them both my vision as we sat together on the verandah. They treated it so lightly that I determined to write it down in my diary and see if the news were verified. And from that diary I am now quoting. Also I mentioned it to at least 12 or 14 other people, and bid them wait the result.

"And surely enough, at the end of several weeks, my sister-in-law wrote that M. N.'s father died at C—— Common on November 18th, 1863, which exactly tallied with the date of the vision. He left £45,000 to be divided between his son and daughter, but the son has never been found.

"Many people in Adelaide heard the story before the confirmation came, and I wrote and told M. N.'s mother. She was much distressed about it, fearing he was unhappy. She is now dead. My husband was profoundly struck when he saw my diary corresponding *exactly* to the news in the letter I had that moment received in his presence."

Mrs. T. states that she has never experienced a hallucination of vision on any other occasion.

Mr. T. has confirmed to us the accuracy of this narrative; and Mrs. T. has shown to one of us a memorandum of the appearance of two figures under date November 18th, in her diary of the year 1863;² and a newspaper obituary confirms this as the date of the death. We learn from a gentleman who is a near relative of M. N.'s, that M. N., though long lost sight of, was afterwards heard of, and outlived his father.

If we regard this vision as telepathic, the agent can apparently only have been the dying man; and the case would then seem to be an extreme instance of the very rare type where the agent's personality does not appear, but some idea or picture in his mind is reproduced in the percipient's mind with a force that leads to an actual percept. For, as the narrator herself suggests, had she bodied forth the idea of M. N. from her own unaided resources, she would almost certainly have pictured him with the aspect that had been familiar to her. But though we have to draw on the father's mind for the unfamiliar features, we must not forget the possibilities of agency below the threshold of consciousness (p. 63, 170-1). And it is at least worth suggesting that the percipient's mind brought its own affinities to bear—exercised, so to speak, a selective influence; and that thus it was rather owing to her special interest in the son than to the conscious occupation of his father's mind with him, that the telepathic impulse which was able to affect her took this particular form. As to the appearance of the *second figure* it may possibly have been also telepathically produced; but I prefer to lay stress on it simply as one of the numerous indications that these waking percepts are really dream-creations, not objective presences.

¹ Cf. case 194.

² [The memorandum consisted of the words "two figures." See Gurney's reply to Taylor Innes in *Nineteenth Century* for Oct., 1887.—Ed.]

The next example [from the additional chapter] is one of the cases where the agent's bond of connection has apparently been with someone who was in the percipient's company at the time of the experience, rather than with the actual percipient. (Cf. Nos. 242 and 355.) The narrator desires that his name may not appear, as the family of the agent, whom he has already assisted liberally, might base on the incident described a sentimental claim to further favours.

" June 12, 1886.

(697) " There can be no doubt whatever that there is some transmission for which no explanation has yet been given by the savants.

" I am a practical business man, and look upon all theories of Spiritualism, &c., as so much humbug that only deludes weak-minded people. But, at the same time, I recently had an experience of a most extraordinary character, which I should scarcely have believed if related to me of anyone else, and the plain facts of which I will give as they actually occurred.

" I had in my employ a clerk who contracted an illness which incapacitated him from regular attendance at his duties. He was absent about six months in 1884, and, on leaving the hospital, as I found that he was unable to resume his regular work, I agreed with him that he should come to the office whenever he felt able to do so, and that I would pay him for the work so done. This arrangement continued for some months; then, at the beginning of April, 1885, he had to stay away altogether for two or three weeks. He seemed in fair general health, but he was troubled with a diseased ankle-joint, which prevented him from getting about. I was in no anxiety on his account, however, and had no apprehension of any serious illness. My wife, who knew Mr. Z. from seeing him occasionally at my private house, did not even know that he was absent from the office at this time.

" On the night of the 27th-28th April I was awakened by my wife calling out convulsively, ' There is someone looking at you.' Though by no means timid as a rule—a practical woman, not subject to nervous fancies of any kind—she was much disturbed and terrified. She jumped out of bed and turned up the gas. Finding no intruder in the room, and all the doors locked, she got back into bed; but she was shivering all over, and it was some time before I succeeded in quieting her. The clock in the hall struck 1 during this disturbance.

" In the morning we referred to the incident, and I told my wife she must have been suffering from nightmare.

" Later on that day, news was brought to my office that poor Z. had passed away in the night. When I got home in the evening, my wife met me as usual at the door, and I said to her, ' I have some sad news to tell you.' Before I could say more she replied, ' I know what it is; poor Z. is dead. It was his face which I saw looking at you last night.'

" I afterwards learnt, from a man who lodged in Mrs. Z.'s house, that he had died just at 1 o'clock in the morning of the 28th, and that in the delirium which preceded his death, he called upon me to look after his wife and children when he was gone."

Mrs. B., the percipient, writes :—

" I have read this paper through, and the contents correctly describe what transpired. I was *awake* when I saw the face. I have never experienced any similar occurrence."

[The last sentence is in answer to the question whether she had experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.]

We have verified in the *Times* obituary the fact that Z. died on April 28th, 1885.

Mr. Podmore has examined the clerk whom Mr. B. despatched to make inquiries of the widow on hearing of the death,—i.e., on the afternoon of April 28th—and who has since heard Mrs. B. narrate her experience. So far as he could recollect, Mrs. Z. told him that Z. died about 1.30 a.m., certainly at an early hour in the morning. He did not remember to have heard anything about the dying words, &c.

[Mr. Gurney, in reply to a suggestion by Professor Peirce, states emphatically that "The percipient had *not* heard of Z.'s death when she announced that it was his face that she had seen. Most people would, I think, infer this from the printed account." (*Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research* (1887), vol. i., pp. 164, 298).—ED.]

[Case 169 here omitted.]

We owe the following case to the Rev. T. Williams, Rector of Aston-Clinton, Tring. The first note written down by Mr. Williams from his sister's account of the occurrence was copied from his diary by the present writer.

(170) "Mrs. Stewart, sister-in-law of Jane, my sister's servant, came up to ask if any news from home. She said, with her husband in bed—moonlight—chest of drawers between window—saw her mother standing—felt perfectly awake—she hid her face—a third time looked up—heard [? saw] nothing, but heard men calling up—knew exact time. She came up to my sister's and related this the same day—said dreading to hear knock at door all day—fearing to hear of something having happened to her mother. Her friends, who lived at Church Stretton, came a month after to christening of her baby; in mourning—said mother's sister, who exact image of her mother, had died at the very time of her vision—but friends did not tell Mrs. Stewart, because of her condition. This written from my sister's account, who saw Mrs. Stewart on the day of the vision, and heard account of what seen from herself." The date 1880 is added.

The following account is from the husband of the percipient, who is herself dead. His mother's name is also appended to the statement.

"April, 1885.

"Mrs. Stewart, the wife of a carpenter, living in Abergavenny, Monmouthshire, and who [Mrs. S.] is since dead, was, in the year 1874, in bed, and early one morning, being sure she was awake (for she had just heard the railway men being called to their work by the call boy), she looked up to see the time, and in one corner of her room she saw distinctly what she thought was her mother, intently looking at her. She was startled, and hid her face. On looking again the vision was still there but on looking up a third time it had disappeared. Mrs. Stewart came up, that day to see a sister-in-law who was in service near the town, to ask if she had had any tidings from her home (the impression the vision had made was so great), but nothing had been heard. Time passed on, and all seemed forgotten, when some of her friends came up to Abergavenny, to the christening of a little baby, born in the meantime. They were in mourning, and inquiries were made as to the friend mourned for, when it was told that on the night Mrs. Stewart thought she saw her mother, a sister of the mother's, to whom she bore a great likeness, had died about the hour named, at some distance off; but they did not tell Mrs. Stewart

of the death until some weeks after it happened, as Mrs. Stewart was in delicate health and much attached to her aunt. " JOHN STEWART."

Miss Williams, of Abergavenny, writes on July 1, 1885 :—

" Mrs. Stewart was not an excitable woman, had never had any hallucination of the senses, and was a quiet, somewhat silent person. Her mother-in-law is now living in Abergavenny, and is a very sensible, respectable, practical woman. She probably heard Mrs. Stewart speak of the occurrence soon afterwards, and was anxious to add her testimony to the statement. I probably mentioned the statement to my brother in 1880, and he set it down in his note-book."

In reference to this last sentence, Mr. Williams says: " I am more inclined to think that I heard of it within a day or two after it happened, and that if I added the date 1880, it must have been the date of my copying it into my note-book from some loose memoranda."

Here we have a singular feature—an appearance which suggested not the agent but a person closely resembling her. The case thus stands in a sort of midway position between the more normal cases and the class of unrecognised phantasms, of which several specimens have already been given (cases 32 and 154). The same peculiarity occurs in the next case. [171 here omitted.]

The next case is from Mrs. Duthie, housekeeper to the Rev. J. C. Macphail, of Pilgrim Manse, Edinburgh, who writes :—

" December 8th, 1885.

(172) " My son has shown me the paper signed by our housekeeper, Mrs. Elizabeth Duthie, and has told me of your desire to be assured of her reliability. Mrs. Duthie has been with me for more than 30 years, and I know her to be one on whose statement the fullest reliance may be placed.

" J. CALDER MACPHAIL."

Mrs. Duthie writes :—

" Pilgrim Manse, Edinburgh, August 22nd, 1885.

" In August, 1883, the family of the Rev. J. C. Macphail had all gone to the country, leaving me alone in the house. An intimate friend of mine, a Miss Grant, who lived in Aberdeen, had been for some time seriously ill, and I was anxious about her, though I did not know that death was near. On Sunday night, the 26th of August, about 8 o'clock, I retired to my room, which is separated from the rest of the house with a flight of stairs leading up to the door. I got into bed, and was lying half-asleep, with my face to the wall, when I felt that someone was bending over me, looking into my face. I opened my eyes, and looked up into the face of my friend Miss Grant. I started up in bed, and, looking round, saw Miss Grant's figure leaving the room. I then got out of bed, and going to the door, looked downstairs, but no one was to be seen. I went down the stairs into the kitchen, but no one was there, nor was there a trace of anyone. I looked at the clock, and saw it was a few minutes past 9, and then went back to bed, feeling very uncomfortable, and certain something had happened to my friend. All next day (Monday) I felt unhappy about it, and waited anxiously to hear of my friend ; but, as there was no one else in the house, I did not mention my experience of the previous night to anyone. That night I received information from Aberdeen that my

friend had died at 9 o'clock on the previous night—at the very time I had seen her form in Edinburgh.

" I have never had a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.

" ELIZABETH DUTHIE."

Mrs. Duthie's *vivâ voce* account, given to the present writer a year later, exactly corresponded with the above. She is quite certain that her eyes were open when she saw the face.

In answer to inquiries Mrs. Duthie says :—

" I am *quite certain* that this experience fell on a *Sunday*, though I forget the exact day of the month ; and I could not have imagined that it fell on the *Sunday after* I got the news, for I heard of the death the very next day."

She has sent us a printed notice which she received, to this effect :—

" 22, Thistle Street, Aberdeen.

" 27th August, 1883.

" Helen Grant died here last night at 9 o'clock.

(Signed) " WM. GRANT."

Mr. G. W. Macphail writes :—

" Mrs. Duthie told my mother of her strange experience less than a month after the event, and I learnt it shortly after from Mrs. Duthie."

The next case is a deposition made by Mrs. Still (known in her professional capacity as Mrs. Byrne), who was introduced to Mr. Myers by Mrs. Longe, of Coddendam Lodge, Cheltenham.

" Cheltenham, December 27th, 1882.

(173) " Mrs. Byrne was stewardess on the steamer ' Lyra,' Captain Gilpin, in the River Plata line of steamers. One morning—probably between 6 and 7, but she had no watch—she was lying in her berth. She awoke and saw Captain Gilpin's head passing slowly along her berth and looking at her. This was a familiar gesture on his part, as he used to be friendly with Mrs. Byrne, and ask her to sit on a seat outside his cabin, and used to look through his window in this way when he thought she was sitting there. Mrs. Byrne got up at once, and went into the pantry, and there heard that Captain Gilpin had been killed (though not instantaneously) by the fall of a spar at 6 that morning."

An extract from the official log-book, obtained by us from the General Register and Record Office of Shipping and Seamen, shows that the accident to Captain Prince Gilpin took place at 5.30 a.m., February 19th, 1878, on the " Laplace," not the " Lyra." He was crushed against the engine-room skylight by a heavy sea ; and his death was due to fracture of the ribs and injuries to the lungs. This would quite correspond with Mrs. Byrne's statement that his death was not instantaneous.

[The coincidence here must have been very close ; as there cannot have been more than a short interval between Captain Gilpin's death and Mrs. Byrne's natural time for rising, and in this interval, apparently, the vision occurred. The short period within which the whole contents of the narrative are comprised is further of importance as making the case an easy one to carry correctly in the memory ; and it seems very unlikely that the percipient should have come to imagine that she got up immediately after her vision and ascertained what had occurred, if the

vision really took place on some other morning. Mrs. Byrne had been on two previous voyages with Captain Gilpin. She has experienced one other visual hallucination, which may have been purely subjective.]¹

The lady who narrates the following case desires that her name may not be published.

"May, 1885.

(174) "An attack of rheumatism and nervous prostration left me far from well for some weeks last spring, and one night I had a strange unaccountable vision which has left a vivid impression upon my memory. I had gone to bed early and was lying awake alone, with a night-light burning in order in some degree to dispel the gloom. Suddenly across the lower end of the room passed Major G.'s figure, dressed in his usual everyday costume, neither his features nor his figure any whit altered. It was no dream, nor was I in the least delirious or wandering, therefore a conviction seized me that something must have occurred; in consequence I particularly marked the hour, when the clock struck 11 shortly afterwards. The next morning I was not the least surprised when my sister handed me a note from Miss G. announcing her brother's death, and was fully prepared before reading it to find that he had passed away before 11 the previous evening—which presentiment, strange to say, was fully verified; Major G. having died at a quarter to 11. Major G. had returned in a bad state of health from Egypt, where he had been serving in the campaign of 1883. For some time he appeared to recover and was able to go about and enter into society during the winter, but during the last month the old symptoms had returned, and gradually he grew worse and worse, until no hopes of his recovery were entertained. Though not personally intimate with him, we were well acquainted with his family, and naturally his case formed a topic of conversation among us. We had also received bad accounts a few days before and were aware that he was in a critical condition; nevertheless at the time of his death he had been quite out of my thoughts and mind. I had never before had any apparition of any description whatsoever, nor has this one been followed by any other.

"C. P."

Miss Scott Moncrieff, of 44, Shooter's Hill Road, Blackheath, says:—

"As I was at [the town where Miss P. lives] at the time, I can myself so far confirm the story as to mention that, on the day after it occurred, we heard that the young lady had been so shaken in her nerves by her illness that she had been seeing what you would call a 'hallucination,' and was going to Malvern for change of air."

She adds that Miss P. was staying with her when the above account was written, and that as to the date, "both she and I remembered that it was on a Thursday near the end of March or beginning of April."

We find from an obituary notice that Major G. died on *Thursday*, April 3rd, 1884.

In an interview with Mr. Myers, December 26th, 1885, Miss P. added the following details:—

"Major G.'s phantom was in his ordinary walking costume—hat and

¹ This was "an *unrecognised* figure, which seems curiously to have corresponded in aspect with a person who, unknown to her, had recently died in the room in which it appeared; but it has been impossible to obtain corroboratory evidence of this incident." See reply by Gurney to Professor Peirce. *Proceedings of American Society for Psychical Research*, 1885-9, vol. i., p. 160.—Ed.]

ulster—in which Miss P. was accustomed to see him. The figure passed quickly across the end of the room without turning its head, but the face as well as the figure were distinctly recognisable. The figure made no noise, and disappeared as it reached the wall.¹ Miss P. at once conjectured that Major G. must be passing away; but she felt no fear. Although Major G. was known to be fatally ill, there was no expectation of his death from day to day. He was not prominently before Miss P.'s mind. Miss P. was somewhat out of health at the time, but never suffered from any kind of hallucination of sight or hearing. She did not mention the incident to her family for fear of ridicule.

Miss P.'s sister (to whom the incident was first told) said that she remembered receiving next morning the letter as to Major G.'s death; and also remembered that some time later Miss P. told her of the incident.

[Here the knowledge of the percipient that Major G. was in a critical state is, of course, an element of weakness; but it remains a remarkable coincidence that she should have had her one experience of a sensory hallucination at the exact hour of his death.]

The next account is from Mr. Runciman, of Oak Villa, Geraldine Road, Wandsworth.

"May 5th, 1884.

(175) "On the morning of December 2nd, 1883, at about 7 o'clock in the morning, I had a dream which merged into a waking hallucination as follows:—I dreamt Mr. J. H. Haggitt was lying on my bed, beside me, outside of the bedclothes. I dreamt I saw him there, and I also thought I saw him there *after* dreaming. I arose and rested on my right elbow, looking at him in the dusky light. There was a very small jet of gas burning in the room. I reflected, 'Am I awake, or is this a dream?' I cannot yet answer this question to my own satisfaction; I cannot tell when my dream merged in my waking thoughts. I only am sure that as the figure disappeared I was as wide awake as I am now. He was dressed in grey tweed, as I had been used to see him actually dressed.² He was turned from me so that I could only partially see his face. Yet I was certain it was he. I was alarmed and shocked to find my dream a reality—as I then thought it. I was about to speak when, in a twinkling, the image of Mr. H. was gone. I was leaning on my right arm and half raised from the bed. It was only half light, our gas burning but turned low. I mentioned the matter on that day to Mr. G. Aynsley, of No. 3, Glover Terrace, South Shields. I was oppressed during the whole day by the unusual experience of the morning, and hence spoke to the above and another twice about the incident.

"I had a note, next day I think, saying that Mr. H. died about 6 hours after his fancied presence in my bed.

"I knew that Mr. H. was afflicted, as he had been for 8 years or so, by bronchial asthma. As he had lived so long in spite of great suffering, I quite thought he would live longer. I had no idea he was near death.

"I believe this was a merely natural occurrence. I am not orthodox in religion.

"THOMAS RUNCIMAN."

¹ The mode of movement and of disappearance here described are not infrequent in visual hallucinations. In my collection (p. 254), besides about a dozen cases where the disappearance was through a door, behind a curtain, into a corner, and so on, I find four where it was respectively through the wall, into the wall, through the window, and into a bookcase. Movement of some sort, as will be seen later, is an extremely frequent feature of both subjective and telepathic phantoms.

² See pp. 351-2.

We find the date of the death confirmed by the obituary of the *Darlington and Stockton Times*.

Mr. Aynsley corroborates as follows, on May 10, 1884 :—

" 3, Glover Terrace, South Shields.

" I remember hearing Mr. Thomas Runciman speak of a vivid dream and hallucination which he had had on the day that Mr. Haggit died. He told me that he dreamt that he saw him lying on the bed beside him, in his ordinary dress, but very pale and haggard. He was so impressed that he awoke, and saw him quite plainly there. I ascertained afterwards that he had died about 6 hours after, on the day that Mr. Runciman related the circumstance.

" GEORGE AYNSELEY."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Runciman writes :—

" With regard to my having had any other hallucination, I have had others, but lapse of time and inattention have quite dimmed the remembrance of them. They were of a different kind to this last case. They were, I should say, simply ' nightmare ' or ' daymare.' That is, they were such, that I quite believe I was *asleep* while experiencing them. In the last case I had not a peculiar sense of breaking out of sleep at once, and with a snap, as it were. I render my idea but imperfectly in the preceding sentence—perhaps I would more truly describe myself as breaking free, not from what was sleep, but from a tyrannous mistake as to my circumstances at the time. This sense was absent in the last case. I believe I might be awake, I even *think* I was awake, with the image of a dream still strongly on my mind. But in the earlier cases I concluded long ago that I was asleep and vividly dreaming till the image disappeared. Briefly, I cannot be sure in the latter case that I was asleep, although all experience would go to say I was. In the earlier cases many years ago I concluded that *waking* had caused what looked real to disappear. But do not think for one moment that I consider the last case any less a delusion than the former. I only try to describe my experience and belief at the moment of hallucination. It is difficult to define the difference in these cases."

In conversation with our colleague, Mr. R. Hodgson, Mr. Runciman mentioned that he found afterwards from the servant that at the time of his hallucination Mr. Haggit was apparently suffering intense agony. The figure was not part of his dream at all; he saw it when he woke. It appeared to be lying almost on its right side, between Mr. Runciman and his wife, with the left side-face exposed and eye open, but the body was motionless, though it seemed to Mr. Runciman to be alive. In addition to the low gaslight, the dusky light of the morning was coming through the window, the blind of which was up. The light was sufficient for Mr. Runciman to see the time by his watch. He tells us that he made a written note of the experience, but does not remember whether this was done before he heard of the death. He has searched for the note, but cannot find it, and thinks that it must have been lost at the time of a removal.

§ 6. I will now give some examples where two senses were concerned. [Six cases, 176–181, follow in which one of the two senses was the sense of touch. These are omitted except 180.]

The following account is from Mr. George J. Coombs, Sheriff's Officer for the County of Nottingham. He tells me that he enjoys singularly

robust health, and he is certainly as free from superstitious fancies as can well be conceived.

" Journal Chambers, Pelham Street, Nottingham.

" December 28th, 1883.

(180) " In the middle of the month of June, 1880, my aunt left Salisbury and went to the Washington Hotel, Liverpool, where I joined her from Nottingham, for the purpose of seeing her off to America, on board the Allan Line steamer, ' Circassian,' the following day.

" Her business was to realise some property. She was getting into years, and very much pressed me to accompany her, but I was unable to leave my business for so long a time. She, however, made me promise to meet her on her return, and said it was her intention to spend the winter at Nottingham before returning to Salisbury.

" About the 25th July following, at 4 o'clock in the morning, while in bed, I suddenly awoke and said to my wife, ' Someone has taken hold of my hand ; the hand was quite cold. I believe it was my aunt ; I saw her rush out of the room.' The door was open on chain, and I immediately jumped out of bed to see, and the chain was still on. I said to my wife, ' My aunt is dead, and she has come again over the water,' to which she replied, ' You are dreaming ; you had too much supper last night ' ; to which I said, ' No, I am positive of the impression.'

" I received a letter from a solicitor in Hamilton, about a fortnight afterwards, announcing my aunt's decease, and a reference to the dates convinced my wife that she died at the very time I had the visitation. When I left my aunt in the steam tug which accompanied the ' Circassian ' down the Mersey, her farewell words were, ' I shall see you first when I come back.'

" GEORGE J. COOMBS."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Coombs adds that the vision was not distinct, but that the hallucination is unique in his experience. In conversation, he described the impression as extremely striking and startling. The door was so chained that it was impossible for anyone to enter the room.

Mrs. Coombs corroborates as follows :—

" July 25th, 1884.

" I very well remember the morning when my husband awoke early, and said he saw his aunt rush out of the bedroom, and that she had taken hold of his hand ; also that, when the news of Mrs. Rumbold's death came from Hamilton, the remark was made that it was the very date my husband narrated his dream. I cannot fix the date without an Almanac of 1880, but it was our Village Feast Monday morning, which is, I believe, the third week in July.

" S. A. COOMBS."

We asked if it was possible to obtain corroboration as to the date of the death. Mr. Coombs sent us the solicitor's letter ; but this letter assumes knowledge of the death, and was not written till September 27th. The letter received by Mr. Coombs " about a fortnight " after the death, and which must be the one by which the coincidence was fixed, is the following. It is undated, but the postmarks are Hamilton, July 21st, and Nottingham, August 5th, 1880.

" 188, King Street East, Hamilton, Canada.

" DEAR SIR,—I am sorry to have the painful task to inform you of the death of your aunt, Mrs. Rumbold. She came to me on a visit on

July 3rd, feeling very poorly. I thought it must be over-fatigue, and probably after a rest she would be better. She continued getting worse and lingered on till the 19th.—Yours truly,

" A. JARVIS."

[Monday in the third week of July, 1880, fell on the 19th, which is so far in favour of the accuracy of Mrs. Coombs' memory. It seems practically beyond doubt that at the time that the news arrived, Mr. Coombs, as well as his wife, fixed the date of the dream as Monday the 19th; and the fact that in his letter to us, written more than 3 years afterwards without reference to documents, he says "about the 25th," is, therefore, unimportant.

We learn, however, from Mrs. Jarvis that Mrs. Rumbold died at 4 p.m.; so that the impression, though falling, of course, within a time of most serious illness altogether unknown to the percipient, preceded the actual death by about 16 hours.]

§ 7. Lastly, we have a group where the two higher senses of sight and hearing were both concerned. The following account is from Miss Kate Jenour, of 23, Belsize Square, South Hampstead, N.W.

" November, 1884.

(182) " On the 4th of May, 1883, when on board R.M.S. 'Spartan,' on my way to Capetown, I was awoke by hearing someone in my cabin, which I alone occupied, when to my surprise I saw the figure of a friend of mine standing by my berth. It then disappeared, and by the first mail after my arrival at Capetown, I received the news of my friend's death, which took place at 10.30 p.m. on that night. I told 2 or 3 passengers on board, who made a note of it."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Jenour says:—

" I was certainly awake; I had no sense of awaking *afterwards*, but the sense of waking *before* I saw the figure, my first impression having been that the steward had come in to shut the port-hole. I had a light burning in my cabin. The figure looked quite solid and natural, and was in day-dress. I knew the girl to be consumptive, but had not thought of her as likely to die, and indeed had not been thinking about her at all; she was an acquaintance and neighbour, but not an intimate friend.

" I think the vessel was about half-way to the Cape. Next day I described what I had seen to my cousin, Mr. Jenour, Captain Wait, Mr. Frames, who is now a lawyer in Grahamstown, and Mr. Hope Hall. I was so impressed that I could not help speaking of it, in spite of expecting to be laughed at: had it been a *dream*, I should have thought nothing of it.

" I am certain I mentioned the date of my vision in my first letter to my father, written when I got to the Cape, and before the news of the death reached me; and I am also certain that when I received the news of the death, I noted, and my cousin noted, that the dates were the same. I cannot now be sure of the exact day.

" I have had no other such waking vision except once, soon after, at Capetown; when I saw the figure of a dressmaker whom I knew in England, and who (as I learnt on my return to England) had died about the same time; but the date was not fixed.

" K. J."

We find from the obituary in the *Times* that the death took place on May 2, 1883.

Miss Jenour's cousin is unfortunately at a distance, and his address cannot at present be ascertained. Captain Wait writes, in April, 1886,

that he does not recall Miss Jenour's mention of the incident. The fact of the coincident death not being then known, such a narration might naturally make very little impression. I wrote to ask Mr. Frames if he remembered any singular announcement made by Miss Jenour during the voyage; but he replied in the negative.

Miss Jenour's father writes on November 1, 1885 :—

"I can positively state that by the next mail to the Cape, after the death of a young friend of ours, I wrote to my daughter; but before my letter can have reached her, she, on arriving at Capetown, wrote to me to say that the lady in question had appeared to her in her cabin, at sea, between Madeira and the Cape, and that she mentioned the fact the following morning to her relatives and friends on board. On comparing dates, it was certain that the appearance was on the same day that the lady died. Since then my relatives have confirmed this in every particular.

"H. J. JENOUR."

Mr. Jenour is certain that his daughter's letter contained the date of her vision, and he has kindly searched for the letter. He writes, on Dec. 1, 1885 :—

"The letter I most wanted I cannot find, but have one dated June 5th, in which my daughter again refers to Miss B.'s death, and adds, 'On the 2nd of May,¹ in the night, or rather morning,² I awoke up and saw Edith standing by my bed. I told about it at the time.' The lady died at half-past 10 o'clock at night."

Mr. Jenour tells me that it was the close coincidence of time that specially struck him, and he mentioned the circumstance to others. Miss Jenour is equally confident that the coincidence of time was noted in Capetown; though, as she has mentioned, her memory does not retain the exact date. We find from the *Times* that the 'Spartan' left Plymouth on the 20th of April, and arrived at Capetown on the 10th of May; therefore her recollection that "the vessel was about half-way" is not far wrong.

[In a reply to an article by Professor Peirce, published in the *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research* in 1887 (vol. i., pp. 170-171) Mr. Gurney writes about this case.] . . . I have now received the independent recollections of one of the persons told, to whom I was unable to apply last year, as he was travelling and his address could not be ascertained. He writes as follows :—

"June 1, 1887.

"It was some years [four] ago that the voyage referred to in your note took place; but I distinctly remember that one morning during that voyage, Miss K. J. told me that during the previous night she had dreamed that a lady friend of hers was dead, or (for I cannot now remember which) that this friend had appeared to her on that night and announced her death.³

¹ The date of the dream in the first account, the 4th of May, was given from memory only, under the impression that the death had occurred on that day—not from any independent record.

² The vision took place soon after midnight—which of course would make its actual date May 3.

³ The second of these alternatives is the right one, but it is not quite correct. The visual experience was certainly a waking impression, not a dream; but there was no impression of an announcement or of any words. This is a good instance of the way in which lapse of time affects memory as to details, without the evidence becoming in the least untrustworthy as to essentials.

" A short time after arriving at the Cape (about the time that would be required for the transmission of a letter), Miss J. informed me that she had heard that her friend had died on the identical night of the dream or supposed appearance."

In answer to the question whether he made a written note, he says : " It is possible I may have at the time noted the date and the supposed apparition in an ordinary pocket-book ; but if I did so, this pocket-book is now lost. I have some recollection of having seen the letter announcing the death of the lady, but none of comparing the date with that in a pocket-book ; it is possible, however, that I have forgotten this circumstance."

I regard it as not improbable that Miss J. is wrong in thinking that any of the persons to whom she mentioned her experience made a written note of it. This is just the sort of feature that is likely enough to creep into an account without warrant, owing to the tendency of the mind to round off and complete an interesting story. One might expect *à priori* that this would be so ; and the fact is illustrated by the far greater commonness of written notes in second-hand than in first-hand accounts.

The next case was received towards the end of 1882, from Mr. J. G. Keulemans, who has already been mentioned more than once (pp. 140, 175, 183).

(184) In December, 1880, he was living with his family in Paris. The outbreak of an epidemic of small-pox caused him to remove three of his children, including a favourite little boy of 5, to London, whence he received, in the course of the ensuing month, several letters giving an excellent account of their health.

" On the 24th of January, 1881, at half-past 7 in the morning, I was suddenly awoke by hearing his voice, as I fancied, very near me. I saw a bright, opaque, white mass before my eyes, and in the centre of this light I saw the face of my little darling, his eyes bright, his mouth smiling.¹ The apparition, accompanied by the sound of his voice, was too short and too sudden to be called a dream : it was too clear, too decided, to be called an effect of imagination. So distinctly did I hear his voice that I looked round the room, to see whether he was actually there. The sound I heard was that of extreme delight, such as only a happy child can utter. I thought it was the moment he woke up in London, happy and thinking of me. I said to myself, ' Thank God, little Isidore is happy as always. ' "

Mr. Keulemans described the ensuing day as one of peculiar brightness and cheerfulness. He took a long walk with a friend, with whom he dined ; and was afterwards playing a game of billiards, when he again

¹ Mrs. Luther, of Adelaide Crescent, Brighton, has supplied us with a very close parallel to this form of impression, in a case which we do not include in our evidence, since the vision, though coinciding with the death of the person seen, may have been due to the percipient's state of anxiety about him. The incident was related to Mrs. Luther by her friend, Miss D. Brooke (since dead), within a year of its occurrence. " Suddenly her attention was called from the thoughts of her young friend, which filled her mind at the time, by a bright light shining in the looking-glass. She thought some one must have entered the room, but on looking at the glass, she saw in the midst of the bright light which therein appeared, her young friend, with a peaceful, happy smile upon his face. As she looked, it and the light gradually disappeared, and she was left again in comparative darkness." Compare the disc of light in case 220.

saw the apparition of his child. This made him seriously uneasy, and in spite of having received within 3 days the assurance of the child's perfect health, he expressed to his wife a conviction that he was dead. Next day a letter arrived saying that the child was ill; but the father was convinced that this was only an attempt to break the news; and, in fact, the child had died, after a few hours' illness, at the exact time of the first apparition.

Mrs. Keulemans says:—

"May 29th, 1885.

"I remember that, the day when little Isidore died, my husband said that he felt strongly impressed that there was something wrong with the little boy in London. It was in the evening that he asked me whether I had received any news from my mother about Isidore. I replied that no letter had come, and asked him why he wanted to know. He made the same remark as before, but would not further explain himself. I tried to expel his gloomy forebodings by referring to a letter we had from my mother, stating that Isidore was very happy, and was singing all day long. My husband did not seem pacified. When the letter mentioning his illness came, my husband was very much dejected, and told me that it was no use trying to make a secret of it, as he knew the worst that happened. He said afterwards that he had seen a vision.

"A. KEULEMANS."

The second apparition in this case may be regarded as a sort of recrudescence of the first. (See, however, Chapter XII, § 6.) With respect to this feature of repetition after a good many hours or days, I may mention that I have but one example of it in my collection of purely subjective hallucinations, and, except in very markedly pathological cases, it seems to be extremely rare—rarer than more immediate repetition. It is perhaps allowable to surmise its connection with a special character of intensity in some of these telepathically produced impressions. Other telepathic examples are Nos. 213 and 240.

In the next example the repetition was of the more immediate sort. The account is from Mrs. Sherman, of Muskegon, Michigan, and was received through the kindness of Mr. F. A. Nims, solicitor of that city, who has known Mrs. Sherman and her family for years.

"Muskegon, Michigan.

"November 18th, 1885.

(185) "On the 4th of July, 1868, my sister Lizzie and myself left Detroit and went to Saginaw, for the purpose of making a short visit with friends there. Our train was due in Saginaw about 7 p.m., but through detention did not arrive there until between 10 and 11. Owing to the lateness of the hour of arrival, we did not go to the residence of our friends, but to the Bancroft House, then the principal hotel in that city. The weather was very warm, our ride had been very dusty, and we were very tired. We had supper, and soon after retired. My sister and I occupied the same room and bed. It was nearly or quite 12 o'clock when we retired. As I now recollect, I went immediately to sleep. I was awakened by feeling what seemed to be a hand on my shoulder. I saw my brother Stewart standing by the bedside, and I had an impression at the same time that my brother-in-law Philip Howard was also in the room. My brother said to me: 'Kate, mother wants you! get up and go home.' I at once became very much excited and awakened my sister, and told her

that I had seen Stewart and what he had said, and that I felt sure that mother was sick or in trouble, or that something unusual had happened to her. We got up, and immediately after heard the clock strike one. There was bright moonlight that night, and all objects in the room and outside the windows were plainly visible. There had been a menagerie in town that day, and it was yet in the neighbourhood, and we could hear the noises of the animals, and talked about them. My sister did not share in my alarm or anxiety, and ridiculed what she called my 'Ghost Story,' and we soon retired again. My mind was somewhat troubled with what had occurred, and I did not go to sleep quite so soon as my sister did, but I did go to sleep again, and the air being somewhat cooler, before going to sleep I had pulled the sheet up over my neck. While asleep I was again awakened by feeling the sheet pulled down off me,¹ and I again saw my brother Stewart, and he repeated the same language as on the first occasion. At this time his appearance was very much more persistent than before, but his face seemed to retire and gradually fade away.² He looked pale and ill, but at that time my concern and anxiety was on account of my mother. I supposed that she was threatened with some serious illness, and that the appearance had relation to that. I again aroused my sister and told her what had occurred, and we both got up and dressed, and did not retire again that night. I am not sure that I mentioned the circumstance to any of our friends that day. If I did, I am not in a position now to obtain the verification of it.

"We returned home on the afternoon of Monday, the 6th of July, arriving there between 6 and 7 o'clock. We found our father and mother very much disturbed in consequence of a telegram which they had received to the effect that Stewart was dying. When my mother communicated the news to us, I answered 'He is dead'; for then the significance of what had occurred at Saginaw first flashed upon me. It was but a very short time after this, the same evening, that we received another telegram giving the tidings of his death. My sister Lizzie had received a letter from him but a day or two before we went to Saginaw, in which he promised to make us a visit in the following October, and there was nothing to afford any ground for anxiety on his account in the letter. As I have been since informed, he died about a quarter before 1 o'clock on the morning of the 5th of July, about the time of his first appearance to me, as near as I can ascertain.

"I have a letter from my sister Lucy, the wife of Philip Howard, at whose house he died, giving full particulars of his death, from which it seems that he was taken suddenly and violently ill on the 3rd or 4th of July, of what was supposed to be yellow fever.

"During his illness he talked a great deal about our mother, and seemed in his delirium to be watching for her and to think that she was coming to see him. He died, as stated, that Sunday morning, and was buried by order of the authorities on the afternoon of the same day.

"You inquire if I have ever had any previous hallucination of that kind. I have never had but one; that occurred when I was 7 years old. At that time a young girl, a relative and playmate of mine, was ill with some form of fever. I had not been allowed to see her for two or three days. On waking one morning, I saw or dreamed she came and kissed me and bade me good-bye. This was before I had arisen. My mother soon afterwards came into the room, and I told her that — had come

¹ I need hardly point out that this sensation is no more a proof of an objective presence than any other feature of the hallucination.

² Compare p. 277, note; and see Chap. xii., § 10, and p. 432, note.

and kissed me and bid me good-bye. Within a few minutes after this, some one of the family came from the house where the little girl resided, and said that she was dying. My mother immediately went over to the house, which was not far off, and when she arrived there the little girl was already dead.

" These are the only cases of what you call 'hallucination' that have occurred in my experience.

" The occurrences at Saginaw were real, and I have never had a doubt about my brother, in some way or form, appearing to and communicating with me.

" KATE SHERMAN."

Mrs. Sherman's sister, Mrs. Park, corroborates as follows :—

" Muskegon, Michigan.

" I have read the foregoing statement signed by my sister, Mrs. S., and am able from my own recollection to confirm the same, except, of course, that I did not myself see my brother, Stewart Paris, or his apparition, at the same time that my sister did.

" At the time of the occurrences at Saginaw, I supposed what my sister said that she saw to be a dream, or something of that character, and gave the matter no serious thought or consideration until our return home the next day, when we learned of our brother's illness and death.

" I remember, however, that what my sister said she saw made a very strong impression upon her, and that she said, and seemed to believe, that some serious illness or misfortune had occurred or was about to occur to our mother.

" ELIZABETH O. PARK."

Mr. Nims adds that he had hoped to get a statement from Mrs. Paris, mother of Mrs. Sherman and Mrs. Park ; but " while she remembers hearing about the vision on her daughters' return from Saginaw, she is unable to say whether it was before or after the news of the death."

The next case [from the additional chapter] illustrates the psychological identity of dreams and waking phantasms in an interesting way ; the telepathic impression taking effect first as a dream, and afterwards as a hallucination. The visual hallucination was apparently a prolongation of the dream-image into waking moments ; but the waking experience included a further feature—a hallucination of hearing. The case is from Mr. M. S. Griffin, of San Remo, Weymouth.

" May, 1886.

(702) " I have been requested to give an account of an odd coincidence which occurred some three years since. (I am no believer in spirits, and believe the following was the result of illness.) I was in the tropics, and, at the time I mention, laid up with fever, when one night I had a dream about an old lady friend of mine. I woke up suddenly, and thought I saw her at the foot of my bed, and the strange part was I thought I heard her speak. She seemed to be dressed in white. I told this to a friend, who only laughed at me and said I was ill, but at the same time, he put down the date and hour. A few mails after, I heard of the old lady's death, at the same date and hour. I have no belief in spirits whatever, but this was a fact."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Griffin supplied the following fuller account.

" June 15, 1886.

" At the time of the occurrence, June, 1882, I had been in Jamaica for about 18 months. I had been ill with country fever, but was con-

valescent, though still very weak. I was sleeping in a room next that of a friend, with the door open between. I had a dream, in which my mind went back to old times when I had seen much of the lady I mentioned; and then I became aware that she was dead, in a room which seemed to be near me, and that I wanted to get to her; and as this thought flashed across me, I seemed to see her. Then I woke with a sudden start, and distinctly saw her standing at the foot of my bed, dressed in white, and with the hands by her side. The face was extremely distinct, and quite unmistakable. Had a real person been standing in that place, I certainly could not have distinguished the features, as it was a dark night.¹ The figure plainly pronounced my name, 'Marcus,' once, and then gradually disappeared as I watched it. It remained visible a sufficient number of seconds for me to be keenly aware that I was awake; I felt quite clearly, the *former* experience was a dream, *then* I woke, and *now* this is a waking reality. After the disappearance, I called out, and my friend came in. I described the whole experience to him, and he was sufficiently impressed with it to notice the time—which was a few minutes past midnight, June 11th—and to note the occurrence *at once* in his diary. The next morning he and others laughed at the matter, but could not but be impressed by its reality to *me*.

"About three weeks afterwards, I received a letter from a daughter of my friend, informing me of her mother's death in England, on June 11th, soon after 5 a.m. My friend and I calculated the difference of longitude, and the hours corresponded to within a few minutes. I had no idea of the lady's being ill, and had neither been anxious about her nor thinking about her. In conversation with the family, two years later, they told me that a few minutes before her death she said, 'Tell Marcus I thought of him.' I may mention that this lady had, three years before, nursed me through a dangerous illness; and I had a warm affection for her.

"I do not recollect on any other occasion in my life experiencing the continuation of a dream-image into waking moments; nor have I ever had a hallucination either of sight or hearing.

"MARCUS SOUTHWELL GRIFFIN."

Mr. Griffin kindly allowed me to copy the following sentence from the letter which announced the death:—

"Alphington.

"June 17, 1882.

"Mother died on St. Barnabas' Day [*i.e.*, June 11], at 5.20, and was buried on the Thursday following, June 15th, 1882."

We have verified the date of death in the Register of Deaths.

The next letter that Mr. Griffin received made it quite clear that the 5.20 was A.M.; and in conversation with the family since, the death was described to him as having taken place *before breakfast*.

[Mr. Griffin has now no *separate* recollection of the date of his vision. He had an idea that the death had been on June 15, not having looked for some time at the letter in which it was announced, where it will be seen that June 15 (the day of the funeral) is the only day of the month mentioned, the day of the death being otherwise described. The "June 11" in the foregoing account was added after he had referred to this letter. But there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that he is justified in his conviction that his vision took place on June 11. He can hardly be wrong in his recollection that he and his friend made a careful computation of the longitude, with a view to ascertaining how close the coincidence was;

¹ See pp. 290 (note) and 359.

and that they specially noticed a slight discrepancy. (The difference of longitude being about $73\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, the time of the death would correspond with about 12.30 a.m., not 12.10 a.m.; so that if the two times are quite accurately given, Mr. Griffin's experience preceded the death by about 20 minutes.) Now persons who took this amount of trouble with regard to the *hours*, may fairly be assumed not to have made a gross blunder as to the identity of *day*; even if Mr. Griffin is mistaken (which there is no reason for supposing) in his recollection that the means for establishing the identity of day were there in black and white before them. It is to be hoped that the diary has been preserved, and that the evidence will in time be completed by our obtaining the entry. The friend who made it is at present in America, and Mr. Griffin has written to him, but doubts whether the last address given will now find him. He is sure, he thinks, to have news of him before very long. I may mention that Mr. Griffin's mother told me that her son gave her a full description of the occurrence on his return to England, not very long after it took place.]

I naturally cannot convey to others the full effect of Mr. Griffin's *vivâ voce* description. Though he had not attributed any scientific importance to the incident, he impressed on me that his own experience, taken alone, and quite apart from the facts which he learnt afterwards, was to him absolutely unique—by far the strangest and most perplexing thing that had ever happened to him. It gave him precisely the same vivid feeling of astonishment that the sanest of my readers would receive if they looked up from this page, and saw a friend standing palpably before them, who gazed at them, addressed them, and then vanished into air. As regards the coincidence, Mr. Griffin will allow me to add that the view expressed in his first account—namely, that his own illness was a sufficient explanation of his experience, and that the coincidence therefore was accidental—is not that which he now holds. I pointed out to him (as so often in the course of these pages) that the theory of accident which would be the reasonable one if the particular experience in question stood alone or nearly alone in our generation, becomes unreasonable when the case is only one of a large class; and I can only hope that others may agree with him in finding this argument as just as it is obvious.

[Omitting cases 186 to 189.] The next and concluding case is from Mrs. Lightfoot, a lady who is none the worse witness because she takes not the slightest interest in our work. The names and dates were filled in by the present writer, immediately after a personal interview, January 30th, 1884.

" 51, Shaftesbury Road, Ravenscourt Park, W.

" January 11th, 1884.

(190) " In giving the following experience. I may premise that as a child, and since, I have comparatively had but little knowledge (as a personal experience) of fear; and in the existence of ghosts I have always disbelieved. Did I ever see or hear sights or sounds for which, on examination, I could not account, I have always come to the conclusion that they arose from natural causes which were beyond my reach of inquiry—hence I always refused to accept anything, without proof, and I may add, that I have rarely been convinced.

" Some 10 years ago, when in India, I contracted a great friendship, which was reciprocated, for a lady, Mrs. Reed, the wife of an officer. She

had not been very strong, but when I parted from her with the intention of returning to England, no danger (the word had not even been mentioned) was anticipated, and for some few months after my return I heard from her, bright and cheerful letters enough. In them she certainly spoke of her health not being good, but nothing more. Then after a time her letters ceased, but I heard very regularly from others at the same place, and they mentioned that her health was gradually getting worse, and that she would probably be ordered to England for a thorough change, but still I heard no sound of fatal ending, and I was looking forward to her return with a great degree of pleasure.

"It was my practice not only to go to bed very late, but also for the last half-hour to pick up a book, the most uninteresting and dry that it was possible to find, and so try to soothe the mind. The moment I commenced to really feel sleepy, I would lower the gas to almost a pin's point (for I did not care to extinguish it, as I had a child of 3 sleeping in the same room), and then I could always compose myself comfortably to a sleep into which I could then fall in a very few minutes.

"On the night of September 21st, 1874, I had followed this exact routine. I had put aside my book, lowered the gas, and at a little after midnight I was sound asleep. As I knew afterwards, I must have slept about 3 hours, when I was suddenly aroused (and was, so far as I know, *perfectly wide awake*) by a violent noise at my door, which was locked. I have some recollection of feeling astonished (of fear I then had none) at seeing or rather hearing within the instant my door thrown violently open, as though by someone in great anger, and I was instantly conscious that someone, something—what shall I call *it*?—was in the room. For the hundredth part of a second it seemed to pause just within the room, and then by a movement, which it is impossible for me to describe—but it seemed to move with a rapid push—*it* was at the foot of my bed. Again a pause; for again the hundredth part of a second, and the figure-shape rose. I *heard* it, but as it got higher its movements quieted, and presently *it* was above my bed, lying horizontally, its face downwards, parallel with my face, its feet to my feet, but with a distance of some 3 or 4 feet between us.¹ This for a moment, whilst I waited simply in astonishment and curiosity (for I had not the very faintest idea of either who or what it was), but no fear, and then it spoke. In an instant I recognised the voice, the old familiar imperious way of speaking, as my Christian name sounded clear and full through the room. 'Frances,' it repeated, 'I want you; come with me. Come at once.' My voice responded as instantaneously, 'Yes, I'll come. What need for such a hurry?' and then came a quick imperative reply, 'But you *must* come *at once*; come instantly, and without a moment's pause or hesitation.' I seemed to be drawn upwards by some extraordinary magnetic influence, and then just as suddenly and violently thrown down again.

"In one second of time the room was in a deathly stillness, and the words, 'She is dead,' were simply burnt into my mind. I sat up in bed dazed, and *now*, for the first time, frightened beyond measure. I sat very still for a few moments, gradually making out the different forms in the

¹ This rather bizarre form of impression has a close parallel in the case of a purely subjective experience, described to me by Mrs. Pirkis, of the High Elms, Nutfield, Surrey, who has never had any other hallucination. She was one night sleeping with her sister—both being in perfect health—when, suddenly waking, she saw a figure kneeling over her sister, "a foot or something less above her, in reversed position, face towards the foot of the bed. It was a beautiful picture. I lay watching it, I should say, for about 4 or 5 minutes, till it melted away as I looked."

room, then I turned the gas, which was just above my head, full on, only to see that the room was totally unchanged. At the foot of my bed, at some distance from it, was the child's iron cot. I got up and looked at him; he was sleeping quite peacefully, and had evidently been totally undisturbed. I went to the door, to find it *fast locked*. I opened it, and gazed into the passage—total silence and stillness everywhere. I went into the next room, where there were sleeping two other children and their nurse, to find equal quietness there. Then I returned to my room, and, I must confess it, with an awful fear oppressing me. She had come once—might she not come again? I wrote down the date and the hour, and then opening shutter and window only looked out for the welcome dawn.

"I went down to breakfast that morning, but said nothing of the details of my dream,¹ only mentioning that I had had a very bad and a very vivid one. Afterwards I found I could settle to nothing, and at last was becoming positively so ill that I was obliged to go back to bed. That same afternoon, curiously enough, a sister came to see me, who had been abroad with me, and whilst there had known and liked this same friend. She saw I was much upset about something of which I did not care to speak, and, by way of cheering me up, began telling me news of various mutual friends. At last, during a slight pause, she said, 'By the way, have you heard anything lately of Mrs. Reed? when last I heard she was not very well.' *Instantly* came my reply, 'Oh, she is dead,' and it was only my sister's look of blank horror and astonishment that recalled me to myself. 'What do you mean, when did you hear?' came from her in rapid utterance, and then I bethought me, *how* indeed did I hear—who had told me? But tell her the dream I *could* not, so I merely answered, 'You will see that I am right when you look in the newspapers—*how* I have heard of it I will tell you some other time,' and directly I changed the conversation. The visit did good, however, for I got up and went out with her, and I can only say that the impression my manner and words made upon her was so deep that, the moment she arrived home, she sat down and wrote to a lady in the West of England—one who knew us *all* and who heard by every mail from her husband, who was in the same place as our friend. My sister told her exactly what I had said, and begged that she would at once send her particulars, since I had not done so. By return came the reply:—

" 'I cannot, dear Lady B., in the least understand your letter, nor what your sister can possibly mean. The last foreign mail only came in *this morning*' (after the date, of course, of my dream), 'and so far from being "dead" my husband tells me Mrs. Reed is much better; therefore, where Mrs. L. (myself) can have obtained her news is beyond my comprehension, for it is *quite impossible* that she can have had later news than mine, in fact, not so late, since my foreign letter arrived after your visit to her.' [This is not a *copy* but a *reminiscence* of the letter.]

"And so the matter rested, but within a month from the date of my dream came the news of Mrs. Reed's death, on September 21st.

"I have but little now to add. The bereaved husband returned to England and called upon me. He gave me some details of the last days, and on my asking whether he remembered her last words, he turned to me with quite a look of surprise and said, 'Why, Mrs. Lightfoot, I believe *your* name was the last she mentioned.' Further, it was *many* months afterwards before my sister again broached the subject, but at last one day she said, 'I do wish you would tell me *how* you knew of Mrs. Reed's

¹ Though the narrator twice uses this word, she certainly did not regard her experience as a dream.

death.' Of course I then told her, and, I may add, that so deep was the impression produced upon her that even in her last illness, which occurred 7 or 8 years afterwards, she spoke of it. For myself I never really recovered the shock for a long time, and even now the impression is as vivid as though it only happened yesterday.

" FRANCES W. LIGHTFOOT."

Both the *Calcutta Englishman* and the *Pioneer Mail* (Allahabad) give September 20th, 1874, as the date of Mrs. Reed's death. Mrs. Lightfoot has unfortunately not kept her note of the day and hour. As she has now no *independent* recollection of the date of her experience, but only remembers the fact of the *coincidence*, and as it is practically certain that she heard the *correct* date of the death, the 20th, which has since become converted in her memory to the 21st, it seems tolerably safe to assume that her experience fell on the night of the 20th, that is, on the early morning of the 21st—not on the *night* of the 21st, as stated in the account.

In answer to the question whether this was the only occasion on which she has had a sensory hallucination of this kind, Mrs. Lightfoot answered " Yes." She adds that her sister, Lady B., " mentioned the matter at once to several friends and relatives." The sister has since died.

[In conversation, Mrs. Lightfoot confirmed again the fact of having had no sort of visual hallucination on any other occasion. She once, and once only, has had another remarkable *auditory* experience, when the sudden hearing of her Christian name saved her from a terrible fall in the dark. The origin of the sound was carefully inquired into and could not be ascertained.

As a proof of the absolute conviction produced in her that her friend was dead, she told me that she had prepared a birthday present to send her, and the box was actually soldered up, and had been going by the next mail ; but she found it impossible to send it.

She had been under the impression that the time of death exactly coincided with her vision ; but she had reckoned difference of longitude the wrong way. Mrs. Reed's husband informed her, on her inquiry, that the death took place at 11, that is 11 p.m. (as she thinks of September 21st, but no doubt of September 20th) ; and the vision was probably, therefore, 8 or 9 hours *after* it.

My impression of Mrs. Lightfoot entirely corresponds with her own description of herself—that she is a practical person, and without any sort of predisposition to frights or visions. The present one gave her a most severe shock, the effects of which lasted for some time.]

In this chapter, various points of interest or difficulty have been passed over with very inadequate comment. It seemed better, however, not to forestall the more complete discussion of the relation of telepathy to sensory impressions, which will shortly follow.

CHAPTER X

HALLUCINATIONS: GENERAL SKETCH

§ 1. WE are now approaching the most important division of our subject. So far the impressions, possibly or probably telepathic, that we have considered, have been (1) the *non-externalised* sort (chiefly ideal or emotional, but sometimes with a physical element) occurring during the hours of normal waking life; and (2) this sort, and also the *externalised* sort, occurring either in sleep or in a bodily and mental state which, though not that of sleep, is yet to some extent distinguishable from that of ordinary waking life. The class, then, that remains to be considered is the externalised sort—impressions of sight, hearing, or touch—occurring to persons who are quite clearly wide awake. The reader will not now need to be told to what family of natural phenomena I am about to refer this class. Something is presented to the percipient as apparently an independent object (or as due to an independent object) in his material environment; but no such object is really there, and what is presented is a phantasm. Whatever peculiarities such an experience may present, there can be no mistake as to its generic characteristics: it is a *hallucination*.

It is naturally only with one particular species of the great family of hallucinations—the *veridical* species which psychology has so far not recognised—that I am here directly concerned. But it is not easy to treat the single species satisfactorily, without either assuming or supplying a certain amount of information with regard to the family to which it belongs. To assume this information would hardly be safe; for though most educated persons may have a general idea what hallucinations are, the idea is not always the result of very close or critical study. It seems better then, to err, if at all, on the side of excess and to devote one chapter to a brief general sketch of the subject; in attempting which I shall endeavour to avoid side issues, and to confine myself to points that will aid comprehension in the sequel.

Is it possible to treat Hallucinations as a single class of phenomena, marked out by definite characteristics? The popular answer would no doubt be Yes—that the distinguishing characteristic is some sort of false belief. But this is an error: in many of the best known cases of hallucination—that of Nicolai, for instance—the percipient has held, with respect to the figures that he saw or the voices that he heard, not a false but a true belief; to wit, that they did not correspond to any external reality. The only sort of hallucination which is necessarily characterised by false belief is the purely non-sensory sort—as where a person has a fixed idea that everyone is plotting against him, or that he is being secretly mesmer-

ised from a distance. Of hallucinations of the *senses*, belief in their reality, though a frequent, is by no means an essential feature ; a *tendency* to deceive is all that we can safely predicate of them.

If we seek for some further quality which shall be distinctive of both sensory and non-sensory hallucinations, the most hopeful suggestion would seem to be that both sorts are *idiosyncratic and unshared*. However false a belief may be, we do not call it a hallucination if it has " been in the air," and has arisen in a natural way in a plurality of minds. This is just what an *idée fixe* of the kind above mentioned never does : A may imagine that the world is plotting against him ; but B, if he spontaneously evolves a similar notion, will imagine that the world is plotting not against A, but against himself. Instances, however, are not wanting where the *idée fixe* of an insane person has gradually infected an associate ;¹ and as contact between mind and mind is, after all, the " natural way " of spreading ideas, we can make no scientific distinction between these cases and those where, *e.g.*, the leader of a sect has instilled delusive notions into a number of (technically) sane followers. But again, hallucinations of the *senses* are also occasionally shared by several persons. Most of the alleged instances of this phenomenon are, no doubt, merely cases of *collective illusion*—an agreement in the misinterpretation of sensory signs produced by a real external object ; but wide inquiries have brought to light a certain number of instances which I regard as genuine *collective hallucinations*, neither externally caused nor communicated by suggestion from one spectator to another. If then sensory and non-sensory hallucinations agree in being as a rule unshared, they agree also in presenting marked exceptions to the rule—exceptions easy to account for in the latter class, and peculiarly difficult in the former. The conclusion does not seem favourable to our chance of obtaining a neat general definition which will embrace the two ; and in abandoning the search for one, I can only point, with envy, to the convenient way in which French writers are enabled not to combine but to keep them apart, by appropriating to the non-sensory species the words *délire* and *conception délirante*.

Let us then try to fix the character of *hallucinations of the senses* independently. The most comprehensive view is that *all* our instinctive judgments of visual, auditory and tactile phenomena are hallucinations, inasmuch as what is really nothing more than an affection of ourselves is instantly interpreted by us as an external object. In immediate perception, what we thus objectify is present sensation ; in mental pictures, what we objectify is remembered or represented sensation. This is the view which has been worked out very ingeniously, and for psychological purposes very effectively, by M. Taine² ; but it is better adapted to a general theory of sensation than to a theory of hallucinations as such.

¹ A distinct description of *folie à deux* seems to have been first given in 1860, by Baillarger, in the *Gazette des Hôpitaux*. The subject was developed in 1873 by Lasègue and Falret, in an essay reprinted in Lasègue's *Etudes Médicales*. See also E. C. Seguin in the *Archives of Medicine* (New York, 1879), i., p. 334 ; Dr. Marandon de Montyel, in the *Annales Médico-psychologiques*, 6th series, vol. v., p. 28 ; and G. Lehmann in the *Archiv für Psychiatrie* (Berlin), vol. xiv., p. 145.

² *De l'Intelligence*, vol. i., p. 408, etc.,

To adopt it here would drive us to describe the diseased Nicolai—when he saw phantoms in the room, but had his mind specially directed to the fact that they were internally caused—as *less* hallucinated than a healthy person in the unreflective exercise of normal vision. I prefer to keep to the ordinary language which would describe Nicolai's phantoms as the real specific case of hallucination. And I should consider their distinctive characteristic to be something quite apart from the question whether or not they were actually mistaken for real figures—namely, their marked resemblance to real figures, and the consequent necessity for the exercise of memory and reflection to prevent so mistaking them. The definition of a sensory hallucination would thus be a *percept which lacks, but which can only by distinct reflection be recognised as lacking, the objective basis which it suggests*.¹ It may be objected that this definition would include illusions. The objection could be obviated at the cost of a little clumsiness; but it seems sufficient to observe that illusions are merely the sprinkling of fragments of genuine hallucination on a background of true perception. And the definition seems otherwise satisfactory. For while it clearly separates hallucinations from *true perceptions*, it equally clearly separates them from the phenomena with which they have been frequently identified—the remembered images or *mental pictures* which are not perceptions at all. It serves, for instance, to distinguish, on the lines of common sense and common language, between the images of “day-dreams” and those of night-dreams. In both cases vivid images arise, to which no objective reality corresponds; and in neither case is any distinct process of reflection applied to the discovery of this fact. But the self-evoked waking-vision is excluded from the class of hallucinations, as above defined, by the point that its lack of objective basis can be and is recognised *without* any such process of reflection. We have not, like Nicolai, to consider and remember, before we can decide that the friends whose faces we picture are not really in the room. We *feel* that our mind is active and not merely receptive—that it is the mind's eye and not the bodily sense which is at work, and that the mind can evoke, transfigure, and banish its own creatures; without attending to this fact, we have it as part of our whole conscious state. Dreams of the sensory sort on the other hand are pure cases of hallucination, forcing themselves on us whether we will or no, and with an impression of objective reality which is uncontradicted by any knowledge, reflective or instinctive, that they are the creatures of our brain.

But, though the definition may be sufficient for mere purposes of classification, it takes us but a very little way towards understanding the real nature of the phenomena. It says nothing of their origin; and, though it distinguishes them from mere normal acts of imagination or memory, it leaves quite undetermined the faculty or faculties actually concerned in them. And when we pass on to these further points, we

¹ *Objective basis* is to be taken as a short way of naming the possibility of being shared by all persons with normal senses. But in that case, how far will the definition fairly allow for *collective* hallucinations? This question will be considered in Chap. xviii. I may mention that, owing to the special difficulties which collective hallucinations present, I have not included them in the statistics given above, p. 253, and below, pp. 325, 330.

find ourselves in a most perplexed field, where doctors seem to be as much at variance as philosophers. The debate, most ardently carried on in France, has produced a multitude of views; but not one of the rival theorists seems ever to have convinced any of the others. The contradictions might even seem to lie in the facts themselves; for what single guiding clue shall be found to phenomena of which some occur only in the light, others only in the dark; some are connected with hyperæsthesia of the senses, others with blindness and deafness; some are developed, others dispersed, by fixity of gaze; some are promoted by silence and solitude, others by the stir of the streets; some are clearly relevant, others as clearly irrelevant, to the percipient's mental and moral characteristics? Still progress has been made, to this extent at any rate, that it is now comparatively easy to see where the disputed points lie, and to attack them with precision.

§ 2. It was, of course, evident from the first that there was a certain *duality* of nature in hallucinations. In popular language, the *mind* and the *sense* were both plainly involved; the hallucinated person not only *imagined* such and such a thing, but imagined that he *saw* such and such a thing. But the attempts at analysing the *ideational* and the *sensory* elements have too often been of a very crude sort; the state of hallucination has been represented as one in which ideas and memories—while remaining ideas and memories and not sensations—owing to exceptional vividness took on the character of sensations. By the older writers, especially, it was not realised or remembered that sensations have no existence except as *mental* facts; and that, so far as a mental fact takes on the *character* of a sensation, it *is* a sensation. This was clearly stated, as a matter of personal experience, by Burdach and Müller; in the French discussions, the merit of bringing out the point with new force and emphasis belongs to Baillarger.¹ He showed that when the halluci-

¹ In the long and rather barren debates which took place in the *Société Médico-psychologique* during 1855 and 1856, Baillarger, no doubt, insisted too strongly on an absolute gulf between percepts (true or false) and the ordinary images of fancy or memory. But his opponents made a far more serious mistake in so far identifying the two as not to perceive a difference of *kind*, at the point where the sensory element in the mental fact reaches such abnormal strength as to suggest the real presence of the object. Giesinger's statement (*Die Pathologie und Therapie der Psychischen Krankheiten*, p. 91), and Wundt's (*Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie*, vol. ii., p. 353) seem too unguarded in the same respect. In a case which I have received, a child of four stopped in her play, looked intently at the wall, then "ran to it, crying out, 'My mother,' threw her little arms as if it were round a person, saying again, 'My mother,' and seemed wonderfully surprised at the fact that there was no substance to clasp." A child of four does not throw its arms round a memory. Nicolai's case is here very instructive. He experimented on himself, and found that however vividly he pictured in his mind the persons of his acquaintance, he could never succeed in *externalising* them in such a way as to make them the least comparable to his phantoms; and his testimony on this point is the stronger in that his particular phantoms cannot have been of the most vivid sort, since he was always able to distinguish them from *realities*. Even more distinct mental images—the result of a rarer visualising power—may fall far short of hallucination. Raphael, who saw his "Transfiguration" in the air, Talma, who asserted that he worked himself into the necessary state of excitement on the stage by peopling the theatre with skeletons, are not recorded to have ever really localised their images as objects that concealed the walls and the furniture. It is worth noting that probably no recollected visual image was ever so

nated person says, "I see so and so," "I hear so and so," the words are literally true. If the person goes on to say "*You* ought also to see or hear it," he is of course wrong; but when he says that *he* sees or hears it, his statement is to be taken without reserve. To *him*, the experience is not something like or related to the experience of perceiving a real external object: it is *identical* with that experience.¹ To the psychology of our day this may seem a tolerably evident truth. Still it is easy to realise the difficulty that was long felt in admitting that any experience which was dissociated from the normal functions of the sense-organs could be completely sensory in character. Popular thought fails to see that the physical question which for practical purposes is all-important—whether the object is or is not really there—is psychically irrelevant; and a man who has been staring at the sun will, as a rule, think it less accurate to say that he *sees* a luminous disc wherever he looks than to say that he *fancies* it. The best corrective to such a prejudice is the following experiment of Fechner's.

Two small slits are made in a shutter, and one of them is filled with a piece of red glass. The opposite wall is therefore lit by a mixture of white and red light. A stick is now placed across the red slit; its shadow is of course cast on the wall; and the part of the wall occupied by the shadow, though illuminated only by *white* rays from the other slit, appears—owing to the optical law of contrast—a bright green. Let this shadow now be looked at through a narrow tube, which prevents any part of the wall external to the shadow from being seen. Nothing red is now in the spectator's view, so that there can be no effect of contrast: the red glass may even be removed; none but white rays are passing to his eye from the shadow; yet its colour remains green. And in this case the chances are that, unless previously warned, he will tell the exact truth; he will

absolutely and flawlessly correct as a good musician's silent evocation of music, either by memory or by reading of the noted symbols; but even *he* is far from misfurniture. It is worth noting that probably no recollected visual image was ever so absolutely and flawlessly correct as a good musician's silent evocation of music, either by memory or by reading of the noted symbols; but even *he* is far from mistaking his vivid silent impression for actual sonority. I may add that as long ago as 1832 the late Dr. Symonds, of Bristol, drew exactly the right distinction between images and hallucinations. (Lecture reprinted in *Miscellanies*, p. 241.) It is curious to find the same line drawn in the earliest really scientific attempt to deal with the subject that I have met with—the dissertation against Hobbes and Spinoza in Falck's *De Dæmonologiâ recentiorum Autorum* (1692); but Falck still thinks that hallucinations are a mode in which demons sometimes manifest their presence.

¹ It may even be *superior* in distinctness to the percept of a real object; as when a short-sighted person who, during the hypnotic trance, had been impressed with a hallucination representing horsemen at some distance, saw them *clearly*, and remarked on this peculiarity. (Richet, *L'Homme et l'Intelligence*, p. 234.) A case of subjective hallucination experienced by the Rev. P. H. Newnham further illustrates the point. He distinctly saw in church the figure of a parishioner of marked appearance, who it turned out, had not been there and whose place had not been occupied by anyone else. "When I became convinced it was a hallucination, it then occurred to me that the clearness with which I had noted the eyes and the careworn look proved it; for my eyesight is now unable to distinguish such details of features at the distance of the pew in question." It is interesting in this connection to remark that Mr. Newnham, for the larger part of his life, enjoyed particularly good sight; while another correspondent, who occasionally sees subjective phantoms, and who has been short-sighted from birth, says, "I experience the same difficulty in discerning the unreal that I do when viewing real objects; unless the persons come near, I cannot clearly distinguish their features."

admit, and even persist, that what he sees is green. He will scout the idea that the green is a mere memory of what he saw before he applied the tube; he will assert that it is presented to him as an immediate fact. And such is assuredly the state of the case; but it is a state which, from the moment that he has put the tube to his eye, is kept up purely as a hallucination, and without regard to the facts of the external world. The delusion is of course instantly dispelled by the removal of the tube—when he perceives that the only light in the room is white, and that the shadow is grey; but for all that, he will probably never doubt again that a genuine hallucination of the senses is something more than “mere fancy.”

It is impossible to be too particular on this point; for high authorities, even in the present day, are found to contest it. When a person who habitually speaks the truth, and who is not colour-blind, looks at an object and says, “My sensation is green,” they contradict him, and tell him that however much he *sees* green, his sensation is *grey*. Whether this be a mere misuse of language, or (as it seems to me) a misconception of facts, it at any rate renders impossible any agreement as to the theory of hallucinations. For it ignores the very point of Baillarger’s contention—that images sufficiently vivid to be confounded with sensory percepts *have become* sensory percepts.

When once the truth of this contention is perceived, it is also perceived that the previous speculations had been largely directed to a wrong issue; and that the *dual* character of a false perception is after all no other than that of a true perception. A hallucination, like an ordinary percept, is composed of present sensations, and of images which are the relics of past sensations. If I see the figure of a man, then—alike if there be a man there and if there be no man there—my experience consists of certain visual sensations, compounded with a variety of muscular and tactile images, which represent to me properties of resistance, weight, and distance; and also with more remote and complex images, which enable me to refer the object to the class *man*, and to compare this specimen of the class with others whose appearance I can recall. If Baillarger did not carry out his view of hallucinations to this length, the whole development exists by implication in the term by which he described them—*psycho-sensorial*. The particular word was perhaps an unfortunate one; since it suggests (as M. Binet has recently pointed out¹) that the psychical element is related to the sensorial somewhat as the soul to the body; and so, either that psychical events are independent of physical conditions, or that sensations are not psychical events. *Ideo-sensorial* would avoid this difficulty; but the obverse term which M. Binet proposes—*cerebro-sensorial*—is on the whole to be preferred. For this brings us at once to the *physical* ground where alone the next part of the inquiry can be profitably pursued—the inquiry into *origin*. From the standpoint of to-day, one readily perceives how much more definite and tangible the problems were certain to become, as soon as they were translated into physiological terms. So far as the controversy had been conducted on a purely psychological basis, it had been singularly barren. In the vague unlocalised use, “the senses” and other ever-recurring terms become sources of

¹ *Revue Philosophique* for April, 1884, p. 393.

dread to the reader. But as soon as it is asked, Where is the local seat of the abnormal occurrence? and on what particular physical conditions does it depend?—lines of experiment and observation at once suggest themselves, and the phenomena fall into distinct groups.

§ 3. In its first form, the question is one between *central* and *peripheral* origin. Do hallucinations originate in the brain—in the central mechanism of perception? or in some immediate condition of the eye, or of the ear, or of other parts? or is there possibly some joint mode of origin?

For a long time the hypothesis of an exclusively central origin was much in the ascendant. But this was greatly because—as already noted—Esquirol and the older writers did not recognise the sensory element as truly and literally sensation, but regarded the whole experience as simply a very vivid idea or memory. If the central origin is to be established, it must be by something better than arbitrary psychological distinctions. Hibbert and Ferriar, going to the other extreme, contended that the memory was a *retinal* one; if a man *sees* what is not there, they held, it can only be by a direct recrudescence of past feeling in his retina. “But,” urged Esquirol, “the *blind* can have hallucinations of vision; the *deaf* can have hallucinations of hearing; how can these originate in the peripheral organs?” The obvious answer, that this did not necessarily thrust the point of origin back as far as the cerebrum, does not seem to have been forthcoming; and the opposite party preferred to fall back on definite experiment. They pointed out, for instance, that visual hallucinations often vanish when the eyes are closed; or that they may be doubled by pressing one eyeball. There was not enough here, however, to show that the external organs so much as *participated* in the process, much less that they *originated* it, even in these particular cases; while for other cases the observations did not hold. The fact that external objects are hidden from view by the interposition of our own eyelids or any other opaque obstacle, has become to us a piece of absolutely instinctive knowledge; and we should surely expect that an object which was but the spontaneous projection of a morbid brain, might still be suppressed by movements and sensations which had for a lifetime been intimately associated with the suppression of objects. And as for the doubling by pressure of one eyeball, it might fairly have been represented as telling *against* the theory of retinal origin. For the impression—not coming from without—would cover the same retinal spot after the displacement of the eyeball as before; and the natural hypothesis seems certainly to be that retinal identity would, in its mental effect, overpower the sensation of the moved eyeball’s position.¹

¹ The obliteration by closure of the eyes is certainly not invariable. See, e.g., Dr. Voisin, *Leçons Cliniques sur les Maladies Mentales*, p. 72. Sir J. F. W. Herschel, in his *Familiar Lectures on Scientific Subjects*, p. 406, has described some hallucinations of his own, of which “the impression was very strong—equally so with the eyes open or closed.” As regards the failure of lateral pressure to double the image, I do not know whether any clear case has been recorded. Brewster, indeed, speaks of the immobility of the image when the eyeball is displaced; but he made no sufficient distinction between actual hallucinations and mental pictures; while he had an odd notion that even the latter were “painted” on the retina. (*Letters on Natural Magic*, 1868, p. 131.)

An immense advance was made by Baillarger, who maintained the central origin by really scientific arguments. He pointed out (1) that the external organ may often be affected by local irritants—inflammation, blows, pressure, galvanism—without the production of any more pronounced form of hallucination than flashes, or hummings; that is to say, the peripheral stimulation sometimes fails to develop hallucination, even under the most favourable conditions; (2) that there is a frequent correspondence of hallucinations of different senses—a man who sees the devil also hears his voice, and smells sulphur—and that it is impossible to refer this correspondence to abnormalities of the eye, ear and nose, occurring by accident at the same moment; (3) that hallucinations often refer to dominant ideas—a religious monomaniac will see imaginary saints and angels, not imaginary trees and houses. Hence, argued Baillarger, “the point of departure of hallucinations” is always “the intelligence”—the imagination and memory—which sets the sensory machinery in motion.¹ He naïvely admitted that how this action of an immaterial principle on the physical apparatus takes place passes all conception; but it might be forgiven to a medical man writing forty years ago, if he had not fully realised “brain as an organ of mind,” and so did not see that what he took for a special puzzle in the theory of hallucinations, is simply the fundamental puzzle involved in every mental act. Passing him this, we may say that his treatment of the question entitles him to the credit of the *second* great discovery about hallucinations. He had already made clear their genuinely sensory quality; he now made equally clear the fact that the mind (or its physical correlate) is their creator—that they are brain-products projected from within outwards.

This is a most important truth; but it is very far from being the whole truth. Baillarger saw no *via media* between the theory which he rejected—that the nerves of sense convey to the brain impressions which are there perceived as the phantasmal object—and the theory which he propounded, that “the intelligence” (*i.e.*, for us, the brain, as the seat of memories and images), of its own accord and without any impulse from the periphery, excites the sensory apparatus. It seems never to have struck him that there may be cases where the sense-organ supplies the *excitant*, though the brain supplies the *construction*—that irritation passing from without inwards may be a means of setting in motion the constructive activity. He took into account certain states of the organ—*e.g.*, fatigue produced by previous exercise—as increasing the susceptibility to excitation from “the intelligence,” and so as conditions favourable to hallucination; but he got no further.

The facts of hallucination absolutely refuse to lend themselves to this indiscriminate treatment. Following the path of experiment, we are almost immediately confronted with *two* classes of phenomena, and *two* modes of excitation. We need not go, indeed, beyond the elementary instances already mentioned. Fechner’s experiment, where green was seen by an eye on which only white rays were falling, fairly illustrates Baillarger’s doctrine—the green being produced not by an outer affection of the eye, but by an inner affection of the brain. But in the case of a

¹ Baillarger, *Des Hallucinations*, pp. 426, 469, 470.

person who has been staring at the sun, the "after-image" or hallucination can be clearly traced to a continuing local effect in that small area of the retina which has just been abnormally excited; and it will continue to present itself wherever the eye may turn, until rest has restored this area to its normal condition. A still simpler form of change in the external organ is a blow on the eye; and the resulting "sparks" are genuine though embryonic hallucinations.

Such cases as these last are, however, hardly typical; for in them the brain is not truly creative; it merely gives the inevitable response to the stimuli that reach it from below. They are, moreover, *normal* experiences, in the sense that they would occur similarly to all persons with normal eyes. Let us then take another instance, where the mind's creative rôle is fully apparent, while at the same time the primary excitation is clearly not central. Certain hallucinations—as is well known—are *unilateral*, *i.e.*, are perceived when (say) the right eye or ear is acting, but cease when that action is obstructed, though the left eye or ear is still free. Now this in itself could not be taken, as some take it,¹ for a proof that the exciting cause was not central; it might be a lesion affecting one side of the brain. But very commonly, in these cases, a distinct lesion is found in the particular eye or ear on whose activity the hallucination depends.² It is then natural to conclude that the hallucination was the result of the lesion, and that the one-sidedness of the one depended on the one-sidedness of the other; and the justice of the conclusion has been proved in many cases by the fact that the hallucination has ceased when the local lesion has been cured. Other cases which strongly suggest a morbid condition of the external organ are those where the imaginary figure moves in accordance with the movements of the eye. The visual hallucinations of the blind, and the auditory hallucinations of the deaf, would also reasonably be referred to the same class—the seat of excitation being then, not necessarily the external organ itself, but some point on the nervous path from the organ to the brain. In the case, for instance, of a partly-atrophied nerve, the morbid excitation would be at the most external point where vital function continued.³ It should be noted, in passing, that a distinct lesion, *e.g.*, atrophy of the globe, of one eye may give rise to hallucinations of the *sound* eye⁴—the sight of which then receives, so to speak, the rebound of the central disturbance initiated by its fellow.

¹ Dr. Régis in *L'Encéphale*, 1881, p. 51; Prof. Ball in *L'Encéphale*, 1882, p. 5.

² Dr. Régis in *L'Encéphale*, 1881, p. 46; Dr. Voisin in the *Bulletin Général de Thérapeutique*, December 15, 1868, and *Op. cit.*, p. 68, etc.; Dr. Despine, *Psychologie Naturelle*, vol. ii., p. 29; Krafft-Ebing, *Die Sinnesdelirien*, p. 25; Dr. Köppe's paper on "Gehörstörungen und Psychosen," in the *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*, vol. xxiv., pp. 18-28 and 39-46.

³ Delusions due to visceral disturbances are often quoted as cases of hallucination excited from parts below the brain. Thus a woman dying of peritonitis declares that an ecclesiastical conclave is being held inside her (Esquirol, *Maladies Mentales*, vol. i., p. 211). But here there is a prior and independent basis of distinct sensation; so that the experience would at most be an illusion. And it is hardly even that; for one cannot say that the false object is sensorially presented at all; no one knows what a conclave in such a locality would actually feel like; the conclave is merely a *délire*—an imagination suggested by sensation, but which does not itself take a sensory form.

⁴ *Vienna Asylum Report*, 1858, cited by Griesinger, *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

§ 4. But we may now proceed a step further. The excitation may be external not only in the sense of coming from the external *organ*, but in the sense of coming from the external *world*. It may be due not to any abnormality of the eye or the nerve, but to the ordinary stimulus of light-rays from real objects. Some interesting evidence on this point has been lately described by M. Binet.¹ His experiments were conducted on five hysterical young women at the Salpêtrière, who, when hypnotised, could be made to see anything that was suggested to them; and also on an insane patient at St. Anne, who had a standing visual hallucination of her own. The results confirmed the rule first enunciated by M. Féré—that “the imaginary object is perceived under the same conditions as a real one”; and to this M. Binet adds the further conclusion, that a sensation derived from a *real* external source, occupying the same position in space as the imaginary object seemed to occupy, was an indispensable factor of the hallucination. Space fails me to describe the results in detail. It is enough to say that a prism applied to one eye doubled the imaginary object²; that a spy-glass removed or approximated it, according as the object-glass or eye-piece was applied to the patient's eye; that a mirror reflected the object and gave a symmetrical image of it; and that the optical effect, as regards angles of deviation and reflexion and all the details of the deception, was in every case precisely what it would have been had the object been real instead of imaginary. Here then we seem fairly driven outside the patient's own organism; the conclusion is almost irresistible that some point of external space at or near the seat of the imagined object plays a real part in the phenomenon. To this point M. Binet gives the name of *point de repère*; and he regards it as producing a nucleus of sensation to which the hallucination accretes itself. When the *point de repère* is in such a position as to be reflected by the mirror, then the imaginary object is reflected, and not otherwise; the object is, so to speak, attached to its *point de repère*, and will follow the course of any optical mutations to which its external nucleus is subjected.³

¹ In the *Revue Philosophique*, April and May, 1884.

² This observation was first made by M. Féré; see *Le Progrès Médical*, 1881, p. 1041.

³ The full explanation of these phenomena seems to be as follows. If the *point de repère* is not at, but close to, the spot where the imaginary object appears (as seems to have been the case in some of the experiments), there is no difficulty. The *point de repère* is then itself part of what is all along perceived; and in any effects produced on it by optical apparatus, it will carry the neighbouring object with it by *association*. If, however, the actual area covered by the object is sufficiently distinguished from its surroundings to act itself as *point de repère*, and no other possible *points de repère* exist in the field of vision, the case is different, but can still be explained. It will not be disputed that a slightly longer time is necessary for the formation of the image of a suggested object and the conversion of this image into a percept, than for the experience of sensation from an object actually before the eyes. When, therefore, the operator points to a particular place on the white table-cloth and says, “There is a brown butterfly,” we may suppose that in the patient's consciousness a real sensation of white precedes by an instant the imposed sensation of brown. So when the cardboard on which a non-existent portrait has just been seen is again brought before the patient's eyes, it is almost certain that the recognition of it as the same piece of white cardboard (known by its *points de repère*) precedes by an instant the hallucinatory process and the reimposition of the portrait. That there is this instant of true sensation seems to be shown, indeed, by one of M. Binet's experiments. The

In these cases, it will be seen, the experience was really a sort of monstrous *illusion*—totally different, however, from ordinary misinterpretations of sensory impressions; for we must beware of confounding the excitation that comes from the *point de repère* with the sensory element of the hallucination itself. The former is an unnoticed peg for the percept; the latter is its very fulness and substance, and is entirely imposed or evoked by the brain, not supplied to it. The type is too interesting to pass over: at the same time, I am bound to say that it seems to be extremely rare. I have made many endeavours to obtain the prism-effects with hypnotised (but not hysterical) "subjects"; but I have never succeeded, except when some conspicuous real object had first been put under the instrument, and the idea of doubling had thus been prominently suggested.¹ Professor Bernheim, of Nancy, tells me that he has also made repeated trials, and has never confirmed the results of the Salpêtrière. And one further reservation must be made. It is just conceivable that the changes wrought on the imaginary percept were due, not to the optical instruments, but to *thought-transference*. For M. Binet and his assistants of course knew themselves, in each case, the particular

patient having been made to see an imaginary portrait on a blank piece of cardboard, this was suddenly covered by a sheet of paper. The patient said that the portrait *disappeared for a moment*, but then reappeared on the paper with complete distinctness. We may thus fairly conclude that an area which was actually seen before the hallucination was induced in the first instance, will also be actually seen for a moment when vision is redirected to it (or its reflection), after the optical apparatus has been brought into play. During that moment, it will, of course, be seen under the newly introduced optical conditions; and *association* may again cause the object which supplants it to follow suit. It is quite possible, however, to suppose that the supplanted area continues further to *provoke* the hallucination, in the same sense that the white rays provoked the green percept in Fechner's experiment. The rays which are lost to consciousness continue to excite the sensorium physically; and this physical excitation will have definite peculiarities, corresponding to the distinguishing marks of the area whence it comes. Double this excitation by a prism, or reflect it from another quarter, and the percept which it provokes may naturally be doubled or seen in the new direction. So, if both eyes were employed in Fechner's experiment (pp. 290-1), might the green percept be artificially doubled.

¹ In this connection, I may quote the following spontaneous case—where the imagination of the percipient may probably have been adequate to conjure up the reflected figure. The account is from Mr. Adrian Stokes, M.R.C.S., of 16, Howell Road, St. David's, Exeter.

"When I was living in Bedford Street North, Liverpool, in the year 1857 (I think), my wife roused me from sleep suddenly and said, 'Oh! Adrian, there's Agnes!' I started up, crying, 'Where? Where?' but, of course, there was no Agnes. My wife then told me that she had awoken, and had seen the form of her only sister, Agnes, sitting on the ottoman at the foot of the bed. On seeing this form she felt frightened; but then, recalling her courage, she thought if the figure were real she would be able to see it reflected in the mirror of the wardrobe, which she had in full view as she lay in bed. Directing her eyes, therefore, to the mirror, there she saw, by the light of the fire that was burning brightly in the grate, the full reflection of the form seated on the ottoman, looking at a bunch of keys which she appeared to hold in her hand. Under the startling effect caused by this sight, she called me to look at it, but, before I was awake, the form and its reflection had vanished. It was not a dream, my wife is certain.

"When my wife saw her sister sitting at the foot of our bed looking at the bunch of keys, she (the sister) was clad in the ordinary indoor dress of the time. I remember the start of surprise with which I awoke and exclaimed. My wife has never, that I know of, experienced any hallucination or delirium; and is a woman of excellent sense and judgment. She never saw any other vision but that one."

optical effect to be expected. An experimenter who has not expressly recognised the reality of thought-transference would never think of so arranging his experiment that he himself should not know, till after the result, which instrument was in use or what was its position; nor indeed is it easy to imagine how such a condition could in practice be carried out. We have reason, moreover, to think that the hypnotic *rapprochement*, which enables the operator to impose a hallucination on the "subject," is a condition decidedly favourable to telepathic influence. The point seems worth suggesting, if only because thought-transference is a possibility which will assuredly need to be taken into account at many points, in that wide investigation of hysterical conditions which is assuming so much prominence in France. It would be most interesting if a state of hallucination turned out to be one in which the "subject" is specially susceptible to "transferred impressions."

§ 5. But in any case, imaginary objects which are projected on a convenient flat surface form a very outlying class. For the common run of visual hallucinations, even of those seen in good light, we cannot assume the necessity of any objective *points de repère*, or any definite external stimulation of the retina.¹ On the contrary, they have every appearance of being *centrally initiated*, as well as centrally constructed. For instance, it is quite as easy to make the patient see objects in free space—say, out in the middle of the room; and such is the common form of spontaneous hallucination, both of sane and insane persons, where human figures are seen. The eyes are then focussed, not on the real objects from which *points de repère* would have to be supplied, but on the figure itself; which may be much nearer than the wall behind it, and may thus require a very different adjustment of the eyes. For eyes adjusted to the imaginary object, the real objects behind, though in the line of sight, may be quite outside the range of clear vision; and we can scarcely suppose *points de repère* to excite a percept whose position is such that, for it to be visible, they themselves must cease to be so. And the difficulty of regarding external points of excitation as a necessary condition becomes even greater when the hallucination is a *moving* one. I refer not to the cases where the imaginary figure follows the movements of the eye, owing to some morbid affection of that organ which acts as a real moving sub-

¹ It should be observed that light may favour, and darkness hinder, the projection of a phantasm, owing to the different effect of the one and the other on the *general* physiological state. The presence of light might thus be a necessity, quite apart from any distinguishable *points de repère*; and this may apply not only to a crucial case—as, e.g., where Professor Bernheim made a hypnotic "subject" see a phantom-balloon in a cloudless blue sky—but to the common type of hallucinations which cease when the room is darkened. In the same way the presence of light is occasionally found to be a condition of *auditory* hallucinations. (Ball, *Leçons sur les Maladies Mentales*, p. 116.) See also the very interesting case given by Professor F. Jolly in the *Archiv für Psychiatrie*, vol. iv., p. 495. His paper is on the production of auditory hallucinations by the application of an electric current in the neighbourhood of the ear. In one case, he shows good reason for attributing the hallucination, not to a stimulation of the *auditory* nerve, but to a transference to the auditory centre of the stimulus given to fibres of the *fifth* nerve. For the subjective sounds did not, as in all the other cases, correspond in a regular way to the opening and closing of the current, but appeared under all conditions in which *pain* was produced. See also Köppe (*Op. cit.*, p. 54) on the same subject.

stratum for it, but to those where the eye follows the figure in its seemingly independent course. Here we should have to assume that the *point de repère* keeps changing; that is, as the imaginary figure passes along the side of the room, in front of a multitude of different objects—pictures, paper, furniture, etc.—the very various excitations from these several objects act in turn as the basis of the same delusive image. There seem no grounds for such an assumption. What is there to produce or to guide the selection of ever-new *points de repère*? To what external cause could we ascribe the perpetual substitution of one of them for another? On the view that the figure may be centrally initiated, no less than centrally constructed, none of these difficulties occur. Such a figure may just as well appear in the empty centre of the room as on a piece of cardboard, and may just as well move as stand still. Stronger still are cases where the hallucination is not in the line of vision. Dr. Charcot has noted a curious form of unilateral hallucination, which occurs sometimes to hysterical patients with normal eyes, on the side on which they are hemianæsthetic—animals passing rapidly in a row from behind forwards, which usually *disappear* when the eyes are turned directly to them.¹ Another type where the hallucination passes out of the range of direct vision is presented by Bayle's case, where a spider used first to appear life-size, and then gradually to expand till it filled the whole room.² Sir J. F. W. Herschel describes an analogous experience of his own. The same sort of argument applies to hallucinations where a figure appears repeatedly, but only in one place, while still not an illusion due to any real feature in the place—as in the case of a patient of Morel's,³ who always saw a headless man at the bottom of the garden, or of an informant of my own whose phantasmal visitant confined itself to a particular bed; and also where the percipient is haunted by a figure which can be seen only in one direction, as in Baillarger's case of a doctor who could not turn without finding a little black cow at his side.⁴ The mind may locate its puppet according to its own vagaries; and this last experience is very like a sensory embodiment of the well-known delusion that somebody is always behind one.

We find, however, our clearest examples of the central initiation of hallucinations, when we turn to cases where excitation from the outer

¹ *Le Progrès Médical*, 1878, p. 38. It is probable that an attentive regard is a condition for the establishment of *points de repère*. In the case of M. Binet's "subjects," a certain peculiarity in the fixed regard, which might act in this way, is strongly suggested by the following fact. In some cases, after a screen had been interposed between the patient's eyes and the imaginary object, she continued to see not only that object (say, a mouse), but a *real object* (say, a hat) on which it had been placed. Thus the hat assumed the property—shared by the imaginary mouse, but unshared by any other real objects—of remaining as a percept in spite of an opaque barrier. Kahlbaum describes a patient who saw the form of his deceased child *only* when he fixed his eyes steadily on a point. ("Die Sinnesdelirien" in the *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*, vol. xxiii., p. 7; and see also below, p. 316, second sentence.) But in the general run of spontaneous hallucinations, there is no reason for supposing that the regard has any of this exceptional intentness.

² *Revue Médicale*, 1825, vol. i., p. 34.

³ *Traité des Maladies Mentales*, p. 357.

⁴ Baillarger, *Des Hallucinations*, p. 312; Ball, *Leçons sur les Maladies Mentales*, p. 73.

world is plainly absent. This class includes phantasms seen in complete darkness,¹ and also hallucinations of pain, and probably the large majority of auditory hallucinations, which have so far been disregarded. Here the alternative is simple. The initiation must either occur in the brain, or be due to some morbid or abnormal condition of the outer sensory apparatus. We have already duly noted the latter mode as a frequent one. But the fact that certain hallucinations have been undoubtedly due to injury of the external organ does not establish, or even strongly suggest, the existence of a similar condition in cases where it defies detection.² As a rule, where the abnormal condition has been made out, hallucinations have not been its only result. The ulceration of the cornea which initiates visual hallucinations has begun by affecting the vision of real objects. Illusions, or false perceptions of colour, usually precede the appearance of more distinct phantasms.³ So, in cases of more transient abnormality—such as the *illusions hypnagogiques* mentioned in the last chapter—other signs precede the hallucination. The observer, whose eyes are heavy with sleep, begins by seeing luminous points and streaks, which shift and change in remarkable ways; and it is from these as nuclei that the subsequent pictures develop. Mr. James Britten, of Isleworth, tells me that, as a boy, he often saw in the dark a distant, tiny point of light, which approached and became an eye, then turned into a face, and then, coming nearer, “developed into a mass of very horrible faces,” quite unlike any that he had ever seen or imagined. Similarly one of the seers of “Faces in the Dark” (*St. James’s Gazette*, February 10th, 15th, and 20th, 1882) described the frequent vision of a shower of golden spangles, which changed into a flock of sheep. Now, since our physiological knowledge leaves no doubt that the points, streaks and spangles are due to the condition of the retina, it is safe in such cases to conclude that this condition has initiated the hallucination. But it is not equally safe to conclude that the process must be the same for cases where the points, streaks and spangles are absent. I do not forget that even a normal eye is subject to affections which escape attention until a special effort is made to realise them. But wherever the hallucination can be gradually traced in its development from more rudimentary sensations, these last seem to be very distinct and exceptional things, unknown in ordinary experience. Moreover, the vision itself is commonly of a changing kind—the features developing

¹ Sir J. F. W. Herschel mentions that some of his own hallucinations could be seen with open eyes *only* if the darkness was complete. (*Op. cit.*, p. 407.) Some of Nicolai’s visions could only be seen when the eyes were shut; and this was also a feature of a very interesting case recorded by Dr. Pick (in the *Vienna Jahrbuch für Psychiatrie* for 1880, vol. ii., p. 50), where nevertheless the figures seen gave an impression of complete externality, and were often addressed by the patient. Schüle records a similar instance. (*Handbuch der Geisteskrankheiten*, p. 128.) In the *Gazette Médicale de Paris* for March 21, 1885, Professors Bernheim and Charpentier describe some experiments made in a dark room, where—*points de repère* being necessarily absent—the visual hallucinations of hypnotic “subjects” proved not to be modifiable by optical instruments in the way above described.

² For statements of the opposite view see (as well as M. Binet’s papers above referred to) Professor Ball, in *L’Encéphale*, 1882, p. 6, and *Maladies Mentales*, p. 111, etc.; and the classical paper of Dr. Régis on unilateral hallucinations, *L’Encéphale*, 1881, p. 44.

³ Dr. Max Simon in the *Lyon Médical*, vol. xxxv., p. 439; Voisin, *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

rapidly out of one another ; often also of a swarming kind—detailed landscapes, elaborate kaleidoscopic patterns, showers of flowers, lines of writing on a luminous ground, and so on.¹ Now, compare such experiences with ordinary cases of “ghost-seeing” in the dark. A man wakes in the night, and sees a luminous figure at the foot of his bed. Here the hallucination comes suddenly, single and complete, to a person whose eyes are open and unfatigued ; it is not preceded by any peculiar affection of vision, is not developed out of anything, and does not move, or swarm, or develop fresh features ; nor does it fulfil the test of hallucinations due to the state of the external organ, by moving as the eye

¹ Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, pp. 159–63 ; Maury, *Le Sommeil et les Rêves*, p. 331. Probably the first clear description of these phenomena is that given by Vair, Bishop of Pozzuolo, *De Fascino Libri tres* (Venice, 1589), p. 112. The following cases—the first from Mrs. Willert, of Headington Hill, Oxford, the second sent to me by the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, of Manchester, in the words of his wife—are as good specimens as could be found. Mrs. Willert wrote on Dec. 20, 1883 :—

“The pictures I see generally appear at night before going to sleep, always in complete darkness, and I believe usually when I am rather tired. I can see them with my eyes open, but the colours are much less brilliant than when my eyes are shut. I am quite conscious at the time of the unreality of the scenes—indeed, they seem to be very much like the constantly changing slides of a magic lantern, and I should say of the same size ; when they disappear everything is black again. I see all kinds of things, generally in quick succession ; never, however, blending into one another. I can never recall the same picture however much I try. I see landscapes, interiors and exteriors of houses, &c., and single objects, such as flowers, books, boots, feathers, pots, &c., &c., and sometimes figures—of which, however, I can never distinguish the faces. Once or twice I have seen a little scene enacted. I remember one distinctly. I saw a man in the dress of the last century riding down a lane. As he came forward, two men, also on horseback, rushed out on him from behind some trees and knocked him down. I longed to know the end of this little story, but it disappeared. I am never conscious that the things I see have any connection with what I have been thinking of, nor do I ever remember to have recognised a place I know amongst the many landscapes I see.”

Mr. Willert tells me that his wife can always narrate these visions as they pass, and is certainly wide awake at the time.

Mrs. Macdonald says :—

“For many years I have been accustomed to see multitudes of faces as I lie awake in bed, generally before falling to sleep at night, after waking up in the morning, or if I should wake up in the middle of the night. They seem to come up out of the darkness as a mist, and rapidly develop into sharp delineation, assuming roundness, vividness, and living reality. Then they fade off only to give place to others, which succeed with surprising rapidity and in enormous multitudes. Formerly the faces were wonderfully ugly. They were human, but resembling animals, yet such animals as have no fellows in the creation, diabolical-looking things. So curiously and monstrosly frightful were they that I cannot conceive whence they could have come if not from the infernal world. I could not, certainly, at other times, by any voluntary effort of imagination, conjure up anything even remotely approaching their frightfulness. Latterly the faces have become exquisitely beautiful. Forms and features of faultless perfection now succeed each other in infinite variety and number.”

I will add one more experience, which would, I think, be specially hard to refer to the *Licht-staub* of the eye, inasmuch as it had an obvious cause of another sort. A friend wrote to me on Sept. 29, 1885 :—

“Between sleeping and waking this morning, I perceived a dog running about in a field (an ideal white-and-tan sporting dog, ‘bred out of the Spartan kind,’ &c.). and the next moment I heard a dog barking outside the window. Keeping my closed eyes on the vision, I found that it came and went with the barking of the dog outside ; getting fainter, however, each time.”

moves.¹ Such visions are commonly explained—and often, no doubt, with justice—as due to nervousness or expectancy. But nervousness and expectancy act by exciting the mind, not by congesting the retina; they work on the imagination, and their physical seat is not in the eye, but in the brain. We should conclude, then, that the brain initiates the hallucination; and that nocturnal visions, which vary so greatly both in themselves and in the general conditions of their appearance, vary also in their seat of origin.

The auditory cases are even plainer. For here the hypothesis of *points de repère* seems quite out of the question. It has never been observed that the hallucinations occur when the attention is being fixed on particular external sounds, or begin or cease synchronously with the beginning or cessation of such sounds; in fact silence seems to be a specially favourable condition for them. The only alternative, therefore, to supposing them to be centrally initiated, is to suppose some abnormality in the external organ itself. Such an abnormality has often been detected; and even when not absolutely detected, it may sometimes be inferred from other symptoms. Thus, an enlarged carotid canal, or a stoppage which produces an unwonted pressure on the vessels, will first make itself felt by hummings and buzzings; hallucination then sets in, and imaginary voices are heard which we should naturally trace to the local irritation that produced the former sounds.² But the analogy is not obvious

¹ M. Binet treats all “ghost-seers” as so paralysed with terror that they do not move their eyes from the figure—which leaves it open to him to guess that the figure would move if their eyes moved. Brewster (*Natural Magic*, p. 130) had the same idea. To Wundt, also, stationary hallucinations that can be looked away from seem unknown as a distinct and fairly common type, and he inclines to regard them as mere illusions. Brewster’s own case of Mrs. A., and the well-known cases given by Paterson (*Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal*, Jan., 1843) would alone suffice, I think, to refute this view. See also Kandinsky’s and Schröder van der Kolk’s experiences (*Archiv für Psychiatrie*, 1881, p. 461, and *De Pathologie en Therapie Krankzinnigheid*, p. 27). I have in my possession a good many examples where the imaginary figure has been looked away from and back to again. (See, for instance, Mr. Turner’s case, quoted below, p. 461.) The Rev. P. H. Newnham tells us of three occasions, during the autumn of 1883, on which he saw and recognised in church the figures of persons who proved not to have been there. In two of the three cases the figure thus seen had peculiarities which made it quite unmistakable, and was observed in the same place more than once during the service, just as any real member of the congregation might have been. The third case is this:—

“I went, as usual, to the school, about a quarter of an hour before service, and either spoke or nodded to all the teachers present. I particularly noticed one in whom I am much interested, sitting with her class, nodded to her, and she smiled back again. Subsequently, in church, I noticed her again, and counted her (I always count my congregations) *twice over*; once when I counted the entire number present; once when I counted children and adults separately. It turned out, however, that the girl had not been present. I think I was never so surprised in my life. I made several inquiries, but there was no mistake. She had been detained at home, much to her vexation and annoyance, during the whole afternoon on which I had seen her in two different places, and had had my eye upon her, practically, the whole time.”

² The abnormality may be of the most transient kind. Thus on one occasion I myself distinctly traced the illusion of hearing steps accompanying my own to the recurrent variations in the blood-flow of the ear, caused by the very act of stepping. But I may add that hummings are sometimes experienced where no cause whatever can be discovered in the condition of the ear; and thus may possibly themselves be centrally initiated. (See Köppe, *Op. cit.*, p. 50.)

between these cases and those where there are no hummings and buzzings, and no grounds for supposing that there is a stoppage or lesion of any sort. Among a numerous, though much neglected, class of phenomena—the casual hallucinations of the sane—the commonest form by very far is for persons to hear their name called when no one is by. The experience is often remarkably distinct, causing the hearer to start and turn round. It is not at all connected with conditions that produce blood-pressure, such as lying with one ear closely pressed on the pillow; it comes in a sudden and detached way, and apparently at quite accidental moments. Another experience, which I have myself occasionally had when going to sleep, but without any external pressure on the ear, is for sentences which are floating in one's head to take on a slightly externalised form—a *central* “illusion hypnagogique,” in contrast to the visual sort which are due to the *Licht-staub* of the retina. And when we come to insane cases, we find a more positive refutation of peripheral origin. A well-known form of hallucination occurs in the form of dialogue; the patient returns answers to the voices that haunt him, and is answered in turn. He can regulate the course of his own delusion. Dr. V. Parant has recently reported the case of an asylum-patient who, when thwarted or annoyed, would go to special spots to consult imaginary advisers; the replies that she received—it need hardly be said—always corresponded with her own desires and prejudices. Another insane woman used to play “odd and even” with an imaginary prefect of police, whose guesses were always wrong.¹ We clearly cannot suppose here an *intermittent* abnormality of the ear, which always sets in by chance at the very moment when the imaginary speaker's replies fall due. It may be added that even where a distinct morbid cause can be traced, it is as often as not a *central* cause. After a long course of alcohol a man begins to hear voices; but alcohol, while admittedly affecting brain-tissue, has no recognised tendency to affect the ear.

Again, we have to remember the clear relation which often exists between sensory hallucinations and more general ideas and delusions.* This remark, which is a commonplace of alienists, applies far beyond the limits of insanity. One of the commonest incidents of the witch-cases is the apparition of the supposed witch to the victim. The explanation of this phenomenon must surely be sought in the preoccupation of feeble and excitable minds with a particular terrifying subject. And these cases present a further feature, the importance of which has, I think, escaped notice, and which points still more decisively to a purely cerebral origin. They comprise the most remarkable examples on record of hallucinations of *pain*. The verdict of the victims' senses often was that the witch was not only visibly present, but was torturing them.³ The pains were often

¹ *Ann. Médico-psych.*, 6th series, vol. vii., p. 379; Ball, *Maladies Mentales*, p. 98. See also Kahlbaum, *Op. cit.*, p. 10; the cases described by Michéa in the *Ann. Médico-psych.* for 1856, p. 389; and M. Sandras' own experience in the same journal for 1855, p. 542.

² Lélut, *L'Amulette de Pascal*, p. 101; Krafft-Ebing, *Op., cit.* p. 19; Griesinger, *Op. cit.*, pp. 97-8; Wundt, *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 356; Dagonet, *Les Maladies Mentales*, p. 94.

³ Mather, *Wonders of the Invisible World* (Boston, 1693), p. 105; *Magnalia Christi Americana* (London, 1702), pp. 68, 69, 72, 75; Deodat Lawson, *Further Account of Tryals of the New England Witches* (London, 1693), p. 2; *Sadducismus Triumphatus*

distinctly localised, and were specifically described—as beating, scratching, pinching, biting ; while the parts affected were, of course, not being externally excited more than any other part of the body.

A further argument for the central initiation of many hallucinations of the distinctly morbid sort may be drawn from the *course* which the morbid process takes. The first stage is often not a sensory hallucination at all ; it is a mere delusion ; the patient thinks that plots are being concocted against him. After a time his secret enemies begin to reveal themselves, and he hears their abusive and threatening language. We surely cannot ascribe the sensory experience here to a lesion of the ear which happens to occur independently, but regularly, at this particular stage ; it follows, on the other hand, in the most natural way, if we regard it as imposed from within, as soon as the disease has gone far enough for the mind to clothe its imaginary fears in a more vivid form. Specially conclusive in this respect are the cases where voices begin to address the patient in the most internal way, without sound, and only after a time take on a distinctly audible character.¹ But of all the cases in point the most interesting are those where one type of hallucination assails one side of the body and another the other.² They confirm what was said above—that the mere fact of a hallucination being *unilateral*, or peculiar to one side of the body, though suggesting a defect in the external organ, is by no means a proof of it.³ The double sensory experience follows with exactness the course of the delusions. The patient first suffers from melancholy and discouragement ; this develops into a belief that he is surrounded by enemies : and he then hears insulting voices on the right side. To this unhappy stage succeeds in due course one of exaltation and self-esteem ; the patient believes himself to be some royal personage. And now encouraging and eulogistic voices present themselves on the left side. “ The good and the evil genii form a sort of Manicheism which governs him.” Here the imagination, as its operations become more complex and establish an opposition of character between its creatures, takes advantage (so to speak) of the fact that the body has two opposite sides ; it locates friends and foes just as they might be located in a picture or a play which represented an impending contest. It will scarcely be

(London, 1689), p. 375 ; *Sadducismus Debellatus* (London, 1698), p. 3 ; Boulton, *Complete History of Magick* (London, 1715), vol. ii., p. 31 ; Durbin, *A Narrative of Some Extraordinary Things* (Bristol, 1800), p. 17 ; *Zwei Hexenprocesse in Ballenstedt* (Quedlinburg, 1863), p. 56.

¹ Griesinger, *Op. cit.*, p. 91. The bearing of this fact on the theory of central origin has been noted by Mr. Sully, *Illusions*, p. 119.

² See Dr. Magnan's account in the *Archives de Neurologie*, vol. vi., p. 336.

³ Cf. Dr. A. Robertson in the *Report of the International Medical Congress*, 1881, vol. iii., pp. 632-3. A gentleman who writes to me from the Junior United Service Club, and who describes himself as “ a military physician of long foreign service and not of superstitious tendencies,” says that as a youth he was once transported with passion during an argument. “ There was a large knife lying on the table, and I distinctly heard a voice whisper *into my right ear*, ‘ Take up that knife and use it.’ I glanced over my shoulder involuntarily for the speaker ”—who of course was not visible. There was no question of lesion here, either of the sense-organ or of the brain ; for my informant has never had any other hallucination in his life. That a *whisper* should thus be located in one ear is specially natural ; since it corresponds with our usual way of receiving real whispers.

maintained that by accident the left ear began to be locally affected just at the time when the development of the plot necessitated the entrance of the friendly power upon the scene. Another case involves the sense of touch. A man, after praying for a year that his actions might be Divinely guided, heard a voice say, "I will save thy soul"; and from that time forward he felt his left or his right ear touched by an invisible attendant, according as he was doing right or wrong.¹ Did the auditory hallucination coincide by chance with the commencement of local irritation in the *pinna*? Dr. Magnan adds three examples of alcoholism, where abuse and threats were heard on one side, praise and consolation on the other. In these cases there were crises of fury, in which hallucinations of all the senses took place, involving both sides alike, and masking the more ordinary condition. On the decline of these crises, the opposed auditory hallucinations recommenced. It seems impossible to resist Dr. Magnan's view, that the poison, distributed through the whole brain, provokes at times a general crisis; but that when this subsides, it localises its action at the weakest spot. Should this happen to be the auditory centre on one side, a single unilateral hallucination would be the result; but if both centres remain affected the projection may assume the complex two-sided form.

But perhaps the strongest cases of all in favour of a purely central initiation yet remain—the cases of hallucination *voluntarily originated*.² Wigan's instance has often been quoted, of the painter who, after carefully studying a sitter's appearance, could project it visibly into space, and paint the portrait not from the original but from the phantasm.³ He ended by confounding the phantasmal figures with real ones, and became insane. Baillarger reports another painter, Martin, as having similarly projected pictures, which so interested him that he requested anyone who took up a position in front of them to move.⁴ I have received recently another instance; a lady who has had a scientific training tells me that one bright June day, two years ago—when lying ill in bed, but with her mind specially active—she saw the gradual formation, on the background of the blind, of a statuesque head, which then changed into another. "I tired myself calling the pictures up again during the afternoon. They seemed as clear as if real, but after the first flash I was conscious of a mental effort with regard to them. Banishment was very easy; it only needed a relaxed tension." And I may add that in one of the cases

¹ *Démonomanie des Sorciers*, Paris, 1582, pp. 11–12. For a wonder Bodin gives the case at first-hand; and there is no reason to doubt its truth.

² It is odd to find *involuntariness* not infrequently taken as the distinctive abnormality in hallucinations (Falret, *Op. cit.*, p. 281; Buchez and De Castelnau in the French debates of 1855–6); and the odder, inasmuch as not only may hallucinations be voluntary, but the mental pictures and memories, from which they are to be distinguished, are often of course involuntary.

³ *The Duality of the Mind*, p. 124.

⁴ See also Cardan, *De Varietate Rerum* (Basle, 1557) p. 314, who says he has always been shy of mentioning the peculiarity—"Cum volo, video quæ volo, oculis, non vi mentis." Kahlbaum (*Op. cit.*, p. 33), and Maisonneuve (*Recherches et Observations sur l'Épilepsie*, Paris, 1803, p. 295), give each an instance; and Sir H. Holland (*Chapters on Mental Physiology*, p. 47) says that he has met with several cases. (See also a case mentioned by Dr. Abercrombie's *Inquiries Concerning the Intellectual Powers*, 1838, p. 363). One of the seers of "Faces in the Dark" reported that he could produce the vision of the spangles and sheep at will. His case differs, however,

of *persistent dream-images* mentioned in the last chapter, my informant, Lieutenant-Colonel Hartley, of Hartley, near Dartford, remarks, "I can always produce this phenomenon, if I know that I am dreaming, by opening my eyes, which wakes me, but the dream-image persists." I confess that I should have been tempted to regard the voluntary cases as conclusive evidence of central initiation, had I not found so high an authority as Professor Ball explicitly claiming them as hallucinations provoked by an "abnormal sensation."¹ He does not tell us what the abnormal sensation is, or what causes it. He contents himself with pointing out that hallucinations are very like dreams; that some dreams are (and, therefore, apparently, all dreams must be) provoked by external stimulation—say a knock at the door; and that we can sometimes direct the course of a dream at will: *ergo*, it is easy to see how some people may start a hallucination at will. It would be more to the purpose if he would introduce us to a dreamer who can designedly start a prearranged dream by knocking at his own door.

§ 6. There is only one other point, in relation to the question of origin, that needs special attention; and that concerns hallucinations of what may be called the lowest or most rudimentary grade. There is a class of experience which all the writers who describe it² agree to treat as a quite unique type, and of which frequent examples have been observed among religious mystics, and persons who believe themselves to be in direct communication with spiritual guides. They describe a voice which is yet soundless, which utters the "language of the soul" inside them, and which they hear by means of a "sixth sense," and without any apparent participation of the ear. "I should hear the voice just as well if I were stone deaf," such a person will say; "my ear has nothing to do with it."³ Owing to the absence of a definable sensory quality, Baillarger distinguished this class as *psychic*⁴ hallucinations, in opposition to *psycho-sensorial*; and M. Binet himself, who insists on an external or peripheral basis for all other hallucinations, is inclined to treat these as exceptional, and to grant them an origin from within. As one who holds that that is

from those given in the text. For, in the first place, his vision was one of old standing; and, in the second place, his retina must have been pretty constantly in the abnormal state. I should thus ascribe the phenomenon to a concentration of attention on actual visual sensations, which fell by habit into the familiar lines. It would be interesting to know whether, after the spangles had appeared, it was possible to *check* their development into sheep.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 122. This error (as it seems to me) depends on what has become a very common misreading of the term "psycho-sensorial." The theory so designated is often described as "théorie mixte"—the "mixture" being of the "imagination" and of some prior "abnormal sensation," which sets the imagination to work. But hallucinations (as we have seen) are *psycho-sensorial* in virtue not of their *antecedents* but of their *content*—because they are things actually *seen* and actually *heard*. The "sensorial" element in them is not the incentive or the raw material of the abnormal activity, but its product.

² I find that I must except Dr. Dagonet (*Op. cit.*, p. 92); who, however, is certainly wrong in regarding the phenomena in question as necessarily indicative of insanity.

³ Köppe, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁴ The term must, of course, not be confounded with our special sense of the word "psychical," explained on p. 4, note.

equally the origin of a large number of the undoubted *psycho-sensorial* hallucinations, I cannot recognise this exception; and to me the class in question is of interest, not as *distinguished* from the psycho-sensorial family, but as a true species of that genus, presenting the sensorial element reduced to its very lowest terms. I regard it as the first stage of a graduated series—the embryonic instance of the investiture of an image or representation with a sensory or presentative character. In proportion as the sensorial element in hallucination is attenuated and dim, or full and distinct, will the perception appear internal or external; and these cases are simply the most internal sort, between which and the most external sort there exists various degrees of *partial* externalisation. This view has surely everything to recommend it. We can but take the perceiver's own account—that he has a distinct impression of words; and that this impression has an actuality which clearly separates it from the mere image or memory of words. How can this separation be conceived, except by recognising the presence of a genuine, though faint, sensorial element?¹ The question is of importance to my argument; for to admit a genuine sensory element in the most “internal” species of hallucination—which all agree to be centrally initiated—will practically be to admit a similar initiation for *other* psycho-sensorial hallucinations.

The Rev. P. H. Newnham, of Maker Vicarage, Devonport, already so often mentioned, has supplied me with some examples which are eminently in point. He has had on several occasions “psychic” hallucinations in the ordinary sense—an impression of words which “seem to be formed and spoken within the chest.” But he has also experienced and clearly distinguished another type of hallucination—a *soundless* voice, which yet seems to speak *into his right ear* (he is deaf of the left ear), and which thus produces the sense of externality, though not of actual sound. We must surely recognise this as the stage just above that of “psychic” hallucination.² And we meet with exactly parallel degrees of *visual*

¹ Of what exactly this element may consist is another question. Dr. Max Simon (in the *Lyon Médical*, vol. xxxv., pp. 435, 486) has made the suggestion that what is felt is a muscular impulse to form the words, rather than the sound of them—an impulse exhibited in its extreme form in the irrepressible continuous vociferation of mania; and on this account he even refuses to regard the experience as hallucination at all. It is quite possible that the constitution of the phantasmal words may be a complex one, and may include an embryonic sense of muscular impulse. But it seems certain that the patient's sensation is of something other and more than this. For him the words are not suggested or initiated, but actually and completely impressed. The impression is not recognised as impulse any more than as sound; but it is an impression of objective reality. Here, then, we surely trace the characteristic hallucinatory element. The close connection between the auditory and speech centres is well illustrated in the following case of undoubted hallucination, recorded by Holland (*Medical Notes and Reflections*, 1840, p. 232). A slight concussion of the brain having produced a temporary inability to find the right words and to speak coherently, the patient was some days later amused by hearing, as it seemed close to his ear, a dialogue in which the phrases exhibited precisely similar defects. (See Dr. A. Pick's remarks in the *Prager Medicinische Wochenschrift* for Oct. 31, 1883.)

² The most interesting case known to me of the speaking “within the chest” forms another instructive link, since the *internal* voice is expressly described as *audible*, and as producing a strong impression of a second person's presence. A Yorkshire vicar, whose name I may mention but not print, writes to me:—

“In the autumn of the year 1858, I was staying at Invercargill, the most southern part of New Zealand. There was only one hotel there in those days, kept by a Dane.

externalisation. I have received several accounts from persons who profess to see with the "spiritual eye," and whose language betrays the struggle to describe something that is indescribable—seeing that is *not* seeing, a perception of objects which yet are not perceived as in the external world. And just higher in the scale we have the stage of Blake's visionary experiences. He constantly saw slightly objectified figures with which he was on such familiar terms as to take their likenesses; but on only one occasion in his life did he see a "ghost"—*i.e.*, have a completely

There was no village of any kind; the place was as wild as could be. When I had been about two days at this inn, I heard myself addressed by name, and found that the speaker was one of the sailors who had worked the vessel in which I had sailed from England to New Zealand. He was a man I knew well, because he was on one occasion put in irons for mutinous language, on our passage, and I had often spoken with him both before and since that event. When the ship reached the Heads, as the entrance to Port Chalmers is called, this man, with five or six others of the crew deserted, taking the ship's whale-boat in the darkness of the night, and leaving it on the beach.

"In the evening I went into the large kitchen of the hotel, where this man and several others were sitting round the fire, smoking and drinking. The landlord was there, and we were all very friendly together. I found that three or four of the men were also some of the men who had deserted, though I did not remember them at first. They told me they were going in the morning to the Island of Ruapuke, where there was a missionary, as one of the party wished to be married, and there was no minister on the mainland in that neighbourhood. I said I should rather like to see the mission station, and they said they meant to stay there a day or two before returning, as there were a great many wild boars in the island, and would have some hunting, sleeping in their boat at night. They told me they had plenty of provisions—meat, fish, bread, and so on, besides beer and spirits, and one or two bottles of champagne for the wedding breakfast. They said it would be necessary to start about 4, as it was high water on the bar about 5, and the bar was a very shallow one at the point they desired to cross it. They were all most eager for me to join them, and I had thoroughly entered into the spirit of the thing, and promised to go if they would call me. I remember rising up to go to bed, and saying, 'Well, as I shall have to be up before 4, I won't sit up any longer.' It was then about 11. They said they were all going to 'turn in' directly, and would rouse me up, never fear; 'Don't you be afraid, we won't go without you,' or words to that effect.

"I left them with the fullest intention of going with them I ever had of doing anything in my life. The thing was settled. That was why I was going to bed, otherwise I should have stayed another hour at least. I had no candle on the way, but usually struck a match when I reached the bedroom, and lit the candle in the room. When I left the kitchen I walked through a good-sized room, or second kitchen, and into the front part of the inn, and came to the staircase. I had got up about four or five stairs, when someone or something said, '*Don't go with those men.*' There was certainly no one on the stairs, and I stood still and said, 'Why not?' The voice, which seemed as if some other person spoke audibly inside my chest (not to the ear), said in a low tone, but with commanding emphasis, 'You are *not* to go.' 'But,' said I, 'I have promised to go.' The answer came again, or rather I should say the warning, 'You are *not* to go.' 'How can I help it?' I expostulated, 'they will call me up.' Then most distinctly and emphatically the same internal voice, which was no part of my own consciousness, said, 'You must bolt your door.' All this time I had stood still on the staircase. I did not even remember there was a bolt to the door, for I recollect just for a moment thinking I must and *would* go, and then such a strange feeling of mysterious peril that I wondered how I should secure the door in case there was no lock or bolt. On reaching the room I lit the candle, and felt very queer, as if some supernatural presence was very near me. There was a strong common iron bolt to the door, I discovered on examination. As a proof that there had been no mere revulsion of feeling, I may mention that even now I hesitated whether to secure the door or not, so anxious was I to go, and so accustomed in those days (I was only 19 years old) to doing my own will at all hazards. At the very last moment

objectified hallucination—which so terrified him that he rushed out of the house.¹

In the same connection, it is of interest to observe that below even the lowest stage of sensory hallucination there is a type of delusion which may take a very distinct form, and which looks like *potential* hallucination—namely, the sense of a *presence*, felt not merely in the general way which probably every one has experienced, but as the presence of a particular person. It is well exemplified in the following account, from Mr. W. de V. Wade, of The Downs, Dunmow :—

“About 4 years ago I awoke about 2 o'clock in the morning, with a curious feeling that a great friend of mine, who is in India, was in my room. I do not think I had been dreaming about him. I felt an irresistible impulse to call out his name, and, although I was wide awake, it took me some moments to realise that he could not be in the room. It was quite dark, and as soon as I had satisfied myself that it was merely a delusion, I went off to sleep again. Some time in 1882, I was thinking about my brother, who is in America, before I went to sleep. In the middle of the night I suddenly woke up, with the feeling that he was in the room and had spoken to me. I actually listened for a second or two, in the anticipation that he would speak again. Hearing nothing, I controlled a great inclination to call out his name, and then, after arguing to myself that it must be all nonsense, I went to sleep.”

Another of my correspondents has had a similar impression with respect to a sister. “On one or two occasions the feeling has been so strong that I have got up and left the room.”² The close connection between a vivid sense of presence and actual hallucination is further shown by examples where the one develops into the other. Thus, Mr. Joseph Kirk, of the Audit Office, Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, informs me that a niece of his had one night an overwhelming sense of an unseen visitant, which lasted some time before it culminated in a clear auditory impres-

(it was quite a ‘toss up’ which it should be) I bolted the door and got into bed. A great calm succeeded the past agitation, and I soon fell asleep.

“The next thing I heard was about 3 in the morning (I suppose) a hammering at the door, as I had expected. I was wide awake, but gave no reply. Then I heard voices, and the door violently shaken and kicked at. I did not speak, for I knew I should have been over persuaded if I had called out. I did not mean to go. At last, after a thundering noise, I heard them cursing and swearing, as well as shouting. But I lay still as a mouse. So at last they gave it up and went away. I lay awake some little time wondering whether, after all, I had not been foolish, and then fell into a sound sleep.

“About 9 o'clock I went down into the breakfast-room, where a military gentleman, a captain or a colonel, was at his breakfast. As I entered the room, he said, ‘Have you heard what has happened?’ ‘No,’ said I, ‘I am just down.’ ‘Why,’ he said, ‘it seems that a party left this hotel this morning for Ruapuke, and their boat has been capsized on the bar, and they are *every one of them drowned*.’ I said, ‘Why, I was to have gone with them, and very nearly did.’ ‘Then,’ said he, ‘you’ve had a lucky escape.’ I told him I had had a kind of warning not to go, and had bolted my door, &c. ; but I did not tell him all the details.

“Two or three of the men’s bodies were washed up on the beach that day, and the rest in a few days more. Not one of them was saved, and if I had been with them I must have perished without a doubt.”

¹ For further examples of different degrees of externalisation, see Chap. xiv., § 1.

² [For an apparently telepathic instances, see No. 692, pp. 175-7.]

sion, the words, "I must go now—good night." Another informant—a lady of vigorous practical intelligence—experienced lately a similar subjective conviction of a particular friend's presence (probably due to the fact that she was apprehending news of this friend's death), and then saw her form, "standing in a natural attitude and looking straight at my face. The colour of her dress and cap, and the fashion of both, were absolutely familiar to me." In such a process as this, we seem to see the central origin absolutely laid bare.

§ 7. The general conclusion from the foregoing paragraphs is plain—that hallucinations of the senses may be spontaneously initiated by the brain; that they are often a pure projection of the brain from within outwards. The hypnotic "subject" will smack his lips over the sweetness of sugar when there is nothing in his mouth—will sniff with delight at a piece of wood when told it is a rose. When the brain does for sight and hearing what it there does for taste and smell, we have a percept which differs from an ordinary external percept only in lacking the objective basis which it suggests. And looking back from this point, we can completely account for the fact noticed in the preceding chapter, that hallucinations occur with disproportionate frequency to people who are in bed. For it is only natural that images should assume the unwonted vividness of sensations especially at those moments when the external organs of sense are not occupied with *other* sensations. We know that the sort of day-dream which comes nearest to hallucinations is favoured by *repose* of the sense-organs; that when we want to call up the vivid image of a scene, to make it as real—as sensorial—as possible, we close our eyes. One step farther, and we realise the complete continuity of the waking and the sleeping phenomena. Dreams are by far the most familiar instances of the projection by the mind of images that are mistaken for realities: indeed, it is just because they are *so* familiar, and waking hallucinations comparatively so rare, that there is a danger of overlooking the psychological identity of the two classes. We might call dreams the normal form of hallucination, or waking hallucinations the pathological form of dreaming; and we might present the waking-dreams of hashish-poisoning and of starvation¹ as a sort of intermediate link. The normal dream disappears when sleep departs; having been able to impose its images as realities only because in sleep our sensory faculties are to a great extent benumbed, and images cannot therefore be compared with actual presentations. Thus the normal dream cannot survive the corrective which the contact of the waking-senses with the external world supplies; it fades like a candle at sunrise; and its images, if they survive, survive as images and nothing more, memories of a vanished world. The hallucination, or pathological dream, on the other hand, does not require to be thus guarded from comparison with real presentations; its "images" are able to resist the normal corrective, for they are often as fully charged with sensory quality as the external realities which compete with them.

¹ See the interesting case of Mr. Everts, in *Scribner's Magazine* for Nov., 1871. Dagonet considers that fasting, meditation, and solitude favour hallucinations by "diminishing the impressionability of the senses" to external stimuli. (*Op. cit.*, p. 93.)

§ 8. I may now proceed to an altogether different question—namely, at what part or parts of the brain the *constructive* process takes place, and in what it can be conceived to consist. The distinction that has so long occupied us, between central and peripheral initiation, may henceforth be dismissed; for wherever *initiated*, hallucinations are assuredly *constructed* by the brain from its own resources. An initiating stimulus may probably come from any point on the line from the external organ to the central terminus, along which a nervous current passes in our normal perception of objects. But that stimulus will clearly not determine what the imaginary object shall be, or invest it with any of its qualities: it will merely set the constructive machinery in motion; and the same stimulus—the same inflammation of the eye or ear—may set the machinery in motion a hundred times, and each time evoke a different hallucination. Where then, and what, is this constructive machinery? It would be out of place here to attempt any minute account of the various theories, which have for the most part rested on anatomical observation; and the more so, that their details are still *sub judice*. But in a more general way the problem can be stated, and even, I think, to some extent determined.

There can be no doubt that certain sensory centres are connected in a special way with hallucinations. This follows, as soon as the full sensory character of the phenomena is recognised; for that character can only be the psychical expression of physical changes at the “sensory centres”—the spots where (in the ordinary crude but convenient language) impressions are transformed into sensations. As to the exact locality of these spots, there is a conflict of views which may be to some extent reconciled if we regard the process as taking place in several stages. Some (Luys, Ritti, Fournié) believe the principal scene of action to be the large midway masses called the optic thalami; others (Schröder van der Kolk, Meynert, Kahlbaum, Kandinsky) would place it lower down—the centre for vision, for instance, in the corpora quadrigemina; while others again (Hitzig, Ferrier, Tamburini) locate it higher up, in the cortex itself. But the authorities are generally agreed in connecting the several forms of sense with several limited areas, distinct from the larger tracts associated with the most highly developed phenomena of intelligence.

A diagram may make the relation of the parts clearer.

Let A represent the retina of the eye, which in itself has no more power of seeing than a mirror has. Let B represent the group of cells in the brain which constitutes the sensory centre—say the “visualising centre”—and which is excited into activity whenever sight takes place. And let C represent the cortical or exterior substance of the hemispheres of the brain, part of which is excited into activity whenever any of the higher psychical faculties—intelligent perception, imagination, comparison, memory, volition—are called into play. A is connected with B by the fibres of the optic nerve, and B is connected with C by other nerve-fibres. Now any disturbance of the cells at B which reaches a certain intensity will be accompanied by the sensation of sight; and when this disturbance is propagated onwards in the natural course from B to C, this sensation will develop into a complete percept—an object for the mind—which can



be reflected on, compared with other objects, and remembered. But the indispensable event—the disturbance or discharge at B—may itself originate in several different ways. It may be excited (1) normally, from A, by the stimulus of external rays of light, which makes us see surrounding objects; (2) accidentally, from A, by the stimulus of a blow on the eye, which makes us see sparks; (3) pathologically, or by morbid irritation at A, or on the line of nerve A B; and (4) pathologically or abnormally, but spontaneously, at B itself.

Now for *one* view of the construction of hallucinations these data are sufficient. We have only to suppose that in cases (3) and (4) the agitation at the sensory centre falls readily into certain lines and combinations; so as not only to produce a large variety of sensations—colours, if it be the visual centre, sounds, if it be the auditory one—but to arrange these elements in various definite groups. Everything will now proceed precisely as if these effects had been due to the presence of a real object. The excitation will pursue its ordinary upward course to the highest parts of the brain, and will lead to intelligent perception of the sensory group as an object; while, in the most complete or “external” form of hallucinations, it is possible that by yet a further process a reflux current passes downwards to the external organ,¹ to which the perception is referred, just as though its object were really acting on the eye or ear from outside. There then is the full-fledged hallucination; and its creative machinery, according to this view, lies wholly in the sensory centre.

But there is another view. I have noted *four* ways in which the machinery may be set in motion; but there is a *fifth* possible way. The excitation may come *downwards* from C—from the seats of ideation and memory. And clearly this sort of excitation will have a dominance of its own. It will have *its own* psychical counterpart—an idea or a memory; and when it sets the sensory machinery in motion, that machinery will not now produce or combine a group of sensations determined by its own

¹ Krafft-Ebing, *Op. cit.*, p. 11; Despine, *Etude Scientifique sur le Somnambulisme*, p. 328; Tamburini in the *Revue Scientifique*, 1881, p. 139; Wundt, *Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 356. This point, however, can hardly be said to be established. The mere subjective fact of the reference to the external organ would not prove (as Tamburini seems to assume) that the organ had been actually excited by a reflux current. Nor (for the reason given on p. 292) can a proof be found in the fact that pressure on the side of one eyeball doubles the phantom—a result which must be attributed either to the doubling of some *point de repère*, or to the association of the sense of lateral pressure with the doubling of real objects. Nor does the fact that “hypnagogic illusions,” hallucinations which consist in the surviving of dream-images into waking moments, and hypnotic hallucinations, can give rise to *after-images* (as noted by H. Meyer, Gruithuisen, and MM. Binet and Féré, respectively), imply more than the brief continuance of excitation at the central cells. A stronger case, at first sight, is that described by Dr. Pick, of Prague, where only the upper halves of imaginary figures were seen with the right eye; and where it was ascertained that the field of vision was defective over nearly the whole of the upper half of the right retina, to which, of course, the lower half of the figure would have corresponded, but in which the ophthalmoscope revealed no abnormality. But even this is not conclusive as to a reflux current; for Dr. Pick may be right in supposing that some lesion of the nerve-fibres connected with this portion of the retina had led to functional inactivity of the corresponding part of the centre itself. I may add, for what it is worth, an observation of Sir J. F. W. Herschel on his own hallucinations seen in the dark, that “the forms were not modified by slight pressure [of the eye], but their degree of visibility was much and capriciously varied by that cause.”

activity ; but will merely embody, or as we might say *execute*, the idea or memory imposed on it. Here, then, the only machinery which is in any sense *constructive* is situated in the higher ideational tracts. But as long as the nervous activity is confined to the ideational tracts, though there is construction, there is no hallucination. That word is never used to describe the mere image or memory of an object ; and in serving as a basis to such an image or memory, however vivid, the cells at C are merely performing their normal functions. It is only when the activity escapes downwards, with such force as strongly to stimulate the cells at the lower centre, that sensation floods the image, and we get the delusive percept or hallucination. The force of this downward current may exhibit all degrees. It is probable that even for the barest idea or memory of an object there is some slight downward escape, causing a slight reverberation at B ; and where, as in rare morbid cases,¹ the escape is wholly barred, all power of calling up visual images is lost. With every increase in the force of the escape, there will be a rise of sensory quality, and a nearer approach to absolute hallucination ; and every stage will thus be accounted for, from the picture "in the mind's eye" to the phantom completely externalised in space. On this view, the *provenance* of the phenomenon clearly cannot be assigned to a single locality : the hallucination is *constructed* at one place, but it only becomes *hallucination* at another. We do not dispute whether a photograph comes into existence in the camera or in the developing-room.

§ 9. Here, then, are the two possibilities : (1) that hallucinations are produced by an independent activity of the specific sensory cells—the sensations which arise there being perceived as objects when the nervous current passes upwards to the higher parts of the brain ; (2) that the part played by the specific sensory cells is only a response to what may be called *ideational* excitation, propagated downwards from the higher tracts where the image has been formed.

In attempting to decide between these possibilities, not much assistance is to be had from direct pathological and physiological observations. These have been mainly directed to an end rather the converse of mine—to utilising the facts of hallucination for fixing the locality of the centres, by inspection of the brains of persons who have been in life markedly hallucinated ; and even so not very successfully ; for cerebral pathology, as Bail trenchantly remarks, has a way of lending itself to the demonstration of whatever one wants.² We are thus thrown back on less direct

¹ In the *Archives de Neurologie*, vol. vi., p. 352, there is cited "un cas de suppression brusque et isolée de la vision mentale des signes et des objets," where the suppression extended to dreams. "Je rêve seulement paroles, tandis que je possédais auparavant dans mes rêves la perception visuelle."

² Lesions rarely confine themselves neatly to specific areas. We find Dr. Luys, the chief advocate of the optic thalami as the primary seat of hallucinations, admitting the constant spread of lesions from the thalami to the cortex (*Gazette des Hôpitaux*, Dec., 1880, p. 46) ; and Dr. W. J. Mickle (*Journal of Mental Science*, Oct., 1881, p. 382) considers—as the result of a number of very careful necropsies—that in cases of hallucination "thalamic disease plays a less important part than cortical." But, on the other hand, he did not find that the lesions were definitely associated with the spots on the cortex which Ferrier and the advocates of restricted cortical localisation

arguments, derived from the nature of the hallucinations themselves. And, I think, the mistake has again been in imagining that one or other of two alternatives must be exclusively adopted—that either the lower or the higher origin of hallucinations is the universal one. All, I think, that can be fairly said is that, while the first mode of origin is a *probable* one for some cases, the second mode is a *certain* one for others.

For simple and recurrent forms of hallucination, much may be said in favour of the lower origin. It is in accordance with all that we know or conjecture as to nerve-tissue, that certain cell-modifications and radiations of discharge would be rendered easy by exercise; and thus the changes to which any morbid excitement gives rise might naturally be the same as have often before been brought about by normal stimulation from the retina or the ear. The elements would fall readily, so to speak, into the accustomed pattern. An object which has been frequently or recently before the eyes, a word or phrase that has been perpetually in the ear—these may certainly be held capable of leaving organic traces of their presence, and so of establishing a sort of lower memory; as markedly shown, for instance, in cases where uneducated persons have in delirium recited passages of some strange language, of which the sound but not the sense has at some past time been familiar to them. That this lower memory should act automatically seems natural enough when we remember how large a part even of the higher memory is also automatic: an unsought word, suddenly reverberating in the sensorium, is on a par with the images that emerge into consciousness without our being able to connect them with our previous train of ideas. Now it is remarkable how large a number of hallucinations are of this primitive type. I mentioned above that, among the sane, the commonest of all cases is to hear the name called; and even with the insane, the vocabulary of the imaginary voices often consists of only a few words, usually threatening or abusive, but

mark out as the visual and the auditory centres; while lesions at these spots—the angular gyrus and the first temporo-sphenoidal convolution—seem to be found in cases where no hallucination has been observed. (*Journal of Mental Science*, Oct., 1881, p. 381, and Jan., 1882, p. 29.) This want of correspondence will seem less surprising, if we remember that in the vast number of casual hallucinations nothing that could be called a lesion exists; that for the delusions of sleep, of the delirium of fever, of fasting, of the early stages at any rate of hashish and opium-eating, only the general physiological explanation can be given that they are due to some change in the constitution or distribution of the blood; and also that the more persistent hallucinations of the insane belong, as a rule, to the *earlier* period of *irritation*, rather than to the *later* one when marked lesion has supervened, and dementia is creeping on. Even if we take subsequent cortical lesion as a sign that the weak spot existed from the first in the highest part of the brain, this would be no proof that the specific sensory centre is cortical. If lesions are not bound to be locally restricted, much less are irritations; and there is nothing to refute the supposition above made, that, when the hallucination occurs, a current has passed downwards to the lower centre—the mischief in the cortex having been primarily an excitant of ideational activities only, and the hallucination being due (as Dr. Mickle well expresses it) to “a tumultuous disorderly reaction of disturbed ideational centres upon sensorial.” The same may be said of the *artificial* irritation of the “cortical centres” during life. Ferrier regards the movements which result when an electrical stimulus is applied to these areas, as an indication that visual or auditory sensations (*i.e.*, hallucinations) have been evoked. We may quite accept this interpretation, but still suppose that the primary seat of the sensation was not the spot where the stimulus was applied, but a lower centre on the path along which the irritation passed.

sometimes quite neutral in character.¹ So of optical hallucinations. With the sane, a large number consist in the casual vision—an *after-image*,² as we might say—of a near relative or familiar associate. A friend, who has had considerable experience of the persistence of a dream-image into the first few moments of waking, tells me that “sometimes these images return during the day, or continue appearing, always suddenly, for several days after.” The Rev. Robertson Wilson, writing from the United Presbyterian Manse, Strath Devon House, Dollar, tells me that at a time when he was in disordered health owing to overwork, he used to take long excursions, and especially interested himself in the inscriptions in country churchyards.

“One day, after having spent a considerable time in inspecting a village churchyard, what was my horror and consternation to find, on leaving it, that wherever my eyes rested I could descry nothing but monumental inscriptions. The dust on the roadside somehow seemed to form itself into letters. The macadamised highway seemed written all over with mourning, lamentation, and woe : and even when I turned my gaze to the stone dykes on either side of the way, it was only to find that, by some subtle chemistry of my brain, the weather-stains and cracks shaped themselves into words which I could plainly decipher, and found to be of the same nature as those which I had recently been reading in the churchyard. Every time that autumn and winter that I paid a visit to a churchyard, the experience recurred ; and on more than one occasion also without that exciting cause.”

The Rev. G. Lyon Turner, Professor of Philosophy at the Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, tells me that he saw one night suspended from the ceiling of the room, which he knew to be plain,

“A large chandelier with some 10 scroll-shaped branches, and the jets shining brightly through the ground-glass globes at the end of each. I at once recognised the chandelier as a duplicate of the chandelier which hung in the college chapel connected with the Countess of Huntingdon’s college at Cheshunt, where I received my training for the ministry. I moved my head, to see whether the phantom moved too. But no, it remained fixed ; and the objects behind and beyond it became more or less completely visible as I moved, exactly as would have been the case had it been a real chandelier.” Mr. Turner woke his wife, who naturally saw nothing.

Another correspondent saw a spectral figure enter his room and stand at the foot of his bed. “Of course I put my head under the bed-clothes, and yet I saw it.” It seems so unlikely that the imagination would attract its visitor “under the bed-clothes,” that one prefers to suppose a mechanical continuance of reverberation at the lower centre ; and the more so that the spectre was a sort of after-image, based on the memory of a picture. More persistent cases are still frequently of a single object. I

¹ On this subject see Dr. V. Parant in the *Ann. Médico-psych.*, 6th series, vol. vii., p. 384 ; Kahlbaum, *Op. cit.*, p. 5 ; and Kraepelin’s paper, “Ueber Trugwahrnehmungen,” in the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie* for 1881, p. 225. These embryonic hallucinations often develop into more complex form ; Ball, *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

² This is a convenient description ; but it must not be held to imply any *retinal* affection, of the sort that Hibbert, Ferrier, and Brewster supposed. See p. 292, and p. 311, *note*.

have mentioned the doctor and the black cow, and the headless man at the bottom of the garden ; similarly a lady, when in bad health, always saw a cat on the staircase ; and among the insane, a single imaginary attendant is tolerably common.¹ Wherever such simple cases are not connected with any special *délire* or any fixed set of ideas, they may, I think, be fairly (though of course not certainly) attributed to an activity following the lines of certain established tracts in the sensorium. We might compare this locality to a kaleidoscope, which when shaken is capable of turning out a certain limited number of combinations.

On the other hand, hallucinations produced *at the will* of the percipient *must* first take shape above the sensory centres. For it is indisputable that the *idea* of the object to be projected—the picture, face, sentence, or whatever it may be—must precede its sensory embodiment as a thing actually seen or heard ; and the idea, as well as the volition, is an affair of the higher tracts. And apart from these rare voluntary specimens, the astonishing variety and complexity of more common cases—whether visual appearances or verbal sequences—seem absolutely to drive us to a higher seat of manufacture ; for they demand a countless store of elements, and limitless powers of ideal combination. The patient listens to long discourses, or holds conversations with his invisible friends ; and what is heard is no echo of former phrases, but is in every way a piece of new experience. So, too, the number and variety of visual hallucinations which may occur to a single person, sometimes even within the space of a few minutes, is astonishing. The physiologist Bostock, who had many hallucinations at a time when he was suffering from nervous exhaustion, says that he did not in a single instance see any object with which he had been previously acquainted. Nicolai, who was never otherwise than perfectly sane, and who eventually recovered, continually saw troops of phantoms, most of them of an aspect quite new to him ; and in insanity such a phenomenon is common enough. So, too, the seers of *Faces in the Dark* (p. 299), who had in the course of their lives seen many thousands of phantasmal faces, had never seen one that they recognised. Mrs. Macdonald, quoted above, has only occasionally recognised a face ; and another of my correspondents, who has been similarly troubled, says, “ The faces I have seen have always been unknown faces.” Even in the perfectly casual hallucinations of the sane and healthy, what is seen is less commonly a mere revival of an object which the eyes have previously encountered than an unrecognised person.² A lady of my acquaintance,

¹ Blandford, *Insanity and its Treatment*, p. 155 ; Kahlbaum, *Op. cit.*, p. 3 ; Binet in the *Revue Philosophique* for May, 1884, p. 500.

² The following case is of special interest ; being the most marked instance of a *mere revival* that I have encountered ; while at the same time clearly due to a train of thought and memory involving the highest cerebral tracts. The account is from the Rev. P. H. Newnham.

“ One of my parishioners is an old woman, now in her 85th year. Though poor and in receipt of parish relief, her education has been good. She retains her faculties in almost undiminished power. She is always bright and cheerful, and I never saw any very aged person at all her equal for a wholesome common sense. I am very much attached to her ; and for some years past have always sent her a little present on her birthday (Jan. 5th), and have visited her either on the day itself, or as soon after it as possible.

“ This year [1885] I visited her on January 6th, and after I had offered the usual

who has been occasionally subject to seeing figures on awakening from sleep, and who tells me that the experience has had no perceptible connection with health, says that on no single occasion has the face been a known face, though the faces are often so clearly seen that, if subsequently met, they would be at once recognised. Another informant, who says that she can evoke figures at any time by looking intently before her, adds that she "cannot tell beforehand what kind they will be, though able after a minute or two to describe the features and dress to anyone that is by." Here, then, we have an immense amount of high creative work—of what in psychical terms we should call *par excellence* the work of the imagination; and this is work which we have good grounds for supposing that

congratulations, she said, with a little air of injured innocence, 'It's 2 years since you came to me on my birthday,' or words to that effect. I felt quite sure she was mistaken, and told her so; but she was confident she was right; and I did not contest the point; but when I said good-bye, added as a last word, 'Mind, I can't believe about those 2 years.' On returning home I referred to my parish books, and found that her birthday in 1884 fell on Saturday, and that being unable to go down and see her myself, I had sent my curate to her, with a message and our little gifts.

"On April 14th, being down in the village where she lives, she called on me in my class-room, and begged me to come and see her, as she had something particular to tell me. On my going to see her, she reminded me of our conversation on January 6th, and of my parting words; and said that she now knew she had 'told me a great story,' and wanted to beg my forgiveness. And how she had found out her mistake was as follows:—

"On the night of March 24th she went to bed early, but could not sleep. This was unusual with her. She lay awake over 3 hours, with no desire to sleep. She could not understand it; but lay very quiet and happy, thinking of nothing particular. All at once my late curate passed into the room, and stood at the foot of her bed. (This gentleman had left me on January 8th, having obtained an appointment as Naval Chaplain.) As she lay in the bed, the curtains shut off the view of the door, so that she cannot say whether he entered the door or not. He stood at the foot of the bed, with a little basket under his arm, and told her that I could not come to see her myself, but would come as soon as I could, and meantime had sent her a present, which he had in a little basket. Having delivered this message, he disappeared.

"And then it flashed upon her memory that this was the exact reproduction of an actual scene which had taken place on January 5th, 1884. Everything was the same: position, manner, words, exactly as it had been on that day. And my poor old friend was almost broken-hearted to think how she had forgotten, and said what was untrue about me.

"I simply give the narrative as she told it to me. I visited her again a week later and made her repeat the story. She did so without the slightest alteration of facts. I cross-questioned her thoroughly as to details, the mode of entry of the figure, the appearance of it, &c., &c. She simply said that everything was as natural as life; that she was wide awake; that it was no dream or anything of the kind. I pressed her as to the words spoken; whether they were soundless or internally spoken words; but here again she was perfectly clear; the words were spoken aloud, just as they were in the actual occurrence. She was perfectly aware all the time that it was a vision; and never for a moment thought it either the real man, or his 'ghost.' She is not in the slightest degree superstitious."

I may add the following parallel though much less elaborate instance. Mr. Alfred Wedgwood, of 20, Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone, describes how, having been trying unsuccessfully in the course of the day to recall the French for "It does not matter," he saw, just as he was stepping into bed, a sheet of paper a foot broad between him and the sheets, with *N'IMPORTE* in large letters stretching all across it. He could have sworn that the object was really there, and immediately told his wife of the experience, as she testifies. We must, of course, attribute this hallucination to the previous gropings after the word.

the highest cortical tracts, and they alone, are capable of performing. From our experience of the number and mobility of the ideas and images that the mind in a normal state can summon up and combine, we know that the cells of the highest cerebral areas are practically unlimited in their possible groupings and lines of discharge ; but we have no right to assume the same inexhaustible possibilities as existing independently in any specific sensory centre—we might almost as well expect a kaleidoscope to present us with an ever-fresh series of elaborate landscapes. The very common implication of two or more senses must also surely be accounted for by supposing a simultaneous excitation of the several centres involved, from a common higher point ; for the difficulty, pointed out by Baillarger, of referring the correspondence to simultaneous but independent abnormalities of the external organs applies equally to the specific centres. And over and above all this, there is the connection so frequently observed between the delusions, the *conceptions délirantes*, of the insane and their sensory hallucinations, which makes it almost impossible not to regard the latter as a particular effect of the more widely diffused cerebral disturbance ; while even with sane persons of low mental development, we may note in a more general way the prevalence of a particular form of hallucination during the prevalence of a particular superstition—as in the witch-cases above mentioned. The conclusion seems to be that for many hallucinations the mode of origin can be no other than the *centrifugal*—i.e., a process in the direction from higher to lower centres.¹

§ 10. I have throughout tried to express what I have called the centrifugal theory in such terms that it might be accepted even by those who locate the sensory centres themselves not below, but in, the cortex. According to these physiologists, the whole *double* transformation, of physical impressions into visual or auditory sensations, and of these sensations into complete perceptions and mnemonic images, would be practically referred to one place. It must be admitted that this view seems at times connected with the want of a due psychological distinction between sensation and perception. But even supposing a specific centre of sensation to be thus equally the seat of psychic functions higher than sensation, it would still be none the less liable to be stimulated by parts of the cortex external to itself ; and the nature of many hallucinations would still indicate that they depend on this stimulation, and not on a mere spontaneous quickening of morbid activity in the centre itself. For instance, a girl is violently distressed by seeing her home in flames, and for days afterwards sees fire wherever she looks.² One must surely trace the hallucination to the *distress*, and so to an “escape of current” from the seat of ideas and images other than visual ones. Again, in the conditions described above, where the hallucinations faithfully reflect the changes

¹ The view has been maintained that this process consists merely in the *removal of an inhibition* normally exercised on the sensory centres from above. (See, e.g., Kandinsky in the *Archiv für Psychiatrie* for 1881.) But this seems to ignore the whole of the facts which support the theory of “ideational excitation.”

² Griesinger, *Op. cit.*, p. 99. For an auditory case, see the account, in the *Lyon Médical*, vol. xxxv., p. 437, of a young Frenchman who was rendered insane by the German invasion, and who was then haunted by the sound of guns firing.

of the whole moral and intellectual bias, the local excitement in the sensory centre would still be traceable to an abnormally strong irradiation from the regions where the highest co-ordinations take place—these regions being themselves, *ex hypothesi*, already in a state of pathological activity. The other hypothesis would be that the mere hyper-excitability at the centre itself made it impossible for images to arise without getting hurried on, so to speak, into sensations by the violence of the nervous vibrations.¹ But then, what should cause images belonging to one particular order of ideas—the order which happens to be diseased—to be picked out for this fate in preference to any others? The hyper-excitable centre in itself, as an arena of images, could have no ground for such a partial selection among the crowd of them which emerge during every hour of waking life. Among the endless and multifiform vibrations involved, why should the excessive amplitude that corresponds to sensation be confined to a particular set? A reason must exist. The unique agreement between the sensory hallucinations and the more general moral and intellectual disorder must have its particular physical counterpart; and for this “a strong downward escape of current” is at any rate a sufficiently comprehensible metaphor.

¹ This seems to be what Wundt has in view when he speaks of hallucinations as originating, not in an actual *irritation*, but in a heightened *irritability*, of the sensory centres (*Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 357); and such a state may doubtless contribute to the effect, even where the disturbance is plainly propagated from above. There are even special cases of “ideational excitation” of which an abnormal strain or instability at the lower place seems a more prominent condition than an abnormal pressure at the higher. We might thus explain the *echoing* hallucinations, where a person finds that what he is reading to himself repeats itself audibly—the occasion for the discharge being here no doubt the slight reverberation which the mere idea of words may be supposed to set up at the auditory centre. (See Kraepelin, *Op. cit.*, p. 356.) Very comparable are the hallucinations which present themselves only when a certain amount of external stimulation is supplied. For example, a man finds an old hallucination of hearing recur when people are talking in his neighbourhood, though able at the same time to distinguish what they are saying (Kahlbaum, *Op. cit.*, pp. 7, 8, 27), another is troubled by insulting voices at night only when the patients in adjoining rooms are audibly speaking or moving (Köppe, *Op. cit.*, p. 49). And with these may perhaps be classed the hallucinations, primarily due to lesions of the eye, which are found to be greatly favoured by a multiplication of external impressions, as by a visit to a busy city (Voisin, *Op. cit.*, p. 71).

CHAPTER XI

TRANSIENT HALLUCINATIONS OF THE SANE: AMBIGUOUS CASES

§ 1. WE have briefly surveyed hallucinations in their more general aspects. But before concentrating our view exclusively on the peculiar telepathic species, we shall do well to pause for a little at an important sub-genus, to which that species belongs, but of which it forms numerically only a small part—namely, transient hallucinations of the sane.

These hallucinations, of course, like all others, are the creation of a mind in an abnormal state; but the abnormality may arise in two very different ways. In the large majority of cases it is purely subjective and in some sense pathologic; and the percepts have no objective basis at all outside the perceiving organism. In a comparatively small residue of cases the abnormality is not pathologic or subjective, but consists (it is maintained) in an impression or impulse transferred from another mind. The percepts still conform perfectly to my definition of a sensory hallucination, in lacking the objective basis *which they suggest*; for that basis would be the actual physical presence of some human body, with its weight, its power of setting the air in vibration by the breath and vocal cords, and all its other attributes. But *an* objective basis of another sort they have—namely, the exceptional condition of the person whom they recall or represent. Now, having regard to these facts of origin, we might fairly expect that a careful comparison of the purely subjective and the telepathic experiences would reveal a large amount of *resemblance*, but also a certain amount of *difference*, between them. And in no way can we better approach the telepathic or “veridical” class than by following out this comparison.

The available material for the task is, unfortunately, far from abundant; for the purely subjective hallucinations of the sane have met with singularly little attention from psychologists. Here and there a medical man, or a writer of repute, has been led to make some observations by finding a “subject” in himself; a few cases of very marked abnormality, where the phenomena have been recurrent and distressful, have become celebrated—students of the literature get to dread the very names of Nicolai and “Mrs. A.”; and the hypnotic cases have an interest of their own, owing to the important place which hypnotism is fast taking in mental science. But no attempt, so far as I know, has been made to obtain wide statistics of perfectly casual cases—of hallucinations in which, if they are still technically pathologic, the abnormality has been of the slightest and most transient kind. The collection which I have formed

during the last few years, numbering more than 500 cases, is at any rate large enough to support certain general conclusions.

§ 2. And first, as regards the bodily and mental condition of the percipient. Probably the common view of the hallucinations of the sane, so far as they are recognised at all, is that they are in all cases due to disease or morbid excitement, or at the very least to indigestion. Ask the first twenty rational men you meet how they would account for a phantasmal visitant if they themselves saw one : as many as ten perhaps will answer, " I should conclude that I had dined or supped too well." " Lobster-salad " is an explanation which I have personally heard suggested many times. It may be at once noted, then, as a point of interest—one, moreover, in which the casual and the telepathic classes completely agree—that in not a single instance known to me has the hallucinated person, according to his own account, been suffering at the time from indigestion. Lobster-salad is the parent of nightmares, of massive impressions of discomfort and horror ; not, however, as a rule, even in dreamland, of the distinct and minute visualisation, and the clear-cut audition, which constitute the more specific hallucinations of sleep ; and certainly not of waking hallucinations. Nor is morbid excitement of a more general sort a frequent, though it is an occasional, condition ; and the same may be said of the ordinary nervous exhaustion that follows hard work. We have only to recall that the commonest occasions of all for delusions of the waking senses are the moments or minutes that immediately follow a night's rest (p. 253). For the majority of cases, the only rule that can be laid down as to the nature of the peculiar disturbance involved is a negative one—that it is not observably connected with any morbid state. Thus the one of my informants who has had perhaps the most interesting experiences of subjective hallucinations, says, " It is when I am at my best physically, and when my mental faculties are keenly interested in something, that the pictures are most frequent and vivid. They are mostly quite the antipodes of my mental occupation." A gentleman who has repeatedly had the hallucination of hearing his name called, tells me that this has always occurred during his holidays, when he was specially well and taking much exercise. And out of 489 visual and auditory cases (waking and " borderland "), I find that only 24 occurred to persons who were in a decidedly abnormal physical state—ill, or fainting, or overtired, or under anæsthetics.¹ Certain exceptional though slight derangement there must undoubtedly be ; but the hallucination itself is usually the only symptom of it ; and as little in the purely subjective as in the telepathic class can we lay our finger on any special predisposing condition.

The puzzle is the greater in that the phenomenon of waking hallucination in a sane and healthy subject (as the numbers to be presently given will show) is a rare one—rare not merely in the sense of occurring to only a small percentage of the population, but in the sense of occurring to most of these only once or twice in a lifetime. One would have expected that

¹ The compatibility of sensory hallucinations, even of a very pronounced sort, with sound bodily and mental health is illustrated in the passage from Abercrombie referred to in note 4, p. 304.

any state of the brain which was liable to occur at all without assignable provocation, would be liable to occur repeatedly. We should account it, for instance, a very odd fact if a person had had one or two extremely distinct dreams in his life, and had had no other experience whatever of dreaming. But we can only take the statistics as we find them. And this peculiar rarity of purely subjective hallucinations of the senses at any rate helps to explain a similar peculiarity in the telepathic class. Our telepathic evidence will show that the hallucination which the percipient describes is as a rule the single and unique instance in his experience. Now at first sight this seems strange, inasmuch as many percipients have been in quite as intimate connection with other persons as with the "agent" of their one phantasmal visitation; and some of these persons have died or have passed through a crisis similar to that to which we trace the visitation in the one instance; why then has it never been repeated? The only answer would seem to be that hallucinations, even when telepathic in origin, depend further on some exceptional condition of the percipient himself. And this answer can now be supported by the analogy of the non-telepathic class; where the conditions, unnoticed and innocuous to health as they so often are, are yet so exceptional that they may occur only once in a lifetime.

The same observation will further tend, I think, to remove a certain vague prejudice which the telepathic evidence encounters in the minds of persons who have never met with an instance of hallucination of any sort. Such persons can often hardly bring themselves to conceive that a sane, healthy, waking mind can really get momentarily off the rails, and can feign voices where there is silence, and figures where there is vacancy, though ear and eye are both alert and discharging their normal functions. Even supposing transferred impressions possible, they will say, why under their influence should sound and sober senses exhibit a perfectly isolated piece of eccentricity, and just for a minute, once in a lifetime, fall victims to delusions such as we commonly associate with sick-beds and madhouses? This vague *à priori* objection will disappear when the statistics of transient hallucinations are better known; seeing that the isolated piece of eccentricity does undoubtedly occur—how or why we cannot say—in numbers of instances with which telepathy has nothing whatever to do.¹

¹ This difficulty in believing that isolated cases of distinct sensory hallucination may occur to persons who are in sound bodily and mental health, was shown in some of the comments which followed Dr. Jessopp's account of his own experience ("An Antiquary's Ghost-story," in the *Athenæum* for Jan. 10th, 1880); for it seemed to be thought that his narrative, as it stood, was incredible, and that he must have been dreaming. I could parallel that case with scores of others, but select the two following as of special interest. The first is from a distinguished Indian officer.

"I had been taking luncheon with some friends, and after it was over, my host proposed that I and my fellow-guest should accompany him to see some alterations he was making in his grounds. After we had been out some little time, looking at these changes, a native servant approached me with a message from my hostess, asking me to go into the house to speak to her. I at once left my friends, and accompanied the man back to the house, following him through the verandah into the room where the luncheon had been laid. There he left me, and I waited for my hostess to come, but no one appeared; so after a few minutes, I called her by name, thinking that she might not be aware that I had come in. Receiving no answer, after once again repeating her name, I walked back into the verandah, where, on entering, I

§ 3. These characteristics, then—(1) the general absence of any obvious predisposing cause, of any assignable abnormality of mind or body, in the person affected, (2) the comparatively small number of persons affected, and (3) the very frequent uniqueness of the affection in the respective experiences of these persons—may be reckoned as distinct grounds of resemblance between the purely subjective and the telepathic classes. Another marked characteristic that they have in common is (4) the usually very brief duration of the phantasm : both sorts of affection are emphatically *transient* hallucinations of the sane—the majority of cases being almost momentary, and very few probably extending to half a minute. And again (5) the disproportionate number of “borderland” experiences in both classes is a fifth important common point. These five heads of resemblance are those which a broad view of the phenomena at once reveals. Our next step would naturally be to see if more detailed resemblances exist between special groups of cases in the two classes ; and every common feature that we find will of course go to strengthen the conclusion that the telepathic phantasms are indeed hallucinations, and not (as some have held) quasi-material appearances. At this point, however, we find ourselves confronted by a problem of considerable difficulty as well as interest, which requires to be carefully considered.

The difficulty is this. If the characteristics of the two classes of hallucination are to be discussed and compared, it is obviously assumed that we know on inspection which cases ought to be referred to the one class, and which to the other. Now, though the elements of a telepathic case have been made tolerably plain, and in the main the grounds of distinction may be clear enough, the attempt actually to draw a dividing line will very soon show us that at present no such line can be drawn. With the discovery that one person's senses can be affected by something that is happening to

had observed a durzee (or tailor) at work, and asked him where the man was who came in with me. The durzee replied, ‘Your Excellency, no one came with you.’ ‘But,’ I said, ‘the man lifted the chik’ (the outside verandah blind) ‘for me.’ ‘No, your Excellency, you lifted it yourself,’ the durzee answered. Much puzzled, I returned to my friends in the grounds, exclaiming, ‘Here’s a good joke’ ; and then, telling them what had happened, and what the durzee had said, I asked them if they had not seen the servant who called for me shortly before. They both said they had seen no one. ‘Why, you don’t mean to say I have not been in the house ?’ I said. ‘Oh, yes ; you were in the midst of saying something about the alterations, when you suddenly stopped, and walked back to the house ; we could not tell why,’ they both said. ‘I was in perfect health at the time of the occurrence, and continued to be so after it.’

The next account is from Dr. Charles M. Smith, of Franklin, St. Mary’s Parish, Louisiana. He narrates that a lady of his acquaintance, Mrs. P., lost her life at Last Island, in the terrible hurricane of August, 1856. “Nearly two months afterwards, on my way to visit a patient in the country, I met Mr. Weeks, a brother of Mrs. P., and in the buggy with him a lady so wonderfully like Mrs. P. that, but for my knowledge of her death, I would have declared it to be herself. The carriage and horses used by Mr. Weeks were easily distinguished by certain well-marked peculiarities from any other in the parish, and I saw these as distinctly as the occupants themselves.” Dr. Smith bowed, and called Mr. Weeks by name, but no notice was taken, and the buggy passed on. Returning home an hour later, he made particular inquiry, and found that no persons in the least resembling those he had seen had arrived in the village ; and he afterwards learnt that Mr. Weeks had been at his home 30 miles away at the time. “The conclusion seemed inevitable,” he adds, “that the whole affair was an optical delusion.”

another person at a distance, our point of view is, in fact, altered in relation to the whole subject of transient hallucinations of the sane. Ever since the abandonment of the idea, once widely held, that delusions of the senses were the direct and (in a manner) objective productions of the devil,¹ the universal assumption has been that they are *all* purely subjective phenomena—even the belief in “ghosts” having been really no exception to the rule, since the believers have not regarded these as hallucinations at all, but as independent entities. Now when telepathy of the externalised type is admitted, the first effect, of course, is to destroy the generality of the old assumption by driving it quite decisively off a certain part of the field: it is involved in the new doctrine that a certain number of sensory hallucinations—the majority, namely, of those which have markedly corresponded to real and unforeseen events—can no longer possibly be regarded as purely subjective.² But the effect does not stop short here. The new *vera causa*, which has decisively occupied one corner of the field, throws, so to speak, a shadow of doubt over the rest; for while we perceive its reality, we have as yet neither probed its conditions nor measured its range. I have already pointed out (p. 77) that the action of telepathy cannot be dogmatically limited to those most conclusive cases on which our evidential proof of it must depend; and if its reality in the world renders the old doctrine of the subjectivity of hallucinations definitely *untenable* in some cases, we need not be surprised if in others it renders it *doubtful*, and doubtful, moreover, in various degrees. Thus, between the hallucinations which are clearly subjective and those which are clearly telepathic, there will be a neutral region, where neither explanation can be adopted with certainty. Now, on all accounts it is important that this neutral region should be recognised and defined. It is important theoretically, because in time we may learn more of the conditions of the phenomena, and may be able to assign them with confidence to this class or that; but even more is it important evidentially, because, till the grounds of doubt are understood, there is always a risk that purely subjective cases will be misinterpreted, and will be reckoned into the cumulative proof of telepathy, or in some other way laid to the account of supernormal influences. It seems advisable, therefore, to take a glance along the whole line of transient hallucinations of the sane, up to the point at which the action of telepathy may appear to be clearly assured. I will make my survey as rapid as possible, being loth to detain the reader among these subjective and dubious cases, while the main body of the telepathic evidence is perforce kept waiting.

§ 4. In the first group, the cause of the phenomena is, by exception, quite clear. The hallucination is an *after-image*—the direct reproduction of some object or sound with which the senses of the percipient have been

¹ [The omitted note on Witchcraft is here referred to.—ED.]

² At this point, the truth of the doctrine is of course not assumed to have been proved; the proof is a long cumulative process, which will be carried on to the end of the book. But it would have been intolerably inconvenient, both to writer and reader, to defer all attempts at logical treatment and analysis until the whole of the cases had been presented *en masse*. I may take leave therefore, by anticipation, to describe as telepathic the incidents which every reader who, in the end, agrees that telepathy is a true fact in Nature, will agree in regarding as almost certainly true examples of it.

particularly occupied; and though we may not always be able to say why the reproduction takes place at such and such a moment, the purely subjective character of the experience is obvious. It is sometimes due to mere fatigue of the retina; it occurs, for instance, after long gazing at objects through a microscope. Some examples due to a more central cause have been given in the preceding chapters; *e.g.*, M. Maury's hypnagogic vision of the beefsteak (p. 252), Mr. Wilson's visions of the tombstones, and Mr. Turner's phantom-chandelier (p. 314)—the latter case being remarkable for the length of time which had elapsed since the real object had been seen. Another type is where the original impression has been of a distressing kind. Thus, Dr. Andral reports¹ that, having received a shock from the condition of a child's body in the dissecting-room, he was startled next morning, on waking, by a vivid repetition of the spectacle. I have a similar first-hand case from a friend, who in girlhood suffered for several nights from a hallucination caused by the unaccustomed sight of death; and another where a lady had a vivid waking vision of a servant who had startled her some hours before. The transcript is not always quite literal. Thus, a gentleman tells me that the figure of a deceased friend, whom he had just been seeing in his coffin, appeared to him, but in his living aspect and carrying a portfolio; and another informant—the Rev. J. M. Blackler, of 121, St. George's Road, S.W.—who one morning had a vision of the upper parts of three cooks in white caps, and was able to trace the impression unmistakably to a recently seen placard, but noticed nevertheless that the resemblance was only of a general kind. As good auditory examples, I may mention the hallucination of hearing the bells of the Town Hall at Manchester play "Auld Lang Syne," experienced more than once by a lady when sleeping in a room where she had on former occasions heard the actual performance; and a case where a young lady, who had suffered considerably from the manners of young schoolboy brothers, was afterwards startled, when alone, by such remarks as "Shut up," and "Get out of the way."

Under the same head may fairly be reckoned such cases as Mr. A. Wedgwood's (p. 316, note), where the phantasmal object, though not reproducing anything that had recently been before the eyes, was the immediate and indisputable result of a very special train of thought.

Comparable, again, are representations of an object or a sound which depend on the fact, not that it *has been* seen or heard, but that it is *about to be* seen or heard—that the percipient is *expecting* it; but as in almost all the visual experiences of this sort the object has been a living human form, the cases will fall more conveniently into a later group.

¶ In the next group the object seen, or the sound heard, is non-human in character, but is no longer traceable to any special previous occupation of the mind or the senses. Such cases are common in insanity and in disease, and the hallucination is then often of a grotesque or horrible sort. They also occur, though forming a decided minority, among the waking hallucinations of sane and healthy persons; but seem then to be rarely grotesque or horrible.² The most grotesque case that I have received is a

¹ Kraft-Ebing, *Die Sinnesdelirien*, p. 16.

² An exception should be made for certain endemic hallucinations (see p. 478, note).

vision of dwarfish gnomes dancing on the wall; but this was seen by a young child. A star, a firework bursting into stars, a firefly, a crown, landscape-vignettes, a statue, the end of a draped coffin coming in through the door, a bright oval surrounding the words, "Wednesday, October 15, Death"—these are the principal phantasms of inanimate objects in my collection. Another known type, described by Sir J. F. W. Herschel, is a geometrical pattern, which sometimes takes very complicated forms. I have also three cases where the hallucination was of a dog, and another where it was of running cats, indefinite in colour and form (this last, however, occurring only when the brain was exhausted). Out of my 302 visual cases (p. 253), only 20 belong to this non-human type. The non-vocal auditory cases are also comparatively few in number—41 out of the total of 187. They comprise tappings, tickings, knocks, and crashes;¹ the sound of footsteps or of a door opening; 7 cases of the ringing of bells, 2 of the striking of clocks, and 7 of music. Such types seem, on the very face of them, to be altogether remote from telepathy; and though we shall find further on that this is not quite universally the case—that there are instances of strong and unique hallucinations of light or noise which have too markedly coincided with some external crisis for the hypothesis of telepathic origin to be ignored—the vast majority of these non-human phantasms may be safely pronounced purely subjective affections.

The same may be said of another smaller group of visual hallucinations which represent fragments of human forms. Thus, two of my informants on waking from sleep, and a third when awake and up, have distinctly seen an imaginary hand and arm;² another sometimes sees a little finger in the air; another when recovering from illness, had a vision of decapitated heads; another has suffered at times from an appearance of eyes and part of a face floating by; and with these may be classed, as auditory parallels, cases where what has been heard has been a sound of groaning, or indistinguishable sounds of talking, or short meaningless sentences—a class of which I have some half-dozen specimens.

We must regard as a separate type the cases where faces or forms appear either in rapid succession or in a multitudinous way. Several varieties of this experience were described in the last chapter (pp. 299–300). I have one other example, where crowds of people and animals made their appearance every night for months; but the percipient in this case was in weak health. We have seen that this type is probably connected with the *Licht-staub* of the retina, and its subjectivity will not be questioned. It scarcely belongs to the family of *transient* hallucinations at all, since—alone among the waking hallucinations of persons in apparently normal health—these swarming and changing visions are liable to last for a considerable time.

And finally we come to the visual cases representing complete and (more often than not), quite natural-looking human forms, usually alone but occasionally in company, and occasionally also with the addition of some independent object, such as a carriage or a coffin; and to the

¹ Some of these may possibly have been real noises whose cause was not ascertained. But I have included no case where my informant did not himself hold this explanation to be excluded.

² We have had, however, a *telepathic* example of this type, in case 161, p. 264.

parallel auditory cases where distinct and intelligible words are heard, which are not (as in the first group) mere echoes of vividly-impressed phrases. These phenomena—which comprise the great majority of the whole number of transient hallucinations of the sane—fall at once into two great classes; that where the figure or voice is *recognised*, and that where it is *unrecognised*. Of both these classes, as of the previous ones, it may at once be said that the majority of the instances included in them are in no way available to prove influence from another mind. Where the figure or voice has been recognised, the absent person whose presence was suggested has generally been in a quite normal state at the time; and where the figure or voice has been unrecognised, no crisis affecting any person nearly connected with the percipient has coincided with the hallucination. The *recognised* phantasms have, moreover, usually represented persons whom the percipient was habitually seeing in real life—often a relative or a servant living in the same house—so that the delusion may still be explained by the analogy of after-images; or else they have represented dead persons whose memory was dear to the percipient, and whose images might readily be evoked by memory.¹ Of the *unrecognised* phantasms we have no reason to suppose that they represented any one at all, even in those cases—the majority of the whole number—where the non-recognition was not due to any indistinctness in the phantasm, but was of the same kind as when in real life we see a face or hear a voice which we perceive at once to be strange to us. But while as a rule so clearly subjective, these human and well-developed forms of hallucination include also nearly the whole of the instances which will be presented in the following chapters as telepathic. It is naturally among them, therefore, that the *ambiguous* cases to which I have referred are principally to be found.

The main grounds of ambiguity (apart from mere uncertainties as to matters of fact, which are not now in question) are, I think, four in number, and are summed up in the following types²:—

(1) Coincidentally with a “recognised” hallucination, the person whose presence it suggested has been in a condition more or less unusual; but we may fairly doubt whether it was unusual *enough* to justify even a provisional supposition that it affected the percipient.

(2) At the time of a “recognised” hallucination, the person whose presence it suggested has been apparently in a perfectly normal condition; but the same hallucination has been *repeated*, and repeated to *different* percipients; and the improbability that the independent hallucinations of several persons should by accident represent the same person suggests some special power of influence in the latter.³

(3) The person whose presence the hallucination presented has been in a decidedly abnormal condition at a time sufficiently near the time of

¹ See above, p. 314. The term “after-image” in connection with the apparitions of dead people was suggested in a paper privately communicated to me by Mr. J. Jacobs.

² To be quite complete, this list ought perhaps to include the ambiguity which is involved in the percipient's failure to connect his impression, at the time, with the supposed agent; but this point is sufficiently noticed elsewhere (p. 162, and Chap. xii., § 5).

³ For illustrations of this very rare and isolated type, see Chap. xiv., § 5.

the hallucination for the correspondence to be observed ; but the correspondence has not been exact ; and the doubt is whether the amount of discrepancy is such as to admit, or such as to preclude, the hypothesis of a causal connection. The question here is the one which was early raised, when we were considering the elements of a telepathic case (pp. 112-113), and was then left undecided.

(4) The case is so far suggestive of telepathy that, at or very near the time of the hallucination, some absent person has been in circumstances which might seem to identify him as the agent ; but there is also evidence of a *condition in the percipient's own mind* which might be regarded as the independent cause of his experience.

Let us begin with this last head, and inquire of what nature an independent subjective cause of the phenomena now in question is likely to be.

Though for the most part, as I have said, the predisposing conditions of these rare and transient delusions entirely elude us, just three emotional states can be named which are present often enough to warrant a suspicion that they may be truly efficacious. These are special forms of *anxiety* ; of *awe* ; and of *expectancy*. We will consider them in order.

§ 5. First, then, as to *anxiety*. A person who has been brooding over the state of some absent friend or relative suddenly has a hallucination which suggests that person's presence. Now suppose that the crisis which was apprehended—say the death of the person whose serious illness was the cause of the anxiety—turns out afterwards to have occurred at the same time as the hallucination. Let us take a couple of cases—one auditory, the other visual.

The following account is from Mr. Timothy Cooper, late of 21, Cadogan Terrace, Victoria Park, E.

“ January, 1882.

“ My father was a Baptist minister at Soham, Cambridgeshire. In the year 1849, being one of a large family, I went from home to begin the battle of life. There was great love between my mother and me. When I had been away about a year, I was sent for in a hurry to see my dear mother, who was thought to be dying. I got leave of absence for a week and went home, and the last day before returning to business, while sitting by my mother's side, I said, ‘ Mother, if it is possible, when you pass away will you come and tell me ? ’ She said, ‘ I will if I possibly can.’ On the morning of October 7th, 1850, I awoke and felt like a soft hand touch me, and heard the well-known voice say, ‘ I am gone,’ and something seemed to glide away from my side. I awoke the young man who was sleeping with me, and said, ‘ My mother is gone. She has just been here and told me so ’ ; and just as I said it the clock standing on the stairs struck 3. The news came to hand that my mother had died at five minutes to 3.

“ TIMOTHY COOPER.”

We have verified the date of death in the *Baptist Reporter*.

The next account is from Miss Summerbell, of 140, Kensington Park Road, W., who has had no other hallucination of vision. This one was mentioned at once to the friend with whom she was staying.

“ November, 1882.

“ I do not know how far the following story will be considered significant, as I was in much anxiety about the gentleman whom it concerns

at the time. I have been for many years on terms of close intimacy with the family of a Dutch nobleman [Jonkheer Huydecoper], who reside in Holland. Early in July last, I received a letter from the eldest daughter of the house, saying that her father was seriously ill. From that time I received news of his condition every day. On the 27th July, I received a post-card, saying that he was slightly better. I was staying at the time at the Spa, Tunbridge Wells, and suffering much from neuralgia. On the night of the 27th, I was lying unable to sleep from pain; no doubt I dozed now and then, but I firmly believe that I was awake when what I am about to relate occurred. It was beginning to be light, and I distinctly saw every object in the room. I do not know whether it is necessary to say that in Holland, when a person of distinction dies, a 'prieur d'enterrement' is employed. This man is dressed in black, with dress-coat, knee-breeches, and cocked-hat, with bands of crape hanging from the corners. It is his office to go to all the houses where the deceased was known, and announce the death. On the morning of which I speak, I saw the door of my room open, and a 'prieur d'enterrement' enter. He said nothing, but stood with a long paper in his hand. I remember distinctly wondering whether I had fallen asleep and was dreaming; I looked round and saw the furniture, and the window, with the dim light coming through the closed blind. I looked at my watch; it was nearly 5 o'clock. I looked towards the man, but he was gone. It is nearly 6 years since I lived for any time in Holland, and I had forgotten the custom of announcing deaths; or, at least, I had not thought of it for years." Miss Summerbell's friend, as it proved, had died about an hour and a half before her vision.

[We may note here how curiously the idea of death, in working itself out, availed itself of materials that had long been dormant—the slumbering memories which associated Dutch customs with Dutch friends in the percipient's mind.]

Supposing these incidents to be correctly reported, which we have no reason to doubt, what is the most probable interpretation of them? Is the state of mind in which the percipients were a sufficient cause for what they respectively heard and saw? If so, the coincidence between the death and the hallucination would be accounted for by the fact that the very conditions which led to the death were also indirectly (through the anxiety connected with them) the cause of the hallucination. But to answer the question,¹ we need some independent evidence of the power of simple anxiety about an absent person to produce a distinct delusion of the waking senses. Anxiety is readily enough assumed as a *vera causa* of such delusions, just as lobster-salad is; but can the assumption be supported? Not very completely, it must be admitted. The cases are nearly all of the same indecisive type; for the condition of an absent person which is sufficiently exceptional to create grave anxiety about him is, as a rule, also sufficiently exceptional to afford a conceivable occasion for telepathic influence, supposing telepathic influences to be facts in Nature; and the hallucination can, therefore, only be assumed to be

¹ A caution may not be out of place against the common habit of deciding such questions off-hand, from a single instance, by mere bias. Some informants have sent us cases of the sort expressly as subjective experiences; others as proofs that the dying person's thoughts turned to them at the last. But if the proof of telepathy itself requires an accumulated mass of evidence, much more must the decision in these doubtful instances.

certainly due to anxiety by rejecting *à priori* the other explanation. Thus, in the collection of hallucinations which I have mentioned, I find none of such a type as this—that a mother, in great anxiety for a sailor son, seems to see his figure in the room, though really the weather at sea has been calm and he has met with no mishap. Still, evidence pointing in this direction does exist. For instance, the records of witchcraft contain many cases, which there is no reason to call in question, of apparitions of the supposed witch to the supposed victim—indeed Bernard¹ mentions this form of hallucination as one of the signs of “possession”; the experience seems, however, to have been invariably connected with a thoroughly morbid and hysterical condition of the percipient. Again, an unusually absorbing possession of the mind with the person whose form appears, at the very moment when the appearance takes place, may make even an “ambiguous” experience seem almost beyond question subjective. Thus a lady writes to us:—

“Rather more than 10 years ago a person with whom I had had much to do was lying dangerously ill. In the evening of a certain day I was standing in my own room, thinking of her case, and reproaching myself for one or two things in connection with my conduct to her, when I turned suddenly round, and saw her gazing steadily, very steadily, and reproachfully at me. She died that night. She was not a near relative, or an intimate friend.”

In the case of auditory hallucinations, the evidence is clearer: some of these, occurring in circumstances of anxiety, bear the conclusive mark of a purely subjective experience. A sister in trouble about her brother, who has had an accident, hears the words, “Your brother is dead.” A mother nursing her son in a dangerous crisis hears an imaginary voice say, “You can’t save him.” In impressions corresponding so closely to the hearer’s state of mind, and *not* corresponding to the actual facts, there can be no question of telepathy. On the whole, then, it seems reasonable to conclude that anxiety has a certain independent tendency to promote hallucinations. Even so, we might fairly enough argue that it is as likely to *facilitate* telepathic hallucinations as to *produce* purely subjective ones. But when the question is of admitting cases to the present collection, the assumption ought always to be made against the telepathic hypothesis; and our principle has been to regard anxiety which has reached a certain pitch as distinctly weakening the evidential value of a coincidence, though great perfection in other points—as, for instance, a complete identity of time—might more than outweigh the objection. The fact that the anxiety may not have been actually dominating consciousness at the moment of

¹ *Guide to Grand Jurymen*, 1627. As typical instances I may refer to the *History of the Witches of Renfrewshire*, pp. 74–5; the report of the *Tryal of Witches at Bury St. Edmunds on the Tenth Day of March, 1664* (published in 1682), where some of the victims who saw the form of Amy Duny saw apparitions of cats and mice as well; and the *Tryals, Examination, and Condemnation of Four Notorious Witches at a Worcester assizes*, where the child who had the hallucination had apparently been previously unhinged by fright, and shortly died. As a rule, it is expressly stated that the apparitions took place during “*fits*”—i.e., hysteric or epileptic seizures; but this seems not to have been invariable. See Deodat Lawson’s *Further Account of the Tryals of the New England Witches* (London, 1693), p. 9.

the hallucination cannot be held to remove the probability (such as it is) that the hallucination was subjectively caused ; for it is the rule rather than the exception for hallucinations which can be at all connected with previous experience to be developed from ideas that are quite latent.

§ 6. The next predisposing condition of hallucinations that we have to consider is *awe*, in that special form which is connected with the near sense of death, and with which elements of grief and regret are often mingled. It is remarkable how large a proportion of phantasms of the recognised sort represent friends or relatives whose recent death is being mourned. Out of 231 cases, I find that 28 are of this type ; of which 6 took place on the day or the morrow, 4 within a very few days, and the rest within a very few weeks, of the death.¹ Now the reader may ask how an emotional condition due to a death can affect the interpretation of any phantasms that could possibly be regarded as telepathic ; for telepathy, as treated in this book, is an action between the minds of *living* persons. But it must be remembered that we have already assumed the possibility of a certain period of *latency* in telepathic impressions. That a certain period has followed a death before the occurrence of the hallucination representing the person who has died, is not, therefore, fatal to a telepathic explanation of the case ; and the question how far the percipient's own emotional state is to be preferred as an explanation will depend, to some extent, on the length of this intervening period. We are, therefore, led on to the wider question—by how large an interval must two experiences be separated before the possibility that they may be telepathically connected is excluded ? This, it will be seen, is the very question involved in No. 3 of the four grounds of ambiguity above set forth.

Putting aside for the moment any special theory, it will be seen that the argument for a causal connection between an event of one class, A, and an event of another class, B, arising from the frequency with which such events approximate to one another in time, is not an argument whose force stops suddenly at any predictable point. It is an argument whose force gradually diminishes in proportion as the correspondences of time throughout a series of cases get less and less precise, and only becomes inappreciable when marked gaps begin to occur in the series. Thus the fact that certain psychical phenomena form a cluster, comparatively thick at first and gradually becoming more and more sparse, in the few days that follow deaths, would strongly indicate some common bond of connection between the phenomena and the deaths, even if such a thing as telepathy in connection with living persons had never been observed. But as a matter of fact, we find the cluster of cases as thick just *before* life has ceased as just *after*. Hence the presumption of a single common cause for the whole group.

Now not only is telepathy the only common cause which it seems possible to name ; and not only is it the cause which is, so to speak, in possession of the field : it is a cause with which, up to a certain point after death, the theory of an emotional origin cannot even come into competition.

¹ I am excluding some cases where the interval is known to have been as great as two months ; but including some which are stated to have occurred "soon" or "very soon" after the death, without specification of time.

For however efficacious grief, or the general awe which death inspires, may be to provoke hallucinations representing the dead person, the grief and awe cannot operate till the fact of his death is known; and for any one at a distance from him, this knowledge must necessarily follow the death at a very appreciable interval. Up to that point, then, we must hold that there is an appreciable chance that the hallucination is telepathic in character, and that an impression, received from the agent before or at death, has lain latent for a while in the percipient's mind. At the same time this theory of latency is one that ought not to be strained. The fact that in the majority of our cases there seems to be no latency at all, and that in another large group the period of latency is short, establishes a sort of presumption that it is not likely ever to be very long; and while admitting that any limitation that we can make is arbitrary, we prefer—for evidential purposes—to draw the line early, and (as explained in Chapter IV) we have drawn it at 12 hours after death.

The cases, however, where knowledge of the death, and the emotion caused by it, have preceded the hallucination, stand on very different ground. A new element is now introduced, which has seemed to many weighty authorities a full and sufficient explanation of all *post-mortem* phantasms. I am not aware, indeed, that any crucial instance has ever been forthcoming—that anyone, believing a friend to be dead who was really in a perfectly normal state, has seen his “ghost.” Moreover, most of those who have attributed *post-mortem* phantasms to the percipient's emotional condition have done so under an *à priori* conviction that with physical death all possibility of affecting others must necessarily cease—a conviction which my colleagues and I do not share.¹ At the same time, death is so wholly unique a fact in human experience that it seems reasonable to believe the ideas and emotions connected with it capable of producing very unique effects; and personally I am disposed to regard such

¹ As our telepathic theory is a psychical one, and makes no physical assumptions, it would be perfectly applicable (though the *name* perhaps would be inappropriate) to the conditions of disembodied existence. And it may be quite fairly asked why this possibility was not taken account of above, in connection with the phantasms that have shortly followed deaths. What need is there, it may be said, to trace these phenomena to a state of the agent preceding or exactly synchronising with his physical decease, when his psychical life may be supposed to be continuing after the great change? The answer is that the point is not one of theoretic possibilities, but of evidence; and that the evidence for *post-mortem* communications seems to us inconclusive. In all the evidential cases cited in this book, the very keystone of the argument is the *coincidence*—more or less close, but always close enough to be remarked—with death or some other external fact. That—and often that alone—is the obstacle to regarding the cases as purely subjective: failing that, very special and peculiar features must be present, to establish even a presumption of some exciting external to the percipient's own mind. For example, the same hallucination might affect several persons independently and at different times; or the phantasm might convey information, afterwards discovered to be true, of something which the percipient had never known—this last condition being probably the only one which could prove an *intelligent* external cause. A certain amount of evidence of both these types exists, of a quality which makes it imperative on us to keep our minds open for more; but at present it will bear no sort of comparison with the evidence for telepathy. For a sketch and criticism of the present state of the question, see Mrs. Sidgwick's paper “On the Evidence, collected by the S.P.R., for Phantasms of the Dead,” in vol. iii. of the *Proceedings*.

ideas and emotions as probably the sufficient cause of any hallucinations that occur while they are present, as long as such hallucinations present no features which the percipient's mind would have been unable to supply. The presumption is at any rate so strong, that no experiences of any sort—even though otherwise admissible, as following within the 12 hours' limit—have been included in our telepathic evidence, if the fact of the death was already known to the percipient, and if his experience was unshared by any one else; and this principle is the easier to justify in that the day immediately succeeding a death seems the most likely of all periods for abnormal subjective impressions connected with the death to occur.

§ 7. The remaining head that we have to consider is *expectancy*. The evidence as to the power of this condition of mind to produce waking hallucinations is rather more definite than in the case of anxiety. Braid describes a lady who, as soon as the idea was suggested to her, saw coruscating flames issue from the poles of a magnet, or wherever she believed the influence of the magnet to extend; and in the dark, liability to this form of delusion seems not very uncommon. Crucial examples of a more developed type—except in crises of epidemic excitement (see pp. 477–8)—are less easy to find. I have one daylight case where a man who was searching for a tennis-ball had a distinct apparition of the missing object in a spot where it was not. And expectancy may probably be answerable for a good many apparitions seen in rooms believed to be “haunted.” I select the following example, however, as free from all superstitious associations, and as almost certainly a hallucination, and not a mere illusion. A barrister—whose name I am at liberty to mention, but not to print—writes to me:—

“ December 21st, 1885.

“ In October, 1885, I was stopping for the night at the Swan Hotel at B., on circuit. My bedroom was No. 17. My friend K., a brother barrister, occupied No. 16. Between No. 17 (my room) and No. 18 there was a communicating door, and before retiring to rest I was under the impression that the door was between my room and my friend K.'s. I had told my friend K. so, when bidding him good-night, and he had jokingly remarked that he would come in and frighten me during the night. I discovered before going to bed that our rooms did *not* communicate. I must have been asleep some hours, when I woke up with a sensation that someone was close to my bed, and feeling about the other side of the chintz curtain at the head of the bed. I could hear the rustling and crackling of the curtain close to my face. I felt perfectly unable to move, or protect myself—not through any fear, but from a want of power of movement.¹ After a few seconds this powerlessness went off, and I sprang out of bed, and saw the figure of my friend K. retreating towards the foot of the bed. He kept his face averted, his head a little bent, but I could see the wire and one of the glasses of his spectacles as he turned from me; he was dressed in his night-shirt. And what made me believe in the reality of the appearance was the ‘solidity’ of the white nightdress, and the light on the spectacles. The room was in dim light, owing to gas-lamps

¹ I have two other cases where a subjective hallucination seen on waking was accompanied by inability to speak or move. See also the telepathic case No. 210, below.

in street, and a fanlight over door admitting light from gas in passage. I grasped at my friend with both hands and supposed I had missed him as my hands met in the grasp. I attempted again to grasp him, when he disappeared as if through the floor under the washing-stand. I then realised, with some interest, that it was a hallucination, and I sat on the bed, wide awake, interested in thinking it over. I told K. of it next morning. I am uncertain whether there was a fan-light over the door, but such was my impression at the time ; anyway, the room was light.

" T. H. L."

" K." sent me a completely concordant account a month earlier. He says that he never walked in his sleep, and adds :—

" I had no notion where L.'s room was that night, but afterwards found that it was separated from mine by a passage. I don't think the sleep-walking theory is possible ; and he is quite clear as to my vanishing."

The auditory examples are commoner and clearer. As might be expected, they are specially connected with sounds which occur in an isolated way, such as those of bells and clocks. Thus a lady tells me that more than once, in her student days, when wondering what time it was, she distinctly heard the college clock strike, and then ascertained that the impression had been a delusion. She has also heard an imaginary " Come in," after knocking at a door. Another lady not unfrequently had a similar clock-hallucination when she was afraid of being late in the morning. A gentleman tells me that he has had the hallucination of hearing billiard-balls, when in bed near a billiard-room. That the habit of half-unconsciously looking out for any particular sound has a tendency to produce a phantasm of it is also shown by the experience of domestic servants. I have cases from two members of this class who occasionally, when at their household work, have heard the voice of their mistress calling them in tones as unmistakable as if they were real. And another informant tells me that she distinctly heard her father's voice call to her one morning, " Come, Sissy, it's past 8, you're late," and ascertained that he had said nothing. No one will doubt that such experiences as these are purely subjective.¹

Cases occur, however, where the other explanation seems less clearly excluded. Mr. Charles Ede, of Womersley Lodge, Guildford, a doctor by profession, who describes himself as a very unlikely person to be " deceived by morbid fancies," sends us the following example. Some ladies who lived about half-a-mile from him had a large alarm-bell outside their house, and one night he seemed distinctly to hear the sound of this bell. He learnt afterwards that there had been an alarm of thieves that night, and that at the very time, 1.30 a.m., when he was startled by the sound, his friends had been on the point of ringing the bell in the hope that it would bring him ; but they had not actually rung it. The hallucination may have been due to the subconscious idea of a possible summons in Mr. Ede's mind ; and the coincidence may probably have been accidental ; but if such a thing as telepathy exists, the probability does not amount to a certainty. Again, a clergyman is awakened at 7.30 one

¹ Some further examples of auditory hallucinations probably due to expectancy may be found in Howells' *Cambrian Superstitions* (Tipton, 1831), p. 65. See also Sikes's *British Goblins*, p. 229.

morning by the sound of his name, ascertains that no one has called him, and learns in less than an hour that a friend, for whom he was fulfilling a trust, had unexpectedly died at 7.30 that morning. He has never on any other occasion heard an imaginary voice. Still, an experience of this sort, coming in sleep, and at the very time when the organism would be, so to speak, preparing itself for the sudden change and the summons to activity which waking involves, must be classed as ambiguous.

A type of case which often makes a great impression on those who experience it is where the expectation is of someone's *arrival*. The following auditory specimen is from the Hon. Mrs. Fox Powys.

" July, 1882.

" I was expecting my husband home, and shortly after the time he ought to have arrived (about 10 p.m.) I heard a cab drive up to the door, the bell ring, my husband's voice talking with the cabman, the front door open, and his step come up the stairs. I went to the drawing-room, opened it, and to my astonishment saw no one. I could hardly believe he was not there, the whole thing was so vivid, and the street was particularly quiet at the time. About 20 minutes or so after this my husband *really* arrived, though nothing sounded to me more real than it did the first time. The train was late, and he had been thinking I might be anxious.

" AMY C. POWYS."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Powys adds :—

" To me the whole thing was very noisy and real, but no one else can have heard anything, for the bell I heard ring was not answered. It was a quiet street in town, and there was no vehicle of any kind passing at the time ; and on finding no one on the landing as I expected, I went at once to the window, and there was nothing to be seen, and no *sound* to be heard, which would have been the case had the cab been driven off."

Now the hearing of a bell, and the hearing of a carriage driving up, are both known forms of subjective impression, even apart from expectancy, nor is there anything odd in their combination ; and if, as I suspect, slight hallucinations of such non-vocal sounds are tolerably common, it is natural to suppose that expectancy might exaggerate them. The recognised voice was, no doubt, a more distinctive feature ; but in the percipient's circumstances, and after the other sounds heard, this seems too natural an addition to warrant us in connecting it with the fact that her husband's thoughts happened to be directed to her at the time. And if this case may be dismissed, *à fortiori* may others of a less prolonged and complicated kind—especially those lacking the distinct *timbre*-element of bell and voice, and so more easily accounted for as mere misinterpretations of real sounds whose source was not evident.

In the parallel visual cases, the impression is, at any rate, often of the most distinctive and unmistakable kind ; and it is impossible not to be struck by the number of instances in which this startling experience—the single visual hallucination of a person's life—has represented the figure of a friend or relative who was on his way to the place where his figure appeared, and whose mind was probably to some extent picturing his own arrival. None the less, I think, if expectancy existed on the percipient's part, must it be assumed to have been the sufficient cause of the

hallucination. Such a case as the following, sent to us by the Rev. F. R. Harbaugh (Pastor of the Presbyterian Church), Red Bank, Monmouth Co., New Jersey, U.S.A., is very instructive.

“ February 7th, 1884.

“ While a resident of the city of Philadelphia, I made an appointment to meet a personal friend. At the appointed hour I was at the designated place. My friend was tardy in his appearing. After a while, however, I saw him approaching (or thought I did). So assured was I of his advance that I advanced to meet him, when presently he disappeared entirely.

“ The locality where I thought I saw his approach was open, and unobstructed by any object behind which he could have disappeared. Only by leaping a high brick wall (an enclosure of a burying-ground) could he have secreted himself. The hallucination was complete—so distinct as to lead me to advance to meet him without a thought of optical illusion.

“ I immediately went to the office of my friend, and there learned from him that he had not been away from his desk for several hours.

“ F. R. HARBAUGH.”

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. Harbaugh adds :—

“ The appointment was *forgotten* by my friend, as he stated in his apology when I entered his office.”

Telepathy from an unconscious region of the defaulter's mind would scarcely be a plausible explanation of this occurrence.

At first sight it may perhaps seem strange that the ordinary everyday sort of expectancy which existed in these cases should be a sufficient cause for so rare and startling a delusion. But remembering that in the majority of startling delusions of the sort there is no assignable cause at all, and that a person may therefore be on the very verge of hallucination without knowing it, we may not unreasonably suppose that a very slight ostensible cause might give the final impulse. It must be noticed, moreover, that in these arrival-cases the alternative to the hypothesis of the subjective origin of the hallucination is by no means clear. For what would the telepathic explanation involve ? That on the agent's part the mere sense of being about to arrive, with thoughts perhaps affectionately turning to the percipient, is adequate to generate a telepathic impulse. Now have we any right to make such an assumption ?

§ 8. This question, it will be seen, brings us round to the head of ambiguity numbered 1 in the above list ;—where the doubt was whether a supposed agent's condition is abnormal enough for a synchronous hallucination of the percipient to form with it a coincidence deserving of attention. And it happens that it is only in the *arrival*-cases that this question has practically been difficult to decide. Many individual incidents of other types have, of course, been excluded from our evidence, on the ground that the abnormality of the alleged agent's condition was only slight, or that it was prolonged over a considerable time ; but these arrival-cases seem to form a distinct little class of their own. It happens also that some of them have presented features which tell rather strongly

in favour of a telepathic origin. For instance, the vision representing the coming person has included some detail of dress or appearance which the percipient's mind would have been most unlikely to supply ; or again, though the person whom the vision represented was actually about to arrive, his arrival was improbable and unexpected, and therefore the vision could not be connected with the percipient's attitude of mind. Such instances—though forming too small a group to be conclusive—do not seem any longer to be *ambiguous* in at all the same degree as those before considered, and they may fairly take their place among the positive evidence in a later chapter.¹ On the other hand—in view of the fact that in the vast majority of the cases where the evidence for telepathy reaches a certain strength, the agent is doing or suffering something much more remarkable than merely returning home—we do not feel that the telepathic explanation can claim any high degree of probability in any arrival-case where the hallucination has not presented some exceptional evidential feature ; and accordingly no such case has been admitted in the sequel.

The discussion of these ambiguous cases has not, I hope, been altogether without positive instruction ; but it was necessary, if only to clear the way for further examination of the telepathic phantasms. For if the question whether, or in what sense, those phantasms are *hallucinations* requires us to compare them with other hallucinations of the sane, the comparison must clearly be confined to cases which are *certainly* subjective, to the exclusion of cases which may conceivably themselves be telepathic.

¹ See Chap. xiv., § 7. In § 6 will be found a few cases where even the condition of arrival was lacking, and the coincidence that suggests telepathy depended simply on a peculiarity of dress or aspect.

CHAPTER XII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TELEPATHIC HALLUCINATIONS

§ 1. THE main points which I shall illustrate in the present chapter are two: (1) the *gradual development* of many telepathic hallucinations; and (2) the frequent embodiment of the idea which is at the root of them in an *original, improbable, or fantastic* manner—its clothing upon (so to speak) with images that indicate a distinct process of mental activity. Both of these points present themselves also in hallucinations of the sane of the purely subjective class; and the consideration of them will, I think, sufficiently establish the parallelism—as phenomena for the senses—of subjective and telepathic phantasms.

As regards gradual development—one form of it might be found in that *deferment* of the percipient's experience, which is as frequent a feature in the phantasmal group as we have found it to be in other groups of telepathic cases.¹ We should scarcely look for any very precise analogy to this deferment in the purely *subjective* class; inasmuch as the connection of a purely subjective hallucination with an idea which has previously obtained *unconscious* lodgment in the mind must, from the very nature of the case, be hard to establish. I may, however, refer once more to the *N'IMPORTE* incident, and to the other case described at p. 315, note 2, where an idea which was so far latent that even a deliberate search for it failed to evoke it, projected itself in sensory form at what appeared to be a quite casual moment. I will add an experience which has been described to me by a naval Captain, who has never in his life had any other hallucination of the senses. During his first important command, he twice in one night had a distinct auditory impression of the words, "Captain F., come on deck"—the reality of the impression being shown by the fact that he obeyed the imaginary summons. He does not recall any preceding knowledge of danger. But it turned out that the course which the ship was running was in fact a dangerous one; and it is natural, therefore, to conclude that some subconscious idea that his presence might be needed shaped itself in this outward form.²

But the development of which I wish here to speak is that which occurs after the abnormal experience has actually commenced. Such development may take various forms. Thus (1) the phantasm may be recognised only some moments after it has been perceived, or even after it has ceased to be perceived; or (2) a visible figure may take shape gradually; or (3) the process of illusion may include several distinct stages. In all these

¹ See, e.g., pp. 144, 187-8.

² The more striking case quoted in the note on p. 306, note 2, may without improbability be attributed to a similar latent idea of danger.

cases we may suppose that the idea, at first but dimly conceived and vaguely apprehended, is working itself into definiteness (as so often occurs in the processes of abstract reasoning), and that the character of the projection undergoes a corresponding change. Nowhere do we more clearly see the affinity of the waking hallucinations to dreams, which often, of course, exhibit the working out of an idea in a prolonged and elaborate form.

§ 2. And first very briefly to exhibit these types among purely subjective experiences—the following case, which most of my readers will probably refer to that class, is one where the phantasm was only recognised in the instant of or after disappearance. The narrator is Mr. R. Gibson, of Mulgrave Cottage, Limerick.

“ February 25th, 1884.

“ As well as I can remember, it was in the year 1862. I know it was in the early part of my courting days, so that it must have been 1862 or 1863. I was walking home one night about 10 p.m.—the night was not dark, I could see clearly for many yards ahead—when I met face to face a man in the by-road which leads from the high road to my father’s house. I felt that sort of start one does when you feel you are coming against something in the dark, without actually striking against it. Then the thought came, ‘ Confound his impudence, why does he not move out of my way ? ’ and I stepped straight forward, intending to walk bang into him, but as I stepped right up to him, with my chest up to him, he was gone, and the instant as he vanished I thought, ‘ Oh, Lord, that is my Grandfather Gibson.’ I felt rather queer, I can tell you, but I looked well round, and there was no one near. I carefully went to that place night after night again, and watched the spot often other nights over our wall, and I could never either see or think I saw anything again. My grandfather was dead about 11 years at the time, and was never much in my thoughts, as I had never been much with him ; and at the time I was thinking only of the events of the evening, as I suppose most young men madly in love, as I was, would have been. I was about as happy and as full of health and life as I suppose any fellow could possibly be. It was quite a puzzle to me for many years what it could have been for ; but I think I know now.” [This last sentence merely refers to the fact that Mr. Gibson was at that time becoming involved in an affair that turned out unfortunately.]

The *gradual formation* of the phantasm is a decidedly rare phenomenon. M. Marillier, in one of the most interesting accounts of subjective hallucination ever published,¹ says of his own experiences, “ C’est un fait intéressant à noter que les hallucinations n’apparaissent pas d’ordinaire d’emblée, mais qu’elles se développent et grandissent, se rapprochent peu à peu tandis qu’elles disparaissent toujours brusquement.” On the whole, I think that it is less uncommon for the *disappearance* to be gradual—a fading away, occasionally accompanied by an expansion of the figure.²

¹ *Revue Philosophique* for Feb., 1886, p. 212.

² For example, Mr. I. Nicholl, of 32, Lancaster Gate, W., describes to me a waking hallucination representing a child of his, whom he “ saw in his night-gown, coming from the window. It increased in size and gradually vanished.”

Other cases do not get beyond the stage of indefinite cloudy forms. But I have very few subjective cases where a definite object took shape out of a vague mass. One of these belongs to the "swarming" class—the faces, sometimes hideous and sometimes beautiful, being described by my informant as developing out of mist. Another informant tells me that during fainting-fits, to which in boyhood he was rather liable, he always saw white cloudy masses pass in front of him, which gradually assumed a general resemblance to human forms. A third case is from Mr. Robert Collings, of 118, Earl's Court Road, S.W. When a boy, he awoke one night, and found the moon brightly illuminating the side of the room facing the bed.

"While gazing, I distinctly saw—rising in the moonlit space between the curtains at the foot of the bed—what appeared to be vapour or cloud, and as this grew higher, it gradually assumed the shape of a draped female figure, holding towards me in one hand a lamp and in the other a basin, from which steam seemed to rise. The form vanished slowly, and I afterwards fell asleep without experiencing either fear or horror."

Mr. Collings' brother, who was sharing his room at the time, writes, from the Royal Naval Club, Portsmouth, that he distinctly remembers hearing of this vision immediately afterwards.

This experience may probably be accounted for as a recrudescence of what the boy's eyes had shortly before beheld on several occasions during a trifling illness. The case, however, ought strictly to rank as ambiguous, because the relative who had tended him in this illness had just died (see pp. 331-2). It will be seen that the disappearance, as well the appearance, was gradual.

The occurrence of subjective hallucinations *in several stages* is, on the other hand, common enough. I have mentioned the occasional development of an undefined impression of a presence into definite visible or audible form (pp. 308-9 and case 300). In another case, as to the subjective character of which I myself entertain little doubt, my informant describes seeing an unusual light on the staircase, looking up, and then perceiving a deceased relative standing with a candle on the stairs. Dr. Jessopp (p. 321, note) saw a large white hand, before he turned round and beheld the complete form of his nocturnal visitor. But the more usual type is where two or more senses are concerned. So marked an instance as the incident of the servant and the message, quoted above (p. 321, note), is no doubt, exceptional; but a figure which speaks, or which shakes the percipient's arm; the sound of footsteps or of an opening door, followed by an entrance; a voice and a kiss—such incidents, though far less frequent than hallucinations of the single senses, are yet well represented among the subjective delusions of the sane.

§ 3. I turn now to the telepathic cases. The most striking case of delayed recognition in our collection is perhaps that of Mr. Marchant (No. 26, p. 149). A case where the phantasmal figure was taken first for one person and then for another, the latter being the one who had died at the time, will be found in No. 249. In the two following examples, the face

of the apparition seemed familiar, though the percipient could not at the time identify it. The first is from Mr. T. W. Goodyear, now of Avoca Villa, Park Road, Bevois Hill, Southampton.

“ Highfield Villa, Winchester.

“ February 9th, 1884.

(191) “ I may remark first of all I am considered by my friends as possessing iron nerves, am passionately fond of athletics, and certainly not given to letting imagination or fear run off with my senses. But although I can without boasting say I hardly know what fear is, I am peculiarly susceptible to mental impressions; that is, I can often tell what is passing in the minds of others (especially my wife) when out, walking with them—so much so that I have almost frightened one or two people by offering to tell them the subject on which they were thinking, and in some cases exactly what they were thinking about that subject. However, I daresay that is common enough, but what I am particularly writing you on is to tell you two facts, one of which occurred 10½ years ago and the other 7 years ago nearly. [The second case is No. 280.] It seems a long time ago to be reproduced, but to me the scenes are fresh as if they only happened yesterday.

“ The first was this. I was going from the house I lived at to a shop kept by my brother, and when about half-way, it came on to rain very fast. I called in at the house of a lady friend and waited some time, but it did not clear, and as I was afraid my brother would be leaving, I said I must go. I rose to do so, and went into the hall, and my friend rushed away upstairs to get an umbrella, leaving me in the dark. In the higher part of the door was a glass window, and I all at once, in the darkness, saw a face looking through that window. The face was very well known to me, though for the instant I did not associate it with the original, as she was 300 miles away. I instantly opened the door, found nobody there, and then searched the ivy with which the porch and house are covered. Finding nothing, and knowing it was impossible anyone could have got away, I then for the first time inquired of myself whose was the face I had seen. I at once knew that the face was that of a married sister-in-law of my wife's. I told all our family of the circumstance directly I got home, and judge of our dismay when we had a letter to say she died at the very hour I saw her. Monday was the evening I saw the face, and on Wednesday, when we were at dinner, the letter came.

“ T. W. GOODYEAR.”

In answer to the usual question, Mr. Goodyear replies that he has had no other experience of a visual hallucination.

Miss Goodyear corroborates as follows :—

“ Hartley Wintney, Winchfield.

“ March 12th, 1884.

“ My brother (Mr. Goodyear, of Winchester) says you wish confirmation of a statement he made as to seeing the face of a friend—who lived some 300 miles off—the evening she died. We are none of us likely to forget the assertion he made as to seeing the face, one evening some 12 years or so ago; still less the great astonishment when two days after (midday of second day) we had a letter to say she had died on that particular evening. My other brother, who was away from home, was written to on the intervening day, and mention was made of the strange affair,

so that he, too, could corroborate the statement, as his letter would reach him before the one announcing the death reached us.

"MARY APPLETON GOODYEAR."

A brother of Mr. T. W. Goodyear writes :—

"March 19th, 1884.

"I recollect my brother mentioning the strange occurrence of seeing the face of a friend a day before her death, though he was in Hampshire and she in Yorkshire. I have not kept my letter, or would forward it to you, but can vouch for the accuracy of the account.

"G. A. GOODYEAR."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on November 3, 1872 ; consequently $12\frac{1}{4}$, not $10\frac{1}{4}$, years before Mr. Goodyear wrote to us. Mr. Goodyear seems also to have made an error as to the day of the week ; for Nov. 3 was a Sunday. But it seems very unlikely that at the time both he and his sister should have been wrong in their identification of the evening of the vision as that of the death. Mr. G. A. Goodyear's words "a day before her death," if more than a slip of writing, can hardly weigh against the evidence of the other two witnesses ; and so far as they had any weight, it would tell against the supposition that the vision was as late as Monday.

[Case 192 is omitted.] The next case [from the Additional Chapter] is from the Rev. R. Markham Hill, of St. Catherine's, Lincoln.

"June 17, 1886.

(696) "On the evening of Easter Sunday, about 8 or 9 years ago, I think, I was just beginning my supper, feeling very tired after the day's work, when I saw the door opening behind me.¹ I was sitting with my back to the door, but could just see it over my shoulder. I may also have heard the opening, but cannot speak with certainty upon this point. I turned half round, and just had time to see the figure of a tall man rushing hastily into the room, as if to attack me. I sprang up at once, turned round, and threw the glass, which I held in my hand, at the spot where I had seen the figure, which had disappeared in the act of my rising. The disappearance had, however, been too sudden to arrest the act of throwing. I then realised that I had seen an apparition, and I immediately connected it with one of my uncles, whom I knew to be seriously ill. Moreover, the figure which I saw resembled my uncle in stature. Mr. Adcock came in, and found me quite unnerved by the occurrence, and to him I related the circumstances. I don't remember telling him that I connected the vision with my uncle. The next day a telegram came announcing my uncle's death on the Sunday. My father was summoned to my uncle's death-bed unexpectedly on the Sunday evening as he was sitting at supper, and the death must have coincided in time with what I saw.

"R. MARKHAM HILL."

The Rev. H. Adcock, of Lincoln, writes :—

"June 16, 1886.

"I called on my friend, the Rev. Markham Hill, one evening, and found him apparently in an exhausted condition in an arm-chair ; he told me, before I could ask for any explanation, that he had just seen the

¹ There is, of course, no reason to suppose the impression that the door opened to have been anything but part of the hallucination.

figure of his uncle standing opposite to him against the wall, behind a piano; that he lifted up a glass from the table, and was about to throw it at him, when the figure vanished. He said he felt convinced that he should hear very shortly of his uncle's death. It was only the following day, or the day after, that he showed me a letter received that morning informing him that his uncle had died on the day when the appearance took place."

In conversation, Mr. Podmore learnt from Mr. Hill that he was alone at the time. He has had no other visual hallucination in his life, unless it were an experience which impressed him in somewhat the same way as this one, but which may well have been merely a case of mistaken identity.

Mr. Adcock explained that the above incident must have occurred about 12 years ago. He cannot remember whether it was a Sunday evening.

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Hill's uncle died on April 5, 1874, which was Easter Sunday.

[It would be difficult to account for the hallucination here as due to anxiety respecting the uncle's condition. If a person's mind, from brooding over the condition of a sick relative, is led to evolve a phantasm of that relative, we should certainly expect the appearance to be *recognised*; and we should not expect its character to be at once unfamiliar and formidable.

It will be seen that the two accounts differ as to whether the glass was actually thrown.]

In the next two cases we have the feature of gradual formation, as well as delayed recognition. [193 is omitted.] The next account is from a lady known to the present writer, whose only reason for withholding her name and address is her fear that a near relative might object to their publication. The description seems to warrant us in regarding the visual experience, at any rate, as a waking and not a mere "borderland" specimen.

"December 17th, 1883.

(194) "Years ago, a friend and myself made the time-worn arrangement that whichever died first would endeavour to return to visit the other. Some years after, I asked this man's sister to remember me to him and say, did he remember his promise, and having received for answer 'Perfectly, and I hope I shall appear to —, and not she to me,' the whole matter passed out of my mind. My friend was in New Zealand, his sister I don't know where. One night I awoke with a feeling some one was in the room. I must tell you that I always have a bright light burning on a table, not far from my bed. I looked about, and presently saw something behind the little table; felt myself grow perfectly cold;¹ was not in the least frightened, rubbed my eyes to be sure I was quite awake, and looked at it steadfastly. Gradually a man's head and shoulders were perfectly formed, but in a sort of misty material, if I may use such a word. The head and features were distinct, but the whole appearance was not substantial and plain; in fact it was like a cloud, formed as a man's head and shoulders. At first I gazed and thought, who is it, some one must be here, but who? Then the formation of the head and forehead (which are most marked in my friend) made me exclaim to myself 'Captain W——.' The appearance faded away.

¹ As to this sensation see note to case 28.

— “ I got up and put the date down ; and waited until news from New Zealand was possible. I made inquiries about my friend, never doubting but that he was dead. The answer always came ‘ No news.’ At last this also, ‘ We are so anxious ; it is so long since we have heard. We shall again wait another mail, and write to so-and-so.’ And then came the news, a mere scrap, ‘ Have had a severe fall off the coach ; can’t write ; head all wrong still.’ That was all, and pretty much the exact words as far as I can remember. In due time we heard more. He had fallen off the coach, and was insensible for some time, and then, as he had said, his head was not clear for a while. I have never had the slightest doubt but that, while insensible, his spirit came here. The appearance to me was coincident with the time of his insensibility. I have never had but this one experience of an apparition.

“ E. W. R.”

In a subsequent letter, Miss R. adds :—

“ January 1st, 1884.

“ I put the date down in a book I use daily ; there is a page for every day in the month. I mentioned it to several people—quite 3 or 4. One was extremely amused because my friend had not died ; which she always used to assure me was—she was sure—a cause of sincere regret to me.”

The present writer has seen the book, which is one containing reading for every day of the month. The words written in pencil, on the page of the 15th day, are : “ Night of this day, March, ’74.”

In answer to further inquiries, Miss R. adds :—

“ I saw his sister, I should say fully a year and a half before I saw him myself, but as this is not to be substantiated in any possible way—and is only a thought—I cannot verify it. I certainly did not write to him or hear from him between the time of my sending the message and receiving the answer, and his appearing. I am not aware that I had had anything to recall him to me particularly.

“ My sister has written the note on the other sheet. She feels as sure as I do that I told her very soon afterwards, but does not like to write more positively.”

The following is the sister’s note :—

“ Ditchingham.

“ May 1st, 1884.

“ As far as I can remember, my sister told me of her vision soon after it occurred, and before the news of her friend’s accident arrived. It is so many years ago that I cannot speak more positively.

“ MOTHER C.”

In conversation, Miss R. especially, and unasked, confirmed the fact that the feeling of a presence in the room preceded the vision. She described the formation of the figure as like a cloud taking a definite shape. She further said that the hair of the head which appeared was distinctly *grey*, and that this was the chief reason why she did not sooner recognise the face. Her friend had *black* hair when she last saw him, and she had never thought of him otherwise ; but she found out afterwards that he had become grey, and was so at the time of his accident.¹ She also stated that she had ascertained beyond a doubt that her vision fell during the period of her friend’s insensibility ; and her memory on this point may reasonably be trusted, since, when the news of the accident arrived,

¹ As to this point see the beginning of § 8 below.

she had in her written entry the means of fixing with certainty the date of her experience.

The previous compact in this case is to be specially noted. It is a feature which we have already encountered and shall encounter again (see pp. 414-15). In the next two examples, again, a feeling of a presence preceded the visual hallucination.¹ Miss Rogers, of 56, Berners Street, W., narrates as follows :—

“ October, 1884.

(195) “ I was on a visit at Colnbrook, in Buckinghamshire, in 1878, and one night when I went to bed, and while yet fully awake, I felt an influence as if some one was in the room. I sat up to see what it was, and saw my grandmother, in the plaid cloak she usually wore, leaning upon my mother’s arm.² I looked round the room to see whether the vision could have arisen from any reflection from the mirrors in the room, and while doing so I saw the figures walk slowly round the room and disappear. I afterwards ascertained that my grandmother died in London about the time I had seen the apparition in Buckinghamshire.

“ KATE ROGERS.”

In conversation, Miss Rogers told Mr. Podmore that she was not absolutely certain as to the year in which this incident occurred. Subsequently she found from the *Times* obituary (as we had meanwhile discovered from the Register of Deaths) that her grandmother, Mrs. Macdonald, died on March 14, 1877.

In answer to inquiries, Miss Rogers says that she has had no other hallucination. She adds that the phantasm was seen “ soon after getting to bed about 10 p.m.”; and that “ on my return home, I heard that my grandmother had passed away just about the time of my vision.”

Appended is a letter from Mrs. Rogers (a sister of our valued helper, the Rev. J. A. Macdonald), who was herself nursing her mother at the time.

“ October 30th, 1884.

“ On receipt of your letter relative to the hour of my mother’s death, I made inquiries of those who remembered the time, and I find she died nearer to 12 o’clock p.m. The reason my daughter mentioned 10 as the time of the vision only depended upon the usage of the family she was visiting, who generally retired at 10. Her memory could not serve her to fix the time exactly; besides, in cases of visitors being in the house, the family remained up later. The exact time of the appearance cannot be noted now, only that on reflection my daughter thinks it would be later than 10. Besides, she would, perhaps, have remained up a long time in her room, conversing with the lady of the house, before going to bed, as was often the habit. It was between 7 and 8 years ago that this experience occurred, and my daughter cannot fix exact times and hours; but, at the time, she thinks her vision corresponded with the time of the death. My daughter is very sorry that a more definite account cannot be given of the circumstances. The facts can be depended upon, but the hours and times have entirely slipped our memories.

¹ Cf. the “ borderland ” case, No. 172, where the apparition was preceded by a feeling as of “ someone bending over.” In such cases one may suspect that what is described as a sense of presence (as sometimes in ordinary life) is really a faint auditory impression, not noticed as such, and here of course hallucinatory like the visual impression which it introduces. Cf. cases 182, 201.

² As to the appearance of the second figure, see p. 359 below.

"My daughter suggests that she was so greatly attached to her grandmother that, in so continually thinking of her, the vision might have come through the influence of strong imagination; but it impressed itself upon her mind at the time as a real presence, and she told me about it on her return to town. She did not expect her grandmother's death just then, as she had been ailing for years, and the death occurred rather suddenly.

"JANE M. ROGERS."

In conversation, Mrs. Rogers explained to Mr. Podmore that Miss Rogers, being absent from home, did not know of any change in her grandmother's condition.¹

The following is a letter from Miss R.'s friend, Mrs. F. She is not explicit as to the vision having been mentioned *before* the news of the death arrived. But we presume she means to imply that it was, as the question was definitely asked; and in a previous short note she uses the words, "Kate certainly seemed to know her grandmother was dead, before the news reached us."

"April 8th, 1885.

"Mrs. R. has sent your note to me, asking me to reply to it; but it is really little I can tell you in reference to the matter, beyond that Miss R. felt convinced that her grandmother was dead before the news reached us, from a dream or vision² (whichever you like to call it) that she had had. I cannot give you her words as she told it to me. The fact that Miss R. had a vivid dream in reference to the death of her grandmother did not strike me as anything but natural. She was always deeply attached to her, and doubtless had gone to bed with an anxious mind, knowing that her grandmother was ill.

"C. B. F."

[Case 196 is omitted.]

In the following case a visual phantasm first appears, and then words are heard³ which, in the mind of both agent and percipient, were probably of all others the most significative of the bond between them. The narrator is Mrs. Bishop, formerly Miss Bird, the well-known traveller and authoress. The account, received in March, 1886, is almost identical with a second-hand version which was given to us in March, 1883. When travelling in the Rocky Mountains, Miss Bird had made the acquaintance of a half-caste Indian, Mr. Nugent, known as "Mountain Jim," over whom she established a considerable influence.⁴

(197) "On the day in which I parted with Mountain Jim, he was much moved and much excited. I had a long conversation with him about mortal life and immortality, and closed it with some words from the Bible. He was greatly impressed, but very excited, and exclaimed, 'I may not

¹ [In a reply to Professor Peirce (*Proceedings of American Society for Psychical Research*, 1887, vol. i., p. 165) Mr. Gurney says, "It ought to have been stated that the percipient returned home almost immediately after—she and her mother think the very day after—the death, thereby missing a letter which was sent to her, and finding her grandmother dead. She would thus only have to carry her memory back a day or two to identify the date of her vision with that of the death."—ED.]

² As to the great injustice done to the telepathic argument by confounding dreams and waking visions, see pp. 255-7, and 373-4.

³ [From the contemporary letter quoted below, it appears that the words were an impression on the mind, not an auditory hallucination.—ED.]

⁴ See *A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains*, letters vi.-ix. and xiii.-xvii.

see you again in this life, but I shall when I die.' I rebuked him gently for his vehemence, but he repeated it with still greater energy, adding, 'And these words you have said to me, I shall never forget, and dying I swear that I will see you again.'¹

"We parted then, and for a time I heard that he was doing better, then that he had relapsed into wild ways, then that he was very ill after being wounded in a wild quarrel, then lastly that he was well, and planning revenge. The last news I got when I was at the Hotel Interlaken, Interlaken, Switzerland, with Miss Clayton and the Kers. Shortly after getting it, in September, 1874, I was lying on my bed about 6 a.m., writing to my sister, when, looking up, I saw Mountain Jim standing with his eyes fixed on me, and when I looked at him he very slowly but very distinctly said, 'I have come, as I promised'; then waved his hands towards me, and said, 'Farewell.'

"When Miss Bessie Ker came into the room with my breakfast, we recorded the event, with the date and hour of its occurrence. In due time news arrived of his death, and its date, allowing for the difference of longitude, coincided with that of his appearance to me. "I. B."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Bishop says that she has never had any other hallucination of the senses; that she had last seen Mountain Jim at St. Louis, Colorado, on December 11th, 1873; and that he died at Fort Collins, Colorado. She hopes to be able to show us the diaries in which the date was recorded; but she wrote from abroad, and under very great pressure.

We have procured a copy of some of the testimony given at the inquest at Fort Collins, from which it appears that the death took place on Sept. 7, 1874, between 2 and 3 p.m.—which would correspond with about 10 p.m. at Interlaken. The coincidence therefore cannot have been as close as Mrs. Bishop imagines. If the vision took place on the 8th of September, it followed the death by 8 hours; but if it took place on the 7th, then the 12 hours' limit was exceeded by some 4 hours.

[Mr. Gurney subsequently obtained contemporary documentary evidence which he published in the *Proceedings* of the American Society for Psychical Research in 1887 (vol. i., p. 173) in reply to criticisms by Professor Peirce. He there says:—]

"I have quite recently learnt that the error [as to exact coincidence] was greater than at first sight appeared. The vision took place on the morning of September 6, that is *the day before* the death. The date is fixed by the entry in the diary of the narrator's friend, Miss K.²; under the head of September 5 is written, 'On this night Isabella saw Jim vividly appear to her as if dead.' The vision was actually in the early morning—that is, at the close of the night September 5-6. The case, therefore, if telepathic, is one in which the telepathic impulse coincided not with death, but with a time of exceptional danger and probably excitement on the side of the agent. Another document which has lately been recovered further strengthens the evidence. This is a letter, sent at the time by the narrator to her sister, which, though it contains no date, leaves no doubt as to the record of the hallucination having been written and sent away before the news of the death arrived. This is really a better

¹ As to this promise, see pp. 414-15.

² Before this diary was recovered, Miss K. wrote to me, "I distinctly remember that on my going into her room in the morning she told me immediately what she has related to you."

and rarer form of documentary evidence than an entry in a diary, which sometimes allows of the hypothesis that it was written later than the day under which it figures. The following is the account in the letter :—

“ Hotel Interlaken,

“ Wednesday.

“ A few days ago, about seven in the morning, I had lain down again after drawing up my blind to let in the beautiful view of the rose-flushed morning, when I saw an appearance of Mountain Jim, looking just as he did when I last saw him. There was an impression on my mind as though he said : ‘ I have come as I promised. Farewell.’ It was curious, and if I had not heard that he was getting well and going about, I should have thought he was dead.”

This record, which closely corresponds with the printed account, written more than eleven years afterwards, makes it almost certain that the narrator’s memory was at fault as to one unimportant detail, when she said in that account that she was lying on her bed and *writing to her sister* at the moment when the apparition occurred ; for had she been so employed she could hardly have failed to mention the experience in that letter, instead of waiting some days.

In the next two cases there is a distinct hallucination of sound, suggestive of some one entering or approaching the room (compare the “ borderland ” cases 182 and 190) ; and in the second of the two, a short interval elapses before the visual percept is developed. [The first case, 198, is omitted.] The second case is from Mr. B., confidential clerk to a firm with a principal of which we are well acquainted. He withholds his name from publication, having a strong dislike to the subject. The account is in the words of Mr. D. H. Wilson, of Rosemont, Hyères, but has been read over and corrected by Mr. B. The fact that the percipient had just got up and opened his door may be taken as a proof that he was awake when the visual experience took place.

“ October 24th, 1883.

(199) “ Mr. B. is a gentleman whom I have known for more than 15 years. He is practical, shrewd, and very trustworthy. I am indebted to him for the following narration : One morning, a few months ago, at 5 o’clock, he was awakened by a noise outside his room, but near his room door. Opening the door he saw no person. He returned to bed, and had scarcely composed himself when he was very disconcerted by seeing the form of a lady friend of his glide or flit across the room. He thereupon woke Mrs. B. and informed her of the fact. This was Saturday, and at the end of the next week Mr. B. called at the house of his friend, the subject of his vision, and was informed that the lady had thrown herself out of the window the previous Saturday at about 5 o’clock in the morning, and was instantaneously killed.”

We learn from Mr. B. that the hallucination of the senses here described is the only one that he has ever experienced.

The account, confirmed by Mr. B. in 1883, was written in or before 1876. Mrs. B. writes, on December 31, 1886 : “ I perfectly recollect the occasion of Mrs. ———’s death, and that my husband for a whole week was considerably concerned about her. My husband mentioned the vision the same morning, at the time it occurred, and we did not hear of the

death till seven or eight days afterwards." The death could not be traced in the register at Somerset House ; but on inquiring of the coroner of the district where it occurred, we find that it took place exactly as described, on April 9, 1873, which, however, was a Wednesday, not a Saturday. The mistake as to the day of the week seems neither to increase nor to decrease the probability that Mr. and Mrs. B. were able, after the short interval which elapsed before they heard the news, correctly to identify the day of the vision with that of the death.

In this example we observe a failure to co-ordinate the elements into a completely natural-seeming incident. A feature in Mr. Keulemans' case (No. 184) has been reserved for mention here as illustrating the same point. He says :—

"The sound [of the child's voice] did not proceed from the locality where the vision [of the child] was seen, nor did it seem to be in any way produced by the organs of speech belonging to the apparition ; for the mouth did not move. I heard the voice at a short distance, and on my right side, simultaneously with the vision, which appeared at a greater distance, on my left, or rather in front of me."

§ 4. So much, then, for gradual development. I proceed to my second main point—the embodiment of the idea which is at the root of the hallucination in a manner that is to some extent original, and implies a creative process carried out by the percipient's own mind.

There is no need to illustrate this process at any length in the purely subjective class. A certain amount of it is, in fact, involved in every sensory hallucination which is anything more than a mere momentary revival of familiar images, due, as I have suggested, to a disturbance at the sensory centre, unprompted by any agitation in the higher tracts of the brain (pp. 314–15). Wherever the higher tracts of the brain are the first in action, and the hallucination represents an object which the senses have never actually encountered, there clearly the mind has more or less created its object ; and of the transient hallucinations of the sane the majority seem to belong to this class. A special type that is worth noting is where the hallucination is in part mere reminiscence and in part a new creation. For example, a gentleman tells me that, having been compelled to kill a favourite dog, he very soon afterwards had the subjective vision of a dog running across the lawn, and pursued by a man in a white flannel jacket ; and my friend Mrs. Hunter, of 2, Victoria Crescent, St. Helier's, describes how, having just dismissed for the night a young daughter under 15 years of age, heard her lock her door, locked her own, and resumed her own train of thought, she looked up, and there the child "stood smiling, in dressing-gown and hair floating down her back, just as she had left me, but *with a baby in her arms*"—the apparition lasting for a few seconds.¹ A good example of a subjective hallucination whose development from the root-idea is obvious, is a visionary crown, clearly seen by a lady hovering near the head of a preacher to whom she was listening (as she implies) with sympathy and admiration. As more or less fantastic instances, I may mention the apparition, out of doors, of a tall female figure, which went on in front of the percipient, and whose head then left its body ; a

¹ Cf. Mr. Blacker's case, p. 324.

man in parti-coloured Oriental garb, about as wide as high, and with a face like a king on a card; and some curious appearances of "flats," human-looking figures without any apparent depth, by which a gentleman tells me that he has been more than once visited. Peculiarities in costume and appurtenances are very common; a woman in grave-clothes, a woman in brocaded silk with a small book in her hand, a black man with a knife in his hand, a sweet-looking creature in a low black dress and mantilla, a tall man with dark curly hair and in antique dress, a woman with a crown and a child, recalling a statuette of the Virgin—such are among the visual hallucinations in my collection which there is no reason to suppose other than purely subjective affections. Of auditory cases, some that have been already given show the construction from a root-idea in the percipient's mind very plainly—*e.g.*, the words, "You can't save him," "Your brother is dead," "Take up that knife and use it" (pp. 329, 303, note). Another good example is that of a clergyman's wife, who tells me that she was once startled by the remark, "Those ladies will borrow money from George to-day," while she was sitting alone, and picturing a call which her husband was paying to some impecunious parishioners whom she mistrusted—unless, indeed, the fact that the loan was actually requested be held to make the case "ambiguous." The hearing of long, original discourses could, of course, not be reckoned as a *transient* hallucination, and is a type which scarcely occurs at all among hallucinations of the sane; but occasionally a very few words may be quite sufficient to show independence of mental action—as where a lady who was expecting to be called by her sister in the morning, distinctly heard, in fictitious tones, not the expected message, but the much more agreeable one, "Not five; don't get up yet."

§ 5. And now to turn to the parallel features of original or fantastic construction in the telepathic class of hallucinations. The question as to the existence and interpretation of these features is of such special importance to my general argument that, at the risk of wearying the reader, I must make its bearings plain.

I must recur for a moment to the breach which has been more than once noted (pp. 92-3, 134, 174-5) as dividing telepathic phantasms from the less concrete forms of telepathy, and especially from the results of experiments in thought-transference. To resume the two marked points of difference: in the experiments, (1) the "subject" never perceives the transferred image as an actual sight or sound—there is never an external hallucination; and (2) the image always represents the precise object which is consciously occupying the agent's mind; whereas in the case of the spontaneous phantasms the percept (1) appears to be external, and (2) represents something which is certainly not consciously occupying the agent's mind—to wit, his own form or voice.¹ Here is an

¹ I am here speaking of the common type of spontaneous cases. There are other cases, both visual and auditory, which conform more nearly to the experimental type, in so far as something that is occupying the senses or the mind of the agent is distinctly represented in the phantasmal appearance (see, *e.g.*, cases 157, 158, 220, 221, 267, 268). But such representation is decidedly exceptional, and in visual cases applies usually to only a single feature in the appearance; *e.g.*, in case 213 below we might trace the perception of the checked shawl to the agent's conscious thought, but not the perception of her complete figure.

undoubted *crux*. When the agent is painfully concentrating his attention on a card, with the object of getting the impression of it transferred to the percipient, one might have imagined that he was in a stronger and more hopeful condition for producing a telepathic effect than when his thoughts are wandering at random, and are perhaps not occupied with the percipient at all; and yet the effect on the percipient seems often to be of a far more dominant and startling kind in the latter case than in the former. We may observe further that just the two forms of telepathic impression which, in the ordinary course of experiment, do occasionally reach the pitch of *hallucination*—the transferences of pains and of tastes—are conspicuous by their absence from the records of spontaneous cases, the latter being totally unrepresented and the former very rare: while, on the other hand, the spontaneous class abounds in specimens where the psychical condition of the agent—whether sleeping, swooning, or dying—has apparently lapsed to the very verge of nothingness. Spontaneous telepathy would thus seem to depend as little on the agent's intensity of feeling (for what can be more intensely felt than acute physical pain?) as on his intensity of concentration; or, if some actual intensity of experience be imagined for him even at moments when it is least apparent (Chapter V., § 10), it will at any rate not be imagined as abnormal pre-occupation with his own physical attributes.

Now it is manifest that these differences may be reduced, in proportion as the extent of the impression actually transferred from the agent to the percipient in the phantasmal cases can be conceived to be small, and the part which the percipient's own creative energy supplies can be conceived to be large. If we are at liberty to assume that even a dim and shadowy idea, when once it obtains a lodgment in the mind, may body itself forth as a sensory phantasm, clearly all that we shall have to suppose transferred from the one mind to the other is a dim and shadowy idea. We shall thus shift, so to speak, the responsibility for the hallucination to the *percipient's* mind; which we shall conceive as actively generating and projecting it under a peculiar form of impulse, instead of passively receiving a full-fledged percept from the *agent's* mind, where nothing in the least resembling such a percept had any conscious place.

An unknown quantity—the peculiar form of impulse—has, no doubt, here to be assumed; for unless the transferred idea involves a certain impulsive force which causes the mind to react on it, and to project it as a hallucination, why does it not remain as a mere idea? It might, indeed, be not unreasonably replied that it *does* remain as a mere idea in many cases, as we saw in the 6th chapter; and that there may be many other cases where it never reaches the stage of even a conscious idea—never forces itself on the attention at all,—and where, therefore, we never hear anything about it (see p. 77). We have already had numerous experimental instances of what may be called “underground telepathy”: in Mr. Newnham's cases, for instance (pp. 50–7), no one would ever have known that there had been a transference of ideas, but for the fact—which was not in any way vital to the transference—that Mrs. Newnham had her hand on a planchette at the time. And if we could conceive that a great deal of *spontaneous* telepathy takes place similarly underground and unnoticed, then we might regard the sensory phantasms as a sort of acci-

dental group—as just the cases which here and there get above ground owing to some exceptional favouring condition in the percipient. The question why an idea that has been telepathically transferred should give rise to a hallucination, might thus be answered by saying that it does only in the proportion in which purely subjective ideas develop purely subjective hallucinations—the specific cause being as unknown in the one case as in the other. All this, however, is highly hypothetical; and we need not shrink from the provisional hypothesis that a telepathically conveyed idea which is to some extent charged with emotion really has a certain peculiar tendency to develop into hallucination. Our own ignorance in some measure justifies this assumption; for unable as we are for the most part to connect transient hallucinations of the sane with any antecedent condition at all, we need the less scruple to admit a no-condition when we find one. And in connection with such an onward passage of the impression, it is very pertinent to recall the particular impulsive quality which we found to attach to some of the *experimental* transferences—where the impulse took effect not in sensory but in muscular disturbances (see pp. 59–63, and 67–8).¹

To return, however, to the actual content of the percepts, and their relation to the ideas from which they spring. If once it be granted that the telepathic phantasm need not be the literal embodiment of any clearly defined idea or image, but may be worked out from a suggestion of a vague kind, we should certainly be prepared for variety and independence in working out. The mind is no mere collection of separate compartments into which new ideas will fit and then rest in a passive way; but an organism of interacting parts, where any change or any intruding element may set in motion whole trains of images and associations. We know what small and dim suggestions will sometimes set large tracts of mental machinery to work; we may therefore well credit the vaguer or subconscious order of telepathic impressions with such a power. What more natural, then, than that these further images and associations should be embodied in the sensory projection? We have already noted the process in dreams; we found the telepathic impression operating not to suspend or fetter, but simply to invoke and inform, the spontaneous activities of the dreaming condition. We have since caught the percipient mind at work, so to speak, in the gradual stages which waking hallucinations of the present; and we have noted the originative activity which often goes to the shaping of purely subjective specimens. What is now suggested is that the waking mind may unconsciously react, as in a dream, on

¹ I may note further how the very fact of an *unrecognised* telepathic phantasm bears witness to the suggested specific tendency of telepathic impressions to pass into hallucinations. We have had instances, in former chapters, of vague but strong impressions, not connected by the percipient at the time with any particular perception which afterwards seemed to have been due to the condition of a particular perception. Now one would have supposed, if an undistinctive telepathic idea was to assume more definiteness, that it must be by becoming a *distinctive idea*, an idea of the particular agent. But what we find is that the undistinctive telepathic idea sometimes becomes more definite in a quite different way—namely, by becoming an *undistinctive percept*, an *unrecognised form*. It is hurried on into hallucination, so to speak, without having first declared itself as an idea; it assumes the definiteness of visible shape while yet its content or message remains indefinite.

nucleus of a "transferred impression," and, in the act of externalising the percept, may invest it with its own atmosphere and imagery.¹ We shall thus have a ready explanation for many degrees of distinctness and individualisation, and many diversities of character, in what is perceived. Suppose the same kind of real event—say the peaceful death of an aged parent—to occur in twenty cases, and in each of them to produce a real and unique sort of disturbance in some absent person's mind; then, if that disturbance clothed itself in some sensory form—or, as I should say, if it reached the point of causing *hallucination*—the hallucination might take twenty different forms. One percipient may hear his parent's voice; another may imagine the touch of his hand upon his head; a third may see him in his wonted dress and aspect; a fourth may see him as he might appear when dying; a fifth may see him in some transfigured aspect; a sixth may see a figure or hear a voice resembling his, but not recognise it, or recognise it only in recollection; and others may invest the disturbing idea with every sort of visible symbolism, derived from their mind's habitual furniture and their wonted trains of thought.

§ 6. This frequent activity of the percipient's mind in the elaboration and projection of his percept forms a ready key to much of the evidence that follows. How, for instance, on any theory of merely passive affection of the percipient's mind or senses, could we account for the appearance of a dying friend, attired in a style of dress which was habitual to him at the time when the percipient associated with him, but which has been discontinued, or, at any rate, is not that in which he would be pictured in his own mind? The "ghosts of clothes" in general—a stock bugbear—are the simplest things in the world to explain on a theory of telepathic impressions; but the ghosts of *old* clothes—how could they be impressed *ab extra*? What, on the other hand, is more natural, when once the percipient's active share in the phenomenon is recognised, than that he should invest the idea of his friend with the visual traits that memory supplies, and should project the figure into space in its most familiar aspect?

A few instances of this sort may be quoted. [The first, No. 200, is omitted.]

The next case (which again exemplifies the development of a feeling of presence into distinct hallucination) is from Mrs. Bolland, of 7, Cranbury Terrace, Southampton, the narrator of case 126 above.

"July, 1884.

(201) "About March, 1875, the circumstances hereafter detailed happened to me at Gibraltar. I wrote an account of them from memory in 1878. It was published in *All the Year Round*, of August, I think, that

¹ The psychological identity of hallucinations and dreams—alike in subjective and in telepathic cases—is a point which I am the more anxious to enforce in that there seems sometimes to be a difficulty in catching it. For example, a leading daily paper contrasts members of the Society for Psychical Research with the sensible people "who believe that all those apparitions and stories of second-sight which engage the curiosity of that Society may be relegated to the limbo of waking dreams." With the substitution of "class" for "limbo," this "relegation" is precisely what the present argument seeks to effect.

year, but I have not since seen it, so I can only give the story as far as I remember it now.

"I was lying down in my drawing-room on a bright sunshiny afternoon, reading a chapter on Chalk Streams in 'Kingsley's Miscellanies,' when I suddenly felt that some one was waiting to speak to me. I looked up from my book and saw a man standing beside an arm-chair, which was about 6 feet from me. He was looking most intently at me, with an extraordinary earnest expression in his eyes, but as I walked forward to speak to him he disappeared.¹

"The room was about 18 feet long, and at the further end of it I saw our servant [Pearson], holding open the door as if he had admitted a visitor. Thinking that perhaps he too was but a delusion, I spoke to him, asking if anyone had called. To which he replied, 'No one, ma'am,' and walked away. I then tested myself as to whether I had been sleeping, seeing that it was 10 minutes since I lay down. I said to myself what I thought I had read, began my chapter again, and in 10 minutes had reached the same point.

"I then thought it over again. I knew the face quite well, but could not say whose it was, but the suit of clothes impressed me strongly as being exactly like one which my husband had given to a servant named Ramsay the previous year. This man was a discharged soldier whom I had found in a dying state in Inverness, and who had been taken into our service after leaving the infirmary. He turned out badly and I had to send him away before we went to Gibraltar [in February, 1875], but he was taken on as waiter at the Inverness Club, and I had no cause to be anxious about him, as I thought he was well and doing well, and would probably profit by his past experience and keep that situation.

"I told my husband when he came in what I had seen, and also told his colonel's wife (now Lady Laffan), but did not put down the date. But almost as soon, I believe, as a letter could have come from Inverness, my husband received one from his late sergeant, to say that Ramsay was dead, but giving no particulars. To this my husband wrote that he was sorry, and would like to hear 'any particulars of his illness and death.' This was the answer: 'Ramsay died in hospital, raving, and calling incessantly for Mrs. Bolland.'

"I will only add that I believe the face of the man I saw was that of Ramsay as I had known him at first, when I visited him as a dying man in the infirmary. But seeing him every day as my servant, and in health, it had passed from my mind, or rather did not connect itself with this man in my memory.

"I may add that I had been in ill-health for some years, but at that time was stronger than I ever was in my life, the warm climate suiting me—so well that I felt a strength and enjoyment of life for its own sake, which was a delight to me.

"KATE E. BOLLAND."

In reply to inquiries, Mrs. Bolland adds, "This is the only instance in which I have ever experienced a hallucination of the sense of sight."

The following corroboration is from Lieut.-Colonel Bolland, R.E.:—

"July 20th, 1884.

"With regard to the apparition at Gibraltar, Mrs. Bolland mentioned it to me an hour or two after she saw it, which would be about 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. She said she knew the face, but she could not say whose it was, but distinctly recognised the clothes worn as being like a suit I had given to Ramsay when in Inverness.

¹ See p. 427, second footnote.

"The news of his death was a shock, coming shortly afterwards; and I wrote to my late sergeant on the Ordnance Survey at Inverness (Sergeant Dedman, R.E.) for particulars, with the result which Mrs. Bolland has told you.

"G. HERBERT BOLLAND."

We learn from Mr. J. Wilson Black, house-surgeon at the Northern Infirmary, Inverness, who has kindly referred to the books, that Archibald Ramsay was admitted to that institution on Feb. 24, 1875, suffering from tumour of the brain, and died on March 9. Mr. Black adds: "None of the officials at present in the house were in it at the time; and I am consequently unable to say at what hour he died." Mrs. Bolland has kindly endeavoured to find out, from the Library at Gibraltar, on what day she took out the book that she was reading; but without success.

We find that the above account completely agrees with the fuller one in *All the Year Round*. That account, however, contains a more complete explanation of the non-recognition of the face. As regards the momentary mistaking of the man for a visitor, these words occur: "I will only remind you that, as far as appearances went, the man was a gentleman. He had gentle birth on one side, was always refined in his manners, and, moreover, was dressed in a suit of clothes of which no gentleman need have been ashamed." The paper ends with the following additional incident:—

"There is one odd fact as a pendant to this little story. The man Pearson, whom we had just brought all the way from the Ultima Thule of the ancients, at great expense, gave warning that day, because, he said, 'the house was haunted.' He gave no explanation, and I said nothing, as the reason of his sudden wish to leave only reached me through my maid. You will remember that he stood at the door, having apparently shown in my mysterious visitor. Had his notice to quit come a day later, I should have said he heard other servants speaking of the circumstance in houses where I had mentioned it. But he gave it that day and before I had spoken of it at all. Nor have I heard up to this moment what he meant. Puzzled but not alarmed myself, I would not risk frightening my household, so when my maid told me what he had said, I only replied, 'Nonsense!' and that was the end of it. He left us, and the news of Ramsay's death came after he had gone, or I think I should have felt inclined then to question him."

The narrator in the following case, Miss S., fears that publication of her name might be disadvantageous to her.

"March 11th, 1884.

(202) "In August, 1881, I had been ordered by my doctor to take absolute rest, not even to read at all, and to do no work whatever. I therefore took lodgings in a cottage near London for a few weeks. During the last 6 or 7 years, I had been rather intimate with a lady (Mrs. A.), whose daughter I had instructed during that period. This lady had gone to the seaside with her family during the summer holidays, but had sent me a message, before she left town, that the suddenness of her departure had prevented her from coming to see me, but that she would certainly do so on her return. In the meantime I had heard, through mutual friends, that she and her family were in good health, and would probably return about the middle of September.

"About 3 weeks after Mrs. A.'s departure, I was expecting a friend to come and see me, and had ordered a carriage, to take her a drive. The morning proved wet, and she did not come, and after waiting some time, I

went out alone, in an open landau, at about 3.30 or perhaps as late as 4 p.m. I had not left the house more than 20 minutes, when, in an open lane, I saw coming towards me Mrs. A. with one of her younger children. She was sitting in her own victoria, which I knew well. As she sat I saw only the three-quarter face; but I recognised the bonnet, and also the sealskin jacket, which she was wearing, as one that she generally wore in winter. I remember them particularly, because it struck me, as the carriage approached, that it was very odd of her to be wearing a sealskin jacket in August. Just as the carriage came up to me, and was passing me, so near that if I had put out my arm I could have touched it, I sat up, and called out, 'Oh, Mrs. A.' She did not move or turn her form towards me, but seemed to be half-turned towards the child, who sat on the further side of me. I was very much astonished at this, and then I turned round to look after the victoria, and, as far as my recollection serves me, I saw it slowly drive away. I am perfectly sure that I could not have been mistaken; I was never more certain of anything in my life than that I had actually seen my friend and her little child.

"For the next 10 minutes or so, I was puzzling to think what could have brought her back to London, and was very vexed with myself for not having at once told the coachman to turn and drive after the carriage. I did, however, as soon as I could collect my senses, tell him to drive home as quickly as possible; and as soon as I reached the cottage I said to my landlady, 'There is a lady and a little girl waiting for me upstairs, I suppose?' When she assured me that there was not, I at once sent the servant over to my sister's house, about 10 minutes' walk off, to see if Mrs. A. had perhaps gone there. When the servant came back with no tidings of her, I was very much astonished, and couldn't help wondering over it for the rest of the evening.

"Two or three days afterwards, I asked the landlady to get me a daily paper, feeling a longing to read *something*; and, at my landlady's urgent entreaty not to tire myself, I said that I would only look at the births, deaths and marriages. There I saw the announcement of the death of Mrs. A. at the seaside, on the very day when, as I thought, I had passed her in her carriage, near London.

"I afterwards learned from her relations that she had died after a very short illness, at 6 p.m. on that day, and that she had lain in a state of unconsciousness for some hours before her death. It could not have been much less than two hours before her death—that is during the time when she lay unconscious—that I saw her.

"E. L. S."

We find the announcement of the death in three London daily papers for August 30th, 1881.

In conversation, Miss S. stated that she had never been the subject of any hallucination. She is short-sighted, but wears suitable glasses, and was wearing them on this occasion. No corroborative testimony can be obtained. The landlady was very old, and very unlikely, even if now alive, to remember so trifling an incident as Miss S.'s question about the supposed callers; and Miss S.'s sister was absent from home when the inquiry was made at her house.

This might conceivably have been a case of mistaken identity. But it would have been an extraordinary one; and the sealskin jacket in August would have been as odd a costume for any real person as Miss S. conceived it to be for her friend. It is worth mentioning that visions of horses and carriages are a known species of purely subjective hallucina-

tion ;¹ and it is therefore not as strange as it might appear that a telepathic hallucination should assume this elaborate form. But more important is the appearance of a second human figure—that of the dying friend's child. I have already (p. 266) pointed to a similar feature in one of the "borderland" cases as an indication that telepathic percepts, in their sensory character, are really projections from within. I may now point out, as a fresh instance of parallelism between telepathic and casual subjective phantasms, the extreme *rarity* of the cases in which a second figure thus appears. In my large collection of subjective hallucinations of vision—putting out of the question the peculiar *illusions hypnagogiques* (pp. 299–300)—I find only seven cases, that is, less than 3 per cent, presenting more than one human figure;² three of which occurred to percipients who were in bed, while in two others the percipients were extremely young. And among the telepathic examples in this book, I find almost exactly the same proportion.

As further illustrating the construction of the phantasm from material which the percipient's mind supplies, I may mention a point in case 184. On the day when little Isidore left Paris for London, his hair was cut very short; and the long "fringe," which was removed, could not (the narrator says) have grown to its customary length in the month which followed before the death.³ But, as he adds, "In my memory his image still preserved the usual features, with the fringe over his forehead; and on the morning when the vision awoke me, I saw him with the fringe over his forehead."⁴ In another "borderland" case, No. 495, where the phan-

¹ Cf. Dr. C. M. Smith's case, p. 322, note. Occasionally a subjective experience takes a still more elaborate form. Thus an informant who at one time had a slight tendency to visual hallucination, describes seeing, when quite awake, the details of a complete funeral procession.

² See again Dr. Smith's case, p. 322, note, and Mrs. Hunter's case described in § 4, above. Other telepathic instances are Nos. 168 and 195; besides the cases in which a complete scene with several figures has been represented, as No. 299. In case 185 there was the sense of a second person's presence, but the hallucination was of one figure only.

³ Mr. Keulemans' statement that his little boy's fringe *could not* have grown to its usual length in a month might be questioned. But on my pointing this out to him, he explained that (being struck by the fact that the hair, as he saw it in his vision, was just as he had been accustomed to see it) he had expressly asked his mother-in-law what was the state of the child's hair at the time of his death; and she had said that he "had very little hair—that it grew straight upright, and that he had no fringe when he died." Mr. Keulemans has no difficulty in accepting this description, as he has recently made experiments with two of his children, aged four and six, with a result that entirely accords with it. The rate at which hair grows seems to differ greatly in different people.

⁴ It may be remembered that Mr. Keulemans had in the evening a *second* vision of his child, which was treated above as a mere recrudescence of the morning's hallucination. Mr. Keulemans himself, however, is inclined to explain it otherwise. His grounds are that this second vision, which took place in the bright gaslight of the billiard-room, represented the boy's figure, in an attitude suggestive of death, enclosed as it were in a dark cellar or vault, with a little window in it; and he afterwards found that at that hour the dead body had been taken to a mortuary, which he afterwards saw, and which vividly recalled the visionary scene. (I attach more importance to these details than I should otherwise do, on account of the care which Mr. Keulemans has brought to bear on the study of his own visual impressions, and of his training in habits of accurate observation.) He suggests that this *second* vision was due to a telepathic impulse from his wife's mother, who had the body

tasm of a dying female relative appeared, the dress—" outdoor walking costume, the bonnet being a prominent part of it"—was that in which the percipient had last seen her, nine years previously; in a waking case, No. 555, where the phantasm represented the percipient's mother, " the attire was the same in which I had last seen her several years before "; and in another waking case, No. 645, the phantasm appeared in a dress which the agent had not worn or seen for nine months, but which she had been wearing during the weeks when the percipient had last been in her company. [The three cases last referred to were in the Supplement, and are not in the present edition.—ED.]

§ 7. The examination of these precise points may lead us on to more general ground. If we admit a power in the percipient to evolve a waking dream from the nucleus of a " transferred impression," we at once get rid of what has been a very real obstacle to the recognition of the telepathic evidence. Phantasms having often been conceived as in some way objective and independent presences, it has seemed to the sceptic that all idea of reality about them was sufficiently refuted, if they possessed features which were a clear reflection of the percipient's beliefs and ideas. Students of folklore and of comparative thaumatology have observed that such phenomena, in various times and countries, have borne a perceptible relation to prevalent habits and opinions; and if specimens which have coincided with, and so seemed to announce and typify, unusual events, have borne a similar relation, it has been easy to argue for their purely subjective character from this *subordinate* point, and to ignore the *essential* point—the fact of the coincidence. This wrong issue is precluded as soon as the analogy of dream is boldly insisted on, and the phenomena are described as hallucinations, not presences, and as veridical, not objective. Any presumption against them, as sentimental, or superstitious, or fantastic, then loses its basis. The naked fact of coincidence can no more be sentimental or superstitious than stoical or sceptical; but subjective colourings may attach to waking hallucinations as easily as to dreams; and it cannot seem surprising that the same mental habits and traditions which give a particular character to so many of the hallucinations which are illusory through and through—hallucinations and nothing more—should give a similar character to some of the hallucinations which are not illusory through and through, but are projected under the stimulus of a true impression from the mind of some absent person. The same cast of ideas through the dominance of which a *dévôte* may receive a false impression that she has met the Virgin in a wood, may very naturally lead her, or one like her, on the receipt of a true impression that some beloved relative is dying, to body forth the figure as robed in white and with a radiant face; and much more *bizarre* apparitions than this might; on the same principle, be accepted as having a causal connection with a real

conveyed to the mortuary and whose thoughts were naturally directed to him. Now on this view of the " agency " the experience none the less involves an *independent* contribution on the part of the percipient. For he saw the child's figure, though as if dead, in his little blue sailor suit; which was familiar to him, but which we can hardly conceive to have been present, in association with the ideas of death and burial, in his mother-in-law's mind.

event.¹ The opportunity for observing such phenomena in telepathic cases is, no doubt, limited by the fact that cases of any evidential weight are almost confined to quite modern days, and for the present to the more advanced nations; but it is possible that as interest in the subject increases, a wider area will be covered. Meanwhile we have quite enough cases to illustrate the point.

As examples of phantasmal appearances presenting features which would in reality be impossible, the following three accounts may serve. [The first two, 203 and 204, are omitted.] The next case is from the *Memoirs of Georgiana, Lady Chatterton* (1878), by E. H. Dering, the second husband of Lady Chatterton, pp. 185-6. The author says:—

(205) "In March, 1869, while we were at Malvern Wells, an event occurred, which the reader will, of course, take for what he thinks it is worth but which I cannot see my way to explain as a coincidence.² She (*i.e.*, Lady Chatterton) had a great regard for Father Hewitt, O.S.B.; and he had always shown a very marked sympathy for her in her difficulties. One afternoon she said, 'I am sure that dear Father Hewitt is dead. I saw him just now, when I went upstairs, as clearly as possible, dressed in the Benedictine habit, only it was of dazzling whiteness. He seemed high above me in the air,³ and he looked at me. I knew then that he was dead.' It was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The next morning's post brought us the news that he died at the time when she saw him."

In reference to this incident, Lady Chatterton's niece, Mrs. Ferrers, of Baddesley Clinton, Knowle, writes to us as follows:—

"March 24th, 1885.

"I was with her at Malvern Wells at the time, in some lodgings that we hired for a few weeks; and Father Hewitt was then at Woolton, a village in Warwickshire, my aunt and Mr. Dering renting Woolton Hall that year. I cannot give you the exact date, but I remember that it was one day in Easter week of that year (1869). I was in the drawing-room of those lodgings after luncheon, about a quarter past 2 o'clock, when my aunt came downstairs from her bedroom and told me that she was quite sure Father Hewitt was dead, for she had seen him, &c. We all knew that he was ill of one of his usual severe attacks of gall-stones, but that complaint is not considered a fatal one, and so we were full of hopes that we should find him better on our return home. He was one of the best and dearest of our friends, and his death, corroborated the next morning by hearing his name given out at Mass,⁴ to be prayed for among the dead, was a heavy blow to us all. We afterwards heard that he had died at 2 o'clock on the day my aunt saw him.

"REBECCA H. FERRERS."

¹ See for instance, the narrative of the apparition of the Gwrach y Rhifyn, in Sikes's *British Goblins*, p. 217, which was related to the author at first-hand, in 1878. This extraordinary phantasm, a dreaded local celebrity, seems on the occasion described to have supplied the embodiment for a real telepathic impression. See also a case in W. Henderson's *Folk-lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders*, p. 29.

² This word is often, but very unfortunately, used as equivalent to *chance-coincidence*.

³ Another example of a figure seen above the percipient is No. 352.

⁴ In this detail there is an apparent, though perhaps not a real, discrepancy from Mr. Dering's account.

[We learn from the Provincial of Canterbury, the Rev. H. E. Moore, that the date of the Rev. Peter Joseph Hewitt's death was March 11th, 1869. Easter Sunday in that year fell on March 28th; Mrs. Ferrers is therefore mistaken in supposing the occurrence to have taken place in Easter week; but this is not material. The coincidence was probably exact to a quarter of an hour.]

The luminous appearance of the figure here should be specially remarked. For luminosity is a sufficiently frequent feature both in purely subjective and in telepathic hallucinations, to be included as a fresh point of resemblance between the two classes. It is possibly to definite hallucinations of this character that we should trace the widely diffused superstition which finds in a mysterious light the sign of a supernatural presence; ¹ but considering how natural the symbolism of light is in connection with supernatural ideas, such a hypothesis is perhaps superfluous. It is at any rate not possible to reverse the process, and to trace the hallucinations to the superstition; for they go on occurring in the present day, as my collection alone would show, to persons who have no previous acquaintance with or belief in the superstition. The light occurs in various forms and degrees. One form is the impression of a dark room as illuminated, which is sometimes experienced on waking. In the group of non-human phantasms described above, we found a star, a firework, a firefly, a bright oval, a chandelier (pp. 324-5 and see also p. 481). Among the subjective human phantasms, seven appeared with a candle in the hand. In a considerable number of the nocturnal cases, though no special radiance is mentioned, the aspect of the figure seems to have been far more distinct and detailed than that of a real person would have been²—e.g., the grotesque appearance mentioned in p. 261, note, which was remarkable for brilliance of costume, "disappeared, leaving the room in darkness"; and in other cases the figure has disappeared as radiant.³

The position in which the phantasm was projected in the last case quoted may have been the result of some dim idea of departure or transposition. In other cases there is the distinct symbolism of death. The following is an example. The percipient, Lieutenant-Colonel Jones, of 8, Sussex Place, N.W., is a man as free from superstition as can well be imagined, who has never experienced any other hallucination whatever. He has shown us a letter, written at the time, in which his father alludes to the apparition.

"1883.

(206) "In 1845 I was stationed with my regiment at Moulmein, in Burmah. In those days there was no direct mail, and we were dependent

¹ See Mr. Andrew Lang's remarks in the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1885, p. 629. The following passage occurs in Rink's *Tales and Traditions of the Eskimo* (1875), p. 43: "The Supernatural Rulers, or Inue, as far as they may be perceived by the natural senses, generally have the appearance of a fire or bright light; and to see them is in every case very dangerous, partly by causing *tantamingnek*—viz., frightening to death—partly as foreshadowing the death of a relative (*násárnek*)."
Superstitions of this sort are likely enough to produce the very experiences on which they feed; but the hallucinations of light described in the present work are certainly not suggestive of anything like *tantamingnek*.

² See p. 290, note.

³ As telepathic cases which present the same points, I may refer to Nos. 184, 213, 220, 311, 314, 323, 332, 702. Luminosity is also a marked feature of some of the dream-cases.

upon the arrival of sailing vessels for our letters, which sometimes arrived in batches, and occasionally we were months without any news from home.

"On the evening of the 24th of March, 1845, I was, with others, dining at a friend's house, and when sitting in the verandah after dinner, with the other guests, in the middle of a conversation on some local affairs, I all at once *distinctly* saw before me the form of an open coffin, with a favourite sister of mine, then at home, lying in it apparently dead. I naturally ceased talking, and everyone looked at me in astonishment, and asked what was the matter. I mentioned, in a laughing manner, what I had seen, and it was looked upon as a joke. I walked home later with an officer very much my senior (the late Major-General George Briggs, retired, Madras Artillery, then Captain Briggs), who renewed the subject, and asked whether I had received any news as to my sister's illness. I said no, and that my last letters from home were dated some three months prior. He asked me to make a note of the circumstance, as he had before heard of such occurrences. I did so, and showed him the entry I made opposite the day of the month in an almanack. On the 17th of May following, I received a letter from home announcing my sister's death as having taken place on that very day—viz., the 24th of March, 1845.

"R. WALLER JONES."

As to the coincidence of hour, Colonel Jones only learnt that the death occurred in the morning of the 24th. His vision was seen after an early dinner, so that, allowing for longitude, the correspondence of time was certainly near, and may have been exact. There had been a very close attachment between sister and brother.

We may regard the next two cases—one visual and one auditory—as exemplifying the religious investiture of a telepathic impression. The first, in which the accuracy of the description "waking dream" is specially well shown, is from Mrs. Larcombe, of 8, Runton Street, Hornsey Rise, N., a sensible and superior person who has seen a good deal of the world. She has had no other hallucination, unless an unexplained appearance seen by her in early childhood, and by others as well as herself, was of that character.

"July 17th, 1882.

(207) "When I was about 18 or 19, I went to stay in Guernsey. This would be about 30 years ago. About 10 a.m., one day, I was sitting in the kitchen, blowing up the fire with the bellows. I heard some very beautiful music, and stopped to listen, at the same time looking up. I saw above me thousands of angels, as tight as they could be packed, seeming to rise far above and beyond me. They were only visible as far as the head and shoulders. In front of them all I saw my friend, Anne Cox. As I looked and listened, the music seemed to die away in the distance, and at the same time, the angels seemed to pass away into the distance, and vanish like smoke.

"I ran up to Miss White, the young lady staying in the house, and told her what I had seen. She said, 'You may be sure your friend, Anne Cox, has gone to Heaven.' I wrote home at once, to Lyme Regis, and found that Anne Cox had died that very day.

"Anne Cox and I had been very close friends. She was just my own age, and was almost like a sister to me.

"M. A. LARCOMBE."

Mrs. Larcombe states positively that she was in no anxiety about her friend, and had no knowledge of her illness. She cannot recall where the

death occurred, and it has therefore been impossible to discover its exact date.

The next case is from Mrs. Udny, of 61, Westbourne Park Villas, W.

" July, 1883.

(208) " This family story fell within my own recollection, and I can vouch for the accuracy of the facts. The dates put it beyond any question of being imagined *after* the circumstances had occurred.

" In January, 1850, my husband (George Udny, of the Bengal Civil Service) was in Calcutta, and I was living in London. His sister Emily (Mrs. Ryan) was living near me in London, and her husband, Edmund Ryan, was in Calcutta.

" On the 20th February, 1850, I received a letter from my husband, saying poor Edmund was very ill. Owing to some political news of importance my letter of the 9th had come with a Government dispatch a day later than the ordinary mail of the 8th, the regular mail-day.

" Soon after receiving my letter, on the same day, my sister-in-law, Emily Ryan, came to me in great anxiety to know if I had any later news of her husband than the 9th, as she also had heard he was very ill. I explained to her how impossible it was that there should be any *later* news, as the 9th itself was later than I had ever known the mail leave before. She then explained the reason for her extreme anxiety for news to the 10th January, and told me the following curious circumstance :—

" On the 10th January, she had been engaged in her devotions between 11 a.m. and noon, according to her custom ; for she was in the habit of rising late, and did not make her appearance in the family circle till the middle of the day. While thus engaged on her knees, and making her husband the special subject of her prayers, she thought some one spoke quite distinctly close to her ear, ' Pray not for him, he is in Eternity. Be still and know that I am God.'

" She was so much astonished, she thought some one must have come into the room unperceived by her, and rose from her knees and looked around her, but could see no one. She was, however, so much impressed by the circumstance that she wrote it down at once, with the date of day and hour, and sealing up the paper, carried it downstairs and gave it to the care of a young niece living in the house (Tempè Raikes), telling her to keep the seal unbroken till she asked for it.

" On the morning she came to me, 20th February, hearing of her husband's serious illness on the 8th January, she had asked for her sealed note and had broken the seal and read in the presence of her mother and aunt the above circumstance, and finding the date, which she had forgotten, only two days later than her news from Calcutta, came off to me to inquire for later news, but only heard my letter of the 9th.

" She had, therefore, to await the arrival of another mail—a fortnight after—when the letters of the 23rd January, arriving on the 8th March, told her that her poor husband had died on the 10th January, between 5 and 6 p.m.—the exact time, allowing for the difference of longitude, that she had been forbidden to pray for him in London.

" A. L. UDNY."

We find from notices in the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *Annual Register* that Mr. E. B. Ryan died at Calcutta, on Jan. 10, 1850.

Mrs. Udny showed Mr. Podmore the notes (committed to paper on April 27, 1861, in order to preserve the memory of the occurrence) from

which this account was taken. Mrs. Ryan, now Mrs. Hermon, cannot be questioned on the subject.

In a second letter, Mrs. Udney adds :—

“ I have just received the enclosed from my niece—the Tempè Raikes of my family story. I think you will find it very satisfactory as to the main facts of the story. I think you will find my dates are more accurate than my niece’s ; she has got a little confused as to the hours—perhaps not allowing for the difference of longitude. I distinctly remember Mrs. Ryan’s telling me that she was praying between 11 and 12 a.m., and I think I mentioned in my mem. to you that her husband died about 5 o’clock p.m., because my husband wrote that to me from Calcutta. And the singular thing which struck me at the time was that the difference would be exactly that of the longitude.”

The enclosure was as follows :—

“ 25, Victoria Square, Clifton.

“ September 16th, 1883.

“ About the story of Aunt Hermon [formerly Ryan], the facts, as far as I can recollect, are that she wrote out what had happened one morning at her private prayers, and gave me the sealed letter about it, and said in a few weeks she would either ask me for it to burn it, or to read it out. Six weeks after, when she heard of Uncle Ryan’s death, she asked for it and gave it to her mother ; and in it she had written that, while praying for her husband (from whom she had heard nothing for 6 months), a voice came to her ears, ‘ He is in Eternity.’ She went on, thinking it a silly fancy, and again it said, ‘ It is too late, he is in Eternity.’ She was so convinced of its truth she left off, and was sure she would hear something had happened. He had died that very morning at 4 o’clock, for she had dated her letter, and, moreover, she was quite prepared when his death was announced to her. The overland mail in those days took six weeks coming.

“ TEMPÈ S. BRIGHT (*née* Raikes).”

§ 8. To return, however, to the details of the phantasmal appearance—the theory which I have advanced as to the projection of the percept has received illustration in cases where all its features could be, and in my view have been, supplied by the percipient’s mind. But it must now be added that there is a converse type, where the dress or aspect includes features which equally clearly could *not* be supplied by the percipient’s mind ; and here the former explanation will, of course, not apply. In cases of this type, the actual aspect of the agent, at the time of the occurrence, has included some marked variation from anything that the percipient would naturally picture. If, then, the phantasmal appearance includes this same feature, it must be an element that the *impressing* mind has contributed, and not the *impressed* ; in other words, we must here admit that a ready-made concrete image, and not a mere idea, has been transferred from one to the other. There is no reason to doubt that such an image occupies a certain place in the agent’s mind ; and when a peculiarity of aspect is temporary and accidental, it is sometimes a very prominent part of consciousness. Even when the peculiarity (as it appears to the percipient) is one to which the agent himself has become accustomed—as a change in the growth

or colour of the hair—the fact remains that a certain sense of one's own aspect probably always exists at the background of consciousness. This it is which sometimes, at the season when latent ideas are apt to assume arbitrary prominence, creates for the scantily clad dreamer such embarrassing situations; this it is which, in rare but well-attested cases, projects the apparition (purely hallucinatory, as I should hold) of a person's own self or "double";¹ and I may again recall the experimental indications that even ideas which cannot be recognised as part of consciousness at all may be susceptible of telepathic transference (pp. 63, 67–8). I do not indeed pretend that the analogy here can give entire satisfaction; or that the translation of a vague subconscious image in one mind into a sharply defined, and at the same time a perfectly correct, percept in another, is a fact for which the rest of our evidence, whether of experimental or of spontaneous transferences, would have ever prepared us. All that I would claim is that it is a fact which the conception of psychical transferences is not inadequate to embrace. Another conception no doubt there is—that of some *independent* exercise of the percipient's own faculties—which suggests itself in respect of this type of experience, as before in the cases where the percipient's point of observation seemed transferred to a distant scene (pp. 188–9, 231–2, 242–3). But in the absence of more distinct contemporary evidence for such exercise, I think that we should avoid even provisionally resorting to a theory which introduces problems as formidable as any that it can be employed to explain. And in the present cases, as in the former ones, since nothing is perceived that is definitely outside the agent's range of knowledge, the extension of the percipient's faculties—his *clairvoyance*, if we like to call it so—may still be perfectly well regarded as a *telepathic* extension, an abnormally increased power of receiving impressions from another mind, or rather a power of receiving impressions from the more withdrawn strata of another mind, under conditions of crisis or excitement.

To come now to the evidence—as to which one preliminary remark is needed. Some of the cases to be quoted are, I think, clearly of the type described; others are also instances of it, if quite correctly recorded. But we must remember that a narrative which is completely correct as to the central facts which go to prove the telepathic origin of the phan-

¹ These experiences seem to be of two sorts. Sometimes the percipient's impression is that his own point of observation has been transferred to a point outside his body, whence he sees his body in the place where it really is. An instance is given in p. 425, note; and my collection of hallucinations includes two other cases of the kind, in one of which the "subject" was under chloroform, and in the other was recovering from fever. Another correspondent has had impressions of the same sort, which seem to have stopped short of actual hallucination. He writes: "I have occasionally felt as though I knew that the body was lying in the bed, but that the spirit was hovering about it, and contemplating it. When this is the case I am apt to feel some difficulty in waking, and even feel a little unwell through the following morning." With these experiences should be compared the less marked cases where the impression is simply of "going out of oneself"—a well-known feature of various abnormal conditions; see for instance case 215, below; and Cardan, *De Varietate Rerum* (Basle, 1557), p. 314. But in another class of cases the percipient retains his normal point of observation, and simply sees a phantasm representing himself at a place which is really vacant. An instance of this is case 333 (p. 494); and I have another chloroform case in which the patient, a medical man, seemed to see his own "double" contemplating him.

tasm, may yet be inexact in the particulars which now become important. A *striking coincidence* is rather apt to suggest to the imagination a *detailed correspondence*; and the percipient, in looking back to his experience after hearing of certain features which belonged to the aspect of his dying friend, may come to imagine that they were represented in the phantasm. Every example, therefore, must be weighed with this possibility in view.

A genuine instance of the type, I believe, was the one already quoted (No. 194) where the *grey* hair was a detail of appearance which Miss R. had never imagined, and was very unlikely to conjure up. [Three cases of this type, 210, 211, 212, are here omitted.] The next case is from Mr. John Hernaman, F.S.A., Head Master of the Lambeth Boys' School, Hercules Buildings, London, S.E. He tells us that this account (which we received in 1884) was written within two years of the occurrence; and that he has had no other experience of hallucination.

(213) "When I lived in Bishopsgate, my rooms were at Salvador House. It was a grand old house. Formerly the home of a Spanish Ambassador, it had undergone strange vicissitudes. . . . My apartments consisted of a suite of five rooms, which I occupied with my housekeeper, a middle-aged woman, and her son, a youth of 18, who waited on me. I gave up three of the suite for their use, reserving only two very large rooms, which communicated with each other, for my own.

"Well, one night as I lay asleep, I all at once woke to perfect consciousness, as wide awake as I am now; and there, in the embrasure made by the thickness of the wall, stood a little old woman in her night-dress and cap, with a small black-and-white checked shawl, as far as I could make out, like a duster-pattern, over her shoulders. I want you particularly to remember the shawl. I knew her well, and, as I lay, remarked to myself on the beauty and transparency of her complexion, while a soft lambent light seemed to play over the whole figure, such as you would see on your fingers when you rub a match, or the liquid gleaming phosphorescence one sometimes finds ridging the wavelets at sea. On noting this, the work of an instant, an intense and indescribable feeling took possession of me, beginning somewhere in the region of the feet, and, passing up my spine,¹ reached my head, where 'each particular hair did stand on end.' Vexed and annoyed with myself, I turned away from the sight, as the chime of St. Botolph's struck the quarter to 2. When the sounds had died, and after the clock had struck the hour, I fell asleep again, and rested undisturbed till morning.

"On going downstairs, I met one of our clergy, the Rev. George Wrench, the greatest friend I had in Bishopsgate [since deceased], and said, 'Laugh at me! Here am I, a man supposed to be educated, of average intelligence, at least, living in the very centre of the centre of civilisation, an utter disbeliever in ghosts, and yet last night I saw one.' 'Nonsense!' said he. "'Tis true!' I repeated. 'Well, come, who was it?' 'Mrs. P.,' I answered. 'You don't say so! Do you know she is very ill?' 'Not I.' 'But she is though,' rejoined he, and we chaffed each other about the strange visitant.

"Well, all that day I went about my work and never gave my ghost a thought, retired to bed as usual, slept well and woke exactly at the same time as on the night previous. This I know by the jingle of the chimes

¹ See footnote to case 28, p. 153.

immediately after waking, and the clock striking the succeeding hour of 2. The same intense, indescribable feeling passed over me—that horrid, creepy dread, but I resolutely turned from the side on which the embrasure lay, and reproached myself for being a fool. Nor would I look, and yet I felt assured of her presence.

“When I got up, I found that she had sent a message, wishing to see me. She was the attendant on the pews at my side of the church, a poor widow woman of quiet, gentle manners, a friend of my housekeeper’s, who sometimes came in to help if we had any extra company. Often when I have gone round to the kitchen, she has risen up respectfully, while I used to say, ‘How much you remind me of my dear old mother,’ and have more than once caressingly stroked her hair. I went to see her. There she lay in her little bed—so clean and tidy—so peaceably passing away in a trance-like calm. She at once recognised my voice, when a pleased smile of restful satisfaction seemed to play over her face. [Mr. Hernaman then read a passage of the Bible to the patient.] As I was leaving the room, on turning to look at her, I noticed how striking were the points of resemblance to the figure in the embrasure, but it was incomplete—the shawl was wanting. So I said to her sister who was nursing her, ‘Have you ever during her illness had thrown about her a little black-and-white checked shawl?’ I gave no reason for my question. ‘No, sir!’ was the answer, ‘No! We haven’t such a thing in the house!’ Then suddenly she exclaimed, ‘Oh! do you mean a little brown-and-white plaid, like this?’ making a sudden dive behind a box near the bed’s head, from which she brought up the identical shawl, a *brown-and-white checked*, which she at once placed round the shoulders of the invalid, and the picture was complete.

[Next night, a friend of Mr. Hernaman’s, Mr. James F. Maule, now residing at 61, Rouel Road, Bermondsey, spent the night with him.]

“My rest was sound and undisturbed till the morning, when George, my housekeeper’s son, came rushing into the bedroom, after a hasty knock, with a face full of fright, and said, ‘If you please, sir, Mrs. P. wants you again!’ While I dressed, my friend laughed at me and joked immoderately. George brought me in a cup of coffee, which I hastily swallowed while dressing; but before I could get to her house, which was hard by, she had passed away.

“All I have said with regard to myself is true as it occurred to me and yet my judgment refuses to believe it. I consulted a medical friend, I was so annoyed with myself for thinking the thing possible for a moment. He too laughed at me, but wished George to occupy the spare bed till my holidays came, which were close at hand.

“I did learn some months later that she had saved a little money—not much, about £90 I believe—and was very anxious indeed that I should have charge of it for her two children, who were living at home with her.

“JOHN HERNAMAN.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hernaman adds, on March 7th, 1885:—

“The matter to which you refer occurred some 14 years ago.”

We applied to Mr. Francis Tee, of Finsbury Street, E.C., a brother of the Mrs. P. of the narrative, and he sent us a mourning card which showed that Mrs. P. died on Dec. 14th, 1871, aged 53 years.

Mr. Maule, writing to us on Dec. 19, 1886, says that he well recollects the incident, and “never saw anyone in such a state of mind as Mr. Hernaman was about the affair.”

Here the shawl is the important detail. Other noteworthy points are the light (p. 359), and the sort of attempt at a repetition on the second night, which may or may not have been a mere recrudescence of the previous impression (see p. 278).

[Omitting case 214,] the next case, from Mr. Rouse, of Jarvis Road, Croydon (agent for Cockerells, coal merchants), is another marked instance of deferred recognition (see § 3). As regards the special point of dress, it is inconclusive; as though the aspect of the agent was at the time actually as represented in the phantasm, it was also probably an aspect familiar to the percipient. Writing to us on the 11th of June, 1883, Mr. Rouse explains that in the early part of 1873 he had been a member of a circle which met to investigate spiritualistic phenomena. At each of the séances, which were held in a private house, he sat next to the same lady, Mrs. W., between whom and himself a strong sympathy existed. On one occasion Mr. Rouse had to go to Norwich on the day when the sitting was usually held. Late on the evening of that day he went out for a walk in the outskirts of the town.

(215) "It was in the brightest moonlight, about full moon, I should think, with hardly a cloud in the sky; yet there was a thick white haze overhanging the fields. After walking a little distance I found myself on the top of a small hill, which enabled me to see a considerable distance along the road in front of me, the only living object apparently in view being a human form in the middle of the road, yet so far off that I could not tell if it was a woman or a man, and did not take much notice of it. However, in walking on, I soon made it out to be a woman, and concluded it was a country woman walking into Norwich. The next moment I began to fear that, the time and place being so lonely, the woman would be afraid to pass me. I, therefore, under this feeling, got as near as possible to one side of the road, thus giving her all the width on the other side to pass; but, to my astonishment, she also left the middle of the road, and took the same side as myself, as if determined to meet me face to face. I then walked into the middle of the road, thinking I would avoid her, but to my surprise, the woman did the same, so I then concluded to walk on as we were.

"I had not advanced many more steps, however, before instead of a country woman, as I imagined, with eggs and poultry for next day's market, I could plainly see that the figure before me was a well-dressed lady in evening dress, without bonnet or shawl. I could see some ornament or flower in her hair, gold bracelets on her bare arms, rings on her fingers, and could hear the rustle of her dress. She now seemed to approach me more rapidly, and I noticed that, if I stepped in the least degree out of the direct line between us, she did the same.¹ In the next minute I felt certain that I had seen the lady before, and immediately afterwards I recognised her as Mrs. W. I had not the least fear, for she was so real that I thought she had, like myself, unexpectedly and suddenly got to Norwich. I therefore met her without the least shake or tremble, delighted to see my friend. We approached within about 5 feet of each other; she gazed at me very intently as I thought; she held out her hand to me, and I could see her face and lips move as if about to speak to me. I was in the act of taking her hand to greet her, but had not touched her,

¹ It is not specially remarkable that a hallucinatory object should persist in appearing in the direct line of vision. See p. 298.

when some iron hurdles which formed the fencing of the cattle market, rang as if they were being struck with an iron bar. This startled me, and unconsciously I turned round to see what made the noise. I could see nothing, and instantly turned again to Mrs. W. but she was gone.

"Now it was that I began to tremble, and for some time I felt that she was still near me, although I could not see her. But I soon pulled myself together and walked back to Norwich and my bedroom, but not to sleep, for I could not get rid of the feeling that perhaps my friend had suddenly died or met with some serious accident. I therefore wrote to a gentleman in London—a mutual friend—telling him what I had seen and what my fears were, asking him to be very careful, but to make inquiries about Mrs. W., as to her welfare, and what and where she was on that night and time. The next day's post brought me the welcome tidings that Mrs. W. was quite well and in good health, that at the very time I saw her, about 11 p.m., she was sitting in her usual place in the circle in London, and that there, for the first time in her life, she had fallen into a trance which frightened the other sitters very much, and they had great difficulty in bringing her back to ordinary life.

"JOHN ROUSE."

Mrs. W. has read through the above account, and writes to us as follows, in June, 1883 :—

"It is perfectly correct. I quite remember the séances and the particular occasion to which Mr. Rouse refers, when I became unconscious one night, at about 11 o'clock, and on recovery had no recollection of anything but that I had *gone suddenly out of myself*.¹ My dress at the time of the occurrence is stated quite correctly. I also remember one of our circle calling with Mr. Rouse's letter, to ascertain, at his request, whether I was still in earthly form. Talking over the matter with him, and afterwards with the others, all agreed as to the time of my becoming oblivious. I have never had the same experience before nor since then.

"L. E. W."

[The evidence here will, of course, suffer in the eyes of many, from the fact that both agent and percipient were at the time attending séances. It must also be mentioned that on such occasions Mr. Rouse has seen or imagined vague appearances. He has, however, only on one other occasion (when again there were singular points of correspondence with reality) had anything like a distinct hallucination; and he is a sensible and clear-headed man.]

[Cases 216 and 217 are here omitted.]

Sufficient illustrations have now been given of the two types of case, where special features of dress and aspect may lead us pretty confidently to refer the detailed form which the hallucination takes to the percipient and to the agent respectively. But the majority of visual telepathic phantasms, as we shall find later, present no such special features; the aspect of the figure is free from striking peculiarities, and the dress little noticed, and such as either of the two persons concerned might readily picture as natural and familiar. In all such cases, and alike whether the

¹ It occasionally happens at séances—whether owing to the attitude of expectancy or to some other condition—that a sitter falls into an odd unconscious, or semi-conscious state; which would have nothing alarming in it to any one familiar with the phenomena of hypnotism. As to the subjective sense of "going out of oneself," see above, p. 363, note.

agent is or is not so habited at the moment, it seems to me reasonable to refer the details of the appearance to the percipient's mind. As compared with our total ignorance concerning the prior process of *transference*, our view of the immediate process in the percipient which issues in sensory hallucination may be said to be knowledge; in it we at any rate have the analogy of subjective hallucinations to go by. Inasmuch, then, as a member of a civilised community has been impelled to project a phantasm—for there it stands, projected—it is in accordance with analogy, and we may almost say inevitable, that he should project it in *some* dress; and it is surely simpler, as I have suggested above, to suppose that he does this wholly from his own resources, which are adequate for the purpose, than to suppose that a detailed image is supplied to him, clean-cut and complete, from indefinite unconscious or subconscious strata of the agent's mind. The point becomes clearest when there is a clear *choice* of familiar dresses. For instance, a son sees the phantasm of his mother "dressed in a peculiar silver-grey dress, which she had originally got for a fancy-ball" (p. 423). That *he* should so *project* her image, under a sudden telepathic influence received from her (p. 351-2), no more needs explanation than that any other item of past experience should present itself unsought in memory or dream; but that *she* should so *transmit* her image would decidedly need explanation; for even if she was conscious at the time—which she most likely was not—unless her mind was consciously engaged with this particular dress, what disturbance can we assume of the quite impartial state of latency in which her ideas of her various dresses would be? There being no sudden call on her—as there is on her son—to represent her image, there would be no impulse to the selection (whether conscious or casual) of one particular form of representation. And the same argument will apply wherever the phantasmal costume, or any part of it, is such as would not form an almost necessary element in the agent's consciousness at the time. In most cases where costume is noticed at all, it includes particulars the choice of which presents no difficulty if we leave the *percipient* to make it, among the various familiar aspects of the friend whose image he is *ex hypothesi* impelled to construct; but any precedence of which over others on the *agent's* side would imply a detailed activity of construction, occurring not only without consciousness, but apparently *without cause*; since there is no ground for connecting the construction (least of all the unconscious construction) of highly elaborated visual images with the conditions of spontaneous telepathic agency.¹

¹ Any hypothesis that the condition of agency *in itself* (i.e., apart from that reaction of the percipient on the impression to which I have attributed its projection in sensory form) tends to elicit and transmit out of the recesses of the agent's mind some definite image of his own aspect, would seem open to this objection—that there are a large number of telepathic phantasms—notably the *auditory* class—in which nothing connected with the agent's aspect appears. Apart from literal representations of some conscious thought or sensation of the agent (p. 349, note), it has seemed an adequate hypothesis that the particular form of sensory development is determined on the *percipient's* side; and it would be very difficult to combine with this the hypothesis that *sometimes* the form is *compelled* to be visual by the preponderating force in the *agent's* mind of a latent image of his own aspect. For if the image is *latent*, and has no particular relevance to the circumstances of the moment, such an image has had just the same amount of presence in the agent's mind, and just as much (or little) chance of telepathically asserting itself, in the *non-visual* cases.

§ 9. Before quitting the subject of the development of telepathic phantasms, I may be allowed to point out its relation to the physiological sketch at the close of the tenth chapter; for it happens to supply substantial confirmation to the views of centrifugal origin there maintained. The whole idea of morbid excitation from the more external parts of the sensory apparatus becomes here irrelevant. All that has been said in this chapter as to the development of the hallucination from the nucleus of a transferred impression marks out the higher part of the brain—the part which is concerned with ideas or general images of persons and things, and not with immediate perception of them—as the place where the abnormal process starts; the hallucination itself being due to the downward promulgation of the disturbance from these higher tracts to the specific sensory centre concerned. Especially must this origin commend itself in respect of the phantasms which are bodied forth in a more or less fanciful form, with elements which are clearly the percipient's own contribution, but which he would never have contributed had not telepathy supplied an idea for him to clothe. But perhaps the cases where the hypothesis is most helpful are those of which Mr. Marchant's (No. 26, p. 149) is the type, where no obvious *rapport* exists between the two parties concerned. How—we naturally ask—could the idea of Kelsey be impressed on Mr. Marchant's mind with such force as to embody itself in a visible phantom, when Kelsey's mind was presumably not occupied either with Mr. Marchant or with himself in relation to him? From a physiological point of view the fact becomes less startling if we suppose the primary change in Mr. Marchant's brain to take place at the part which is the great storehouse of old impressions; at the part, moreover, where an appropriate physical basis may be found not only for distinct and recognisable images, but for sub-conscious ideas and memories, and for the most distant and intangible associations. In the register of the brain it is seldom that a record, once made, is so utterly obliterated that, under suitable conditions, it may not be revived. And if once a relation be established between two persons, and the records of it registered in their two brains, it may be possible for the same harmony occasionally to manifest itself between those records—even though they be long sunk below the level of conscious attention—as between the *immediate* impressions of the moment; and, this once granted, we have seen how the physiological process may lead on to the projection of the visible phantom.¹ In psychical terms, I see no reason why sub-conscious ideas and memories which are in no distinct way present to consciousness, such as Kelsey's sense of his old relationship to Mr. Marchant, should not evoke similar blind movements in Mr. Marchant's mind, which, gathering strength, might lead him to body forth the vision of his old acquaintance. A hallu-

¹ I have sufficiently emphasised the difficulty of expressing the *transmission* of telepathic impressions in physical terms (pp. 92-4). And though I here suggest that the difficulty is lessened if we may draw on unconscious parts of the mind, and old records in the brain, my physiological point is independent of this suggestion, and is limited to the percipient's own organism. There certain nervous changes do undoubtedly take place, in correspondence with the psychical fact of the hallucination; and my object is to show that what we observe as to the psychical fact may be best accounted for on a particular view of the physical process.

cination which is thus initiated by the quickening of long-buried memories, and of dim tracts of emotional association, is the most conspicuous example of the projection of an idea from within outwards; and the tremor to which the sensorium reverberates will presumably start in the inmost penetralia of cerebral process.

§ 10. The parallelism between telepathic and purely subjective hallucinations has now been traced out in the most essential particulars. To the five heads of resemblance enumerated in the last chapter (p. 322), the present chapter has added the various modes of gradual development, and of original or fantastic embodiment; the special point with respect to luminosity (p. 359); and the general but not invariable limitation of the percept to a single human figure (p. 356). I may note further the interesting negative characteristic that (with very rare exceptions) neither subjective disturbances nor transferred impressions seem to produce visual hallucinations representing a person who is actually present with the percipient at the time.¹ One fails at first sight to see why this should be. If preoccupation of the percipient's mind with the person seen is to go for anything in the subjective cases, is not the mind often completely preoccupied with a person who is present? and if *rapport* is to go for anything in the telepathic cases, is not *rapport* often at its maximum of strength with a person who is present? I suppose the explanation must be analogous to the reason why the stars are not visible by day; and that vision of friends who are absent depends on a vague sense of remoteness and abstraction in relation to them, the possibility of which is swamped by their presence. The possibility seems, indeed, to be to some extent affected by the presence of *any* companion—a large majority of hallucinations, alike of purely subjective and of telepathic origin, taking place when the percipient is alone.

Various other points of frequent or occasional resemblance between the two classes remain, which have been noted or will be noted as they occur in the examples, and need here only be briefly summarised. Such are the various degrees of externalisation, and of apparent solidity or tenuity; ² rudimentary appearances; ³ fragmentary appearances; ⁴ rapid repetitions; ⁵ movement in the figures seen; ⁶ gradual disappearance; ⁷ special modes of disappearance; ⁸ disappearance on sudden speech or gesture; ⁹ response of the phantasmal voice to words of the

¹ I have encountered only seven instances of the kind, two of which are described later (p. 425, note, and p. 494). The negative fact is worth pointing out; but positive instances (unless perchance "collective," like case 333) would, of course, be more naturally interpreted as purely subjective, on the analogy of after-images (p. 326), than as telepathic.

² Pp. 305-9, 312, 394-7.

³ Chap. xiv., § 4.

⁴ Pp. 325; 393, note; and see cases 161, 240.

⁵ P. 261.

⁶ This feature is so common, in both classes, that I need hardly call special attention to it where it occurs. In this chapter alone, for instance, we have encountered it in cases—Nos. 199, 202, 215.

⁷ See above, p. 338, and p. 432.

⁸ See p. 272, note.

⁹ See p. 427, second note.

hallucinated person ;¹ the fact that the hallucination is unshared by other persons who may be in the hallucinated person's company or vicinity ;² and the fact that every now and then the liability to either type of hallucination seems hereditary.³

Of still greater importance are the *contrasts* that exist between the phenomena of the two classes ; *e.g.*, the great superiority in number of visual over auditory cases in the telepathic class, which is the reverse of what obtains in the purely subjective ;⁴ and the large proportion, in the purely subjective class, of *unrecognised* phantasms, which are decidedly exceptional in the telepathic. But these points of contrast are chiefly interesting as bearing on a larger question which I can now no longer defer—the question whether the cases presented as telepathic can reasonably be regarded as more than merely accidental coincidences ; and they will find their appropriate place in the next chapter.

¹ P. 302. [The instances of this in telepathic hallucinations referred to by Gurney are all in the Supplement—here omitted.—ED.]

² *e.g.*, cases 28, 34, 242, 274, 307, 329, 355. The cases where the experience affects more than one person will be discussed in Chap. xviii., and may perhaps be found to supply a fresh point of resemblance between hallucinations of subjective and of telepathic origin.

³ [As pointed out by Gurney, possible instances of family susceptibility to telepathic influence are cases 14 and 15 ; and several of the collective cases. Instances of separate experiences by different members of families appeared in the original edition, but are not reproduced here. Gurney adds :—] My collection of casual subjective hallucinations of the sane includes 4 cases where a parent and child have been affected at different times. In one of these cases (received from Mrs. Freese, of Granite Lodge, Chislehurst) the son's vision nearly reproduced the one which his mother had experienced years before.

⁴ [This preponderance of auditory over visual hallucinations, was not found in the more extensive "census of hallucinations" subsequently made, and reported on in the *Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research*, vol. x. I have therefore, for the sake of brevity, omitted from the next chapter Gurney's discussion of its bearing on the theory of chance-coincidence.—ED.]

CHAPTER XIII

THE THEORY OF CHANCE-COINCIDENCE

§ 1. AN issue has now to be seriously considered which I have several times referred to as a fundamental one, but which could not be treated without a preliminary study of the subject of sensory hallucinations. *That*, as I have tried to show, is the order of natural phenomena to which "phantasms of the living" in general belong; they are to be regarded as projections of the percipient's brain by which his senses are deceived. We have further found that in a certain number of cases—which may be taken as representing the still larger number to be cited in the following chapters—a phantasm of this kind is alleged to have coincided very closely in time with the death, or some serious crisis in the life, of the person whose presence it suggested. The question for us now is whether these coincidences can, or cannot, be explained as accidental. If they *can*, then the theory of telepathy—so far as applied to apparitions—falls to the ground. If they *cannot*, then the existence of telepathy as a fact in Nature is proved on the evidence; and the proof could only be resisted by the assumption that the evidence, or a very large part of it, is in its main features untrustworthy. It is very necessary to distinguish these two questions—whether the evidence may be trusted; and if trusted, what it proves. It is the latter question that is now before us. The character of the evidence was discussed at some length in the fourth chapter, and is to be judged of by the narratives quoted throughout the book [original edition]. In the present chapter it is assumed that these narratives are in the main trustworthy; that in a large proportion of them the essential features of the case—*i.e.*, two marked experiences and a time-relation between them—are correctly recorded.

Here, then, is the issue. A certain number of coincidences of a particular sort have occurred: did they or did they not occur by chance? Now there are doubtless some who do not perceive that this question demands a reasoned examination at all. They settle it *à priori*. "One is constantly coming across very startling coincidences," they observe, "which no one thinks of ascribing to anything but chance; why should not these, which are no more startling than many others, be of the number?" This idea need hardly detain us: the point in our case is, of course, not that the coincidence is *startling*¹—that alone would be insig-

¹ It is, however, something to get even the startling character of the coincidence admitted. For there are writers of repute who seem to think that the whole occurrence receives a sufficient rationalistic explanation when some plausible subjective cause for the hallucination has been suggested. The Abbé de St. Pierre, after telling the well-known story of Desfontaines' appearance to his friend Bezuél, at the time of the

nificant—but that the *same sort* of startling coincidence is again and again repeated. That is clearly a fact which demands treatment by a particular method, often vaguely appealed to as “the doctrine of chances.” The actual application of that doctrine, however, even to simple cases, seems to require more care than is always bestowed upon it.

Especially is care required in the simple preliminary matter of deciding, before one begins to calculate, what the subject-matter of the calculation is to be—what precise class of phenomena it is to which the doctrine of chances is to be applied. I need only recall Lord Brougham’s treatment of his own case (pp. 256–7). His attempted explanation, as we saw, entirely depended on his miscalling his experience, and referring it to the class of dreams—a class numerous enough, as he rightly perceived, to afford scope for numbers of startling coincidences. And his remarks illustrate what is really a very common outside view of psychical research. Dreams, and hallucinations, and impressions, and warnings, and presentiments—it is held—are the “psychical” stock-in-trade; and these phenomena are all much on a par, and may all be shown by the same arguments to be undeserving of serious attention. There has been the more excuse for this view, in that those who have claimed objective validity for what others dismiss as purely subjective experiences have often themselves been equally indiscriminating. Even this book might lead a critic who confined his perusal to the headings of the chapters to imagine that dreams form a corner-stone of the argument; and in admitting that topic at all, we have so far laid ourselves open to misunderstanding. Thus a distinguished foreign critic of our efforts thought the subjective nature of what we regard as telepathic incidents sufficiently proved by the suggestion that “any physician will consider it quite within the bounds of probability that one per cent of the population of the country are subject to remarkably vivid *dreams, illusions, visions, etc.*,” and that each of these persons is “subject to a *dream or vision* once a week.”¹ It is obvious enough that in circles whose members have

former’s death by drowning, and while the latter was apparently in a swoon, opines that the swoon was the cause of the apparition; and Ferriar, who agrees with the Abbé in this, and adds, “I know from my own experience that the approach of syncope is sometimes attended with a spectral appearance,” agrees with him also in leaving the little detail of the drowning wholly out of account. So with respect to the story told by Baronius, of the appearance of Ficino, at the time of his death, to Michael Mercato, who was studying philosophy. Ferriar (instead of making inquiry into the evidence of dates, which would show the story to be spurious) explains that Mercato’s study of philosophy may have revived the idea of his friend in a vivid manner. It would certainly be a very vivid manner that could kill the friend at a distance.

¹ Another trap lies in the word *hallucination* (see pp. 286–7); which in this book is strictly limited to *sensory* affections, but which common usage often applies to purely mental errors. But for this *équivoque*, an eminent physiologist would perhaps hardly have thought he made a point against us in the remark—a rather rash one from any point of view—that our evidence is manifestly derived for the most part “from a class of persons given to hallucination, especially clergymen and women, who are naturally inclined to believe marvels.” (*Deutsche Rundschau* for Jan., 1886, p. 45.) Among 509 informants from whom I have received accounts of apparently subjective hallucinations of sight and hearing, I find the proportion of females to males almost exactly 3 to 2, and clergymen most sparsely represented. Of the 527 percipients concerned in the hallucinations of sight and hearing which are included

"spectral illusions" of their friends as often as once a week, the approximate coincidence of one of these experiences with the death of the corresponding person will be an insignificant accident. But we have not ourselves met with any specimen of this class; and the present collection [*i.e.* in the original edition] comprises first-hand accounts of recognised apparitions, closely coinciding with the death of the original, from 109 percipients, of whom only a small minority can recall having experienced even a single other visual hallucination than the apparition in question.¹ Once again, then, let me repeat that, though this work connects the sleeping and the waking phenomena in their *theoretic and psychological* aspects, it carefully and expressly separates them in their *demonstrational* aspect. The extent to which either class demonstrates the reality of telepathy can only be known through the application of the doctrine of chances; but the application must be made to them separately, not together; we must not, like Lord Brougham, argue to one class from the data of the other. I have already applied the doctrine to a particular class of dreams, with results which, though numerically striking, left room for doubt, owing to the peculiar untrustworthiness of memory in dream-matters. It remains to apply it to the waking phantasms; and here I think that the results may fairly be held to be decisive.

§ 2. It is clear that the points to be settled are two:—the frequency of the phantasms which have markedly corresponded with real events; and the frequency of phantasms which have had no such correspondence, and have been obviously and wholly subjective in character. These points are absolutely essential to any conclusion on the question before us; and if not settled in any other way, they must be settled by guesses or tacit assumptions. The theory of chance-coincidence, as opposed to that of telepathy, has so far depended on two such assumptions. The first is that the coincidences themselves are *extremely rare*. They can then be accounted for as accidental. For we know that there are such things as hallucinations representing human forms, which do not correspond with any objective fact whatever outside the organism of the percipient; and it would be rash to deny that the death of the person represented may now and then, in the world's history, have fallen on the same day as the

as telepathic evidence in these volumes, 241, or more than 46 per cent., are males; 286, or less than 54 per cent., are females; and 28, or between 5 and 6 per cent., are ministers of religion. The slight preponderance of female informants may probably be due to their having, as a rule, more leisure than men for writing on matters unconnected with business.

¹ Explicit denials have been given by 73 out of the 109. From 22 others no answer has been obtained on the point, either through our own failure at first to realise its importance, or owing to death or some unavoidable cause; but of these 22, the majority have pretty clearly implied that what they describe was a unique experience. Of the 14 who can recall some further instance or instances, 4 have had a single apparently subjective hallucination under exceptional conditions of bad health or mental strain; 3 have had one such experience when in a normal state; and 7 have had several such experiences—some of which, however, differed from the telepathic cases in not representing a living figure, while others were themselves either probably or possibly of telepathic origin. I may add that in a large number of other cases, not given in the actual words of the percipient, there is very good reason to believe the experiences to have been unique.

hallucination. The second assumption is that these purely subjective apparitions of forms are *extremely common*. It can then be argued that even a considerable number of them might fall on the same day as the death of the corresponding human being. Supposing that we could each of us recall the occasional experience of gazing at friends or relatives in places which were really empty, then—since people are perpetually dying who are the friends and relatives of some of us—every year might yield a certain crop of the coincidences.

But as soon as we make these assumptions explicit and look at them, we see how baseless and arbitrary they are. Why should either of them be admitted without challenge? The second one especially seems opposed to what we may call the common-sense view of ordinary intelligent men. The question whether or not a very large proportion of the population have had experience of morbid or purely subjective hallucinations is one, I submit, where the opponents of the chance-theory might fairly take their stand on the ordinary observation of educated persons, and have thrown on others the *onus* of proving them wrong. On this point a broad view, based on one's general knowledge of oneself and one's fellows, does exist; and according to it, "spectral illusions"—distinct hallucinations of the sense of vision—are very far from the everyday occurrences which they would have to be if we are to suppose that, whenever they coincide in time with the death of the person seen, they do so by accident. Nay, if we take even one of our critics, and bring him fairly face to face with the question, "If *you* all at once saw in your room a brother whom you had believed to be a hundred miles away; if he disappeared without the door opening; and if an hour later you received a telegram announcing his sudden death—how should you explain the occurrence"? he does not as a rule reply, "*His* day and hour for dying happened also to be *my* day and hour for a spectral illusion, which is natural enough, considering how common the latter experience is." The line that he takes is, "The supposition is absurd; there are no really authentic cases of that sort." Under the immediate pressure of the supposed facts, he instinctively feels that the argument of chance-coincidence would not seem effective.

Still, "common sense"—though it would support what I say—is not here the true court of appeal. And, moreover, it is not unanimous. On the second point, as on the first, I have received the most divergent replies from persons whom I have casually asked to give a guess on the subject; and some have guessed the frequency of the purely subjective hallucinations as very much *below* what it actually is. The moral—that we cannot advance a step without statistics—seems pretty obvious, though the student of the subject may read every word that has ever been published on both sides of the argument without encountering a hint of the need. There is plenty of assertion, but no figures; and a single instance, one way or the other, seems often to be thought decisive. To A, who has himself seen a friend's form at the time of his death at a distance, the connection between the two facts seems obvious; B, having heard of a phantasm of a living person which raised apprehensions as to his safety, but which "came to nothing," is at once sure that A's case was "a chance." I have even seen this view expanded, and a leading review

gravely urging that the coincidences must be regarded as accidental, if against every hallucination which *has* markedly corresponded with a real event we can set another which has *not*. This is certainly a statistical argument—of a sort—and might be represented as follows:—At the end of an hour's rifle-practice at a long-distance range, the record shows that for every shot that has hit the bull's-eye another has missed the target: therefore the shots that hit the bull's-eye did so by accident.

§ 3. Perhaps the neglect of statistics has in part been due to an apparent hopelessness of attaining a sufficient quantity of reliable facts on which to found an argument—to an idea that any census on which a conclusion could be founded would have to be carried out on a scale so vast as to be practically impossible. "Do you intend," I have been sometimes asked, "to ask every man and woman in England whether he or she has experienced any subjective hallucination during, say, the last twenty years, and also to get a complete record of all the alleged coincidences within the same period, and then to compare the two lists?" Happily nothing at all approaching this is required. We shall find that approximately accurate figures are necessary only on one point—the frequency of the subjective hallucinations; and this can be ascertained by making inquiries of any fraction of the population which is large and varied enough to serve as a fair sample of the whole. Even this smaller task, however, is a very tedious one, consisting, as it does for the most part, in carefully registering *negative* information. The believer in telepathy may feel that he is doing much more to advance his belief by narrating a striking positive instance at a dinner party than by ascertaining, for instance, from twenty of his acquaintance the dull fact that they have never experienced a distinct visual hallucination. Just in the same way a scientific lecturer may win more regard at the moment by a sensational experiment with pretty colours and loud explosions than by laborious quantitative work in his laboratory. But it must be persistently impressed on the friends of "psychical research" that the laborious quantitative work has to be done; and it is some satisfaction to think that the facts themselves may stand as material for others to deal with, even if the conclusions here drawn from them are incorrect.

Nor has the dulness of the work been by any means the only difficulty: its purpose has been widely misconceived, and its scope has thereby been much curtailed. The proposal for a numerical estimate was introduced in a circular letter, every word of which might have been penned by a zealous sceptic, anxious above all things to prove that, in cases where the phantasm of a distant person has appeared simultaneously with the person's death, the coincidence has been an accidental one. Not a syllable was used implying that the authors of the letter had themselves any opinion as to whether phantasms to which no real event corresponds *are* or are *not* common things; it was simply pointed out that it is necessary to have some idea *how* common they are, before deciding whether phantasms to which real events *do* correspond are or are not to be fairly accounted for by chance. And since sensory hallucinations, whatever their frequency, are at any rate phenomena as completely admitted as

measles or colour-blindness, it did not occur to us that the following question could possibly be misunderstood :—

*Since January 1, 1874, have you—when in good health, free from anxiety, and completely awake—had a vivid impression of seeing or being touched by a human being, or of hearing a voice or sound which suggested a human presence, when no one was there? Yes or no?*¹

Clearly, the more *yeses* are received to this question—i.e., the *commoner* the purely subjective hallucinations prove to be—the stronger is the argument for *chance* as an adequate explanation of the instances of coincidence; the more *noes*—the *rarer* the purely subjective hallucinations prove to be—the stronger the argument that the death or other crisis which *coincides* with the apparition is in some way the *cause* of the apparition. We should have expected, if any injustice was to be done us, that it would have taken the form of attributing to us an inordinate desire for *noes*. To our amazement we found that we were supposed to be aiming exclusively at *yeses*—and not only at *yeses*, but at *yeses* expanded into orthodox “ghost-stories”—to be anxious, in fact, that every one in and out of Bedlam who had ever imagined something that was not there, or mistaken one object for another, should tell us his experience, with a view that we might immediately interpret it as due to the intervention of a bogey. A more singular instance of the power of *expectancy*—of the power of gathering from words any meaning that a critic comes predisposed to find there—can hardly be conceived. A statistical question on a perfectly well-recognised point in the natural history of the senses was treated, in scientific and unscientific quarters alike, as a manifesto of faith in “supernatural” agencies; and we found ourselves solemnly rebuked for ignoring the morbid and subjective character of many hallucinations—that is to say, for ignoring the fact which we had set forth as the very basis of our appeal, and from which its whole and sole point was derived.

§ 4. If I have dwelt thus on difficulties and misconceptions, it is not that I may boast of having altogether triumphed over them. On the contrary, they have made it impossible to attain more than a fraction of what I once hoped. I began with the idea that the census might be extended to 50,000 persons; the group actually included numbers only 5705. Still, though this is certainly not a showy number, any one who is familiar with work in averages will, I think, admit that it is adequate for the purpose; and the friends who have assisted in the collection of the answers (to whom I take this opportunity of offering my grateful thanks)

¹ This comprehensive question has been actually asked in several parts. As first put, for example, it contained no limitation as to date—as I was anxious to obtain accounts of as many hallucinations of the sane as possible; and the fact that any experience recorded had or had not fallen within the specified period of twelve years was ascertained by subsequent correspondence. The details of the experience were also a matter of subsequent inquiry.

I need hardly warn the reader not to confound the group of hallucinations belonging to the limited number of persons who were expressly asked the above question, with the large collection of similar experiences which has been frequently mentioned in some of the preceding chapters. That large collection includes the smaller group, and also census-cases which fell outside the twelve years' limit; but it includes also a far larger number of cases which were received quite irrespectively of the census.

need certainly not feel that their labour has been in vain. It is possible for a *small* group to be quite fairly *representative*. Thus, if 50 males were taken at random from the inhabitants of London, if the heights of their respective owners were measured, and added together, and if the total were divided by 50, the result might be taken as representing, within extremely small limits of error, the average height of adult male Londoners; we should not get a much more correct result by taking the mean of 500, or 500,000 heights. This is the simplest sort of case. When it is a question of what proportion of the population have had a certain experience which many of them have *not* had, we must take a larger specimen-number, adjusting it to some extent by our rough previous knowledge. For instance, if we want to know what proportion of the inhabitants of London have had typhoid fever, it would not be safe to take 50 of them at random, and then, if we found that 10 of these had had the illness, to argue that one-fifth of the inhabitants of London had had it. Our rough knowledge is that a great many have not had it, and that a good many have; and in such circumstances we should probably get a very appreciably more certain result by enlarging our representative group to 500.¹ If, again, the experience was of extraordinary rarity, such as leprosy, the number of our specimen-group would have to be again increased; even if we took as many as 500,000 people at random, that is about one-ninth of the population, and ascertained that one of them was a leper, it would not be safe to conclude that there were nine lepers in London. Now our rough knowledge as to hallucinations would place them in this regard very much more on a par with typhoid fever than with leprosy. We realise that a great many people have not had experience of them; but we realise also that they are in no way marvellous or prodigious events. And if a group of 5705 persons seems a somewhat arbitrary number by which to test their frequency, the view that it is *too small* and that 50,000 would be greatly preferable, is one that can at any rate hardly be held with consistency by advocates of the theory of chance-coincidence. For the main prop of that theory, as we have seen, is the assumption that purely subjective hallucinations are *tolerably common* experiences; whereas it is only of *decidedly rare* experiences that the frequency, in relation to the whole population, would be much more correctly estimated from the proportion of *fifty* thousand people that have had them than from the proportion of *five* thousand people that have had them. However, the adequacy of the latter number approves itself most clearly in the course of the census itself. We find as we go on that hallucinations are sufficiently uncommon to force us to take our specimen-group of persons in thousands, not in hundreds, but not so uncommon as to force us to take very many thousands: after the first thousand is reached the proportion of "yeses" to "noes" keeps pretty uniformly steady—as would, no doubt, be the case if the question asked related not to hallucinations but to typhoid fever.

As regards the sort of persons from whom the answers have been collected—if there have been any answers from persons whose deficiencies

¹ In the recently issued Supplement to the Registrar-General's Reports for 1870-80, he bases his conclusions as to the proportionate deadliness of different diseases in the various occupations on batches of 500-1000 deaths.

of education or intelligence rendered them unfit subjects for a simple inquiry bearing on their personal experience, they form, I may confidently say, an inappreciable fraction of the whole. Perhaps a fourth of the persons canvassed have been in the position of shopkeepers and artisans or *employés* of various sorts ; but the large majority have belonged to what would be known as the educated class, being relatives and friends of the various collectors. It is, no doubt, safest to assume that a certain degree of education is a pre-requisite to even the simplest form of participation in scientific work ; and this condition, it will be observed, in no way detracts from the *representative* character of the group. A few thousand educated persons, taken at random, present an abundantly sufficient variety of types ; and, indeed, for the purpose in view, the group is the more truly representative for belonging mainly to the educated class, inasmuch as it is from that class that the majority of the cases which are presented in this work as probably telepathic are also drawn.

§ 5. To say, however, that the answers came in the main from an educated class, is not, of course, a guarantee of the accuracy of the census ; and before giving the actual results it may be well to forestall some possible objections.

It may be said, to begin with, that people may have had the experience inquired about, but may have forgotten the fact. This is the objection which was considered above in respect of dreams of death, and which there seemed to have decided force. In respect of waking hallucinations of the senses, its force is very much less. No doubt hallucinations may exhibit all degrees of vagueness ; and it is very possible that extremely slight and momentary specimens may make little impression, and may rapidly be forgotten ; but for the purposes of the census it would not in the least matter that persons whose experience had been of this slight and momentary kind should answer *no* instead of *yes*. It would have been unwise to complicate the question asked by an attempt to define the extent of vividness that the hallucination must have reached, to be reckoned as an item in our census ; but clearly the only subjective hallucinations of which it really concerns us to ascertain the frequency are those which are in themselves *as distinct and impressive* as the hallucinations that we represent as telepathic ; and any that fall below this point of distinctness and impressiveness have no bearing on the argument. And, *per contra*, it will be seen that by not limiting the wording of the question to distinct and impressive hallucinations, the collector exposes himself to receiving the answer " yes " from persons whose hallucination actually was very vague and momentary, but who do, as it happens, remember its occurrence. In point of fact, this has occurred a good many times ; and the swelling of the list of *yeses* by this means probably outweighs any losses of what should have been genuine *yeses* through failure of memory. For consider what such failure of memory would imply. A fact of sight, hearing, or touch, as clear and unequivocal as most of the sensory impressions which we adduce as evidence for telepathy, must be very clear and unequivocal indeed. And the absence of the normal external cause of such an impression, when recognised, can hardly fail to give rise to genuine surprise—the surprise that follows a novel and unaccountable

experience : this has been the result of almost all the " telepathic " phantasms, quite independently of the news which afterwards seemed to connect them with reality. Now, can it be a common thing for an experience as unusual and surprising as this to be, within a dozen years or any shorter period, so utterly obliterated from a person's mind that his memory remains a blank, even when he is pointedly asked to try and recall whether he has had such an experience or not ?

A second objection is this. It has been suggested that untrue answers may be given by persons wishing to amuse themselves at our expense. Now I cannot deny that persons may exist who would be glad to thwart us, and amuse themselves, even at the cost of untruth. But when the question is put, " Do you remember having ever distinctly seen the face or form of a person known to you, when that person was not really there ? " it is not at once obvious whether the *amusing* untruth would be " Yes " or " No." In neither case would the joke seem to be that of a very exhilarating quality ; but, on the whole, I should say that " Yes " would be the favourite, as at any rate representing the rarer and less commonplace experience. " Yes " is, moreover, the answer which (as I have explained) it has been very generally thought that we ourselves preferred ; so that to give it might produce a piquant sense of fooling us to the top of our bent. But the reader has seen that, so far as the census might be thus affected, it would be affected in a direction *adverse* to the telepathic argument ; for the commoner the purely casual hallucinations are reckoned to be, the stronger is the argument that the visions which correspond with real events do so *by chance*. And if the number of these coincident visions makes the chance-argument untenable, even when the basis of estimation is affected in the way supposed, *à fortiori* would this be the case if the *yesses* were reduced to their true number.

Yet another objection is that persons who have had hallucinations may sometimes be disinclined to admit the fact and may say " No " instead of " Yes " in self-defence. This source of error must be frankly admitted ; but I feel tolerably confident that it has not affected the results to a really detrimental extent. Any reluctance to give the true answer is, as a rule, observable at the moment ; and in most cases it disappears when the purpose of the census is explained, and careful suppression of names is guaranteed. And against this tendency to swell the *noes* may be set several reasons why, quite apart from untruth, a census like this is sure to produce an unfair number of *yesses*. Quite apart from any wish to deceive, the very general impression that *yesses* were what was specially wanted could not but affect some of the answers given, at any rate to the extent of causing indistinct impressions to be represented as vivid sensory experiences ;¹ and it has also led some of those who have aided in the collection to put the questions to persons of whom it was *known beforehand* that their answer would be *yes*. Moreover, when question-

¹ For instance, a lady who answers that she has had an auditory hallucination, and is written to with the view of finding out in what it had consisted, then states that " it was *not* an auditory experience, but merely a feeling that something had happened." Here the answer could be rectified ; but even the many hundreds of letters that have been written on the subject have not served to eliminate all doubtful cases.

forms to be filled up are distributed on a large scale, it is impossible to bring it home to the minds of many of the persons whose answer would be "No" that there is *any use* in recording that answer. They probably have a vague idea that they have heard "negative evidence" disparaged, and fail to see that every percentage in the world involves it—that we cannot know that one man in 100 is six feet high without evidence that 99 men in 100 are *not* six feet high. This difficulty has been encountered again and again; and on the whole I have no doubt that the proportion of *yesses* is decidedly larger than it ought to be. Fortunately, incorrectness on this side need not trouble us—its only effect being that the telepathic argument, if it prevail, will prevail though based on distinctly unfavourable assumptions.

§ 6. And now to proceed to the actual results of the census, and to the calculations based thereon. [I omit Gurney's calculation for auditory cases. Turning to visual ones, he says:—ED.] The *reductio ad absurdum* becomes far more striking when we apply the doctrine of chances to *visual* cases. Out of the 5705 persons taken at random, of whom the above question was asked, only 21 could recall having, in the conditions named and within the specified 12 years, experienced a visual hallucination representing a living person known to them. But two of the 21 had had 2 experiences of the sort; so let us take the total as 23.¹ That is, the experience has fallen to the lot of one 248th of the group of persons asked, or, if that group be fairly representative, to 1 person in every 248 of the population.²

Let us now see what the proportion of the population who have had such an experience ought to be, on the hypothesis that the similar impressions of recognised voices presented in this book as telepathic were really chance-coincidences. As before in the case of dreams (pp. 210-13), I take cases where the coincidence of the hallucination was with *death*—the reasons for this selection being (1) that death is the prominent event in our telepathic cases; and (2) that for the purpose of an accurate numerical estimate it is important to select an event of a very definite and unmistakable kind, such as only happens once to each individual. Again also, in accordance with the official returns which give $\frac{22}{1000}$ as the annual death-rate, the proportion of anyone's relatives and acquaintances who die in the course of 12 years is taken as $\frac{264}{1000}$; and as we have seen (pp. 211-12), it will make no appreciable difference to the calculation

¹ This is a liberal allowance; for it includes several cases where there was such an amount of anxiety or expectancy on the part of the hallucinated person as would prevent us, if it were present in a *coincidental* case, from including such a case in our telepathic evidence. In seven of the cases, the form seen was an "after-image" of what had been, for some time previously, part of the perceiver's daily visual experience.

² It will be seen that one in 248, though a small proportion, is yet quite large enough to make it likely that most of us should casually have heard of a case or two of the kind. For there are probably more than 248 persons whom we are each of us sufficiently near to make it natural that an unusual experience—such as a distinct "spectral illusion"—befalling one of them, should directly or indirectly reach our ears. This is worth noting, because one sometimes hears the statement, "Why I heard the other day of a person who had been disturbed by seeing an apparition of a friend, and nothing came of it," made as though it amounted to a proof that such experiences were common enough to afford scope for any number of marked coincidences.

whether a person's circle of relatives and acquaintances, any one of whom his hallucination may represent, is large or small. The probability, then, that a person hallucinated in the way supposed will, by accident, have his hallucination within 12 hours on either side of the death of the relative or acquaintance whom it represents, is 1 in $\frac{12 \times 365 \times 1000}{24}$, or $\frac{1}{1869}$. That is to say, each coincidental hallucination of the sort in question implies 16,590 purely subjective cases of the same type. Now our collection includes 21 first-hand¹ and well-attested coincidental cases of this kind, which have occurred in this country within the specified time.² On the hypothesis, therefore, that these cases were accidental, the circle of persons from whom they are drawn ought to supply altogether, in the specified 12 years, 348,390 examples.

The next point to decide is the size of the circle from which our coincidental cases are drawn. The number here is not one that it is possible to estimate accurately: what must be done, therefore, is to make sure that our margin is on the side adverse to the telepathic argument, *i.e.*, to take a number clearly in excess of the true one. Our chief means of obtaining information, apart from information derived from our own circle of friends, has been by occasional requests in newspapers. A million-and-a-half would probably be an outside estimate of the circulation of the papers which have contained our appeals; but it by no means follows that every paragraph in a paper is studied by every person, or by a tenth of the persons, whom the paper reaches. However, I will make the extreme assumption that as many as a quarter of a million of people have by this means become aware of the kind of evidence that was being sought—an assumption which probably arrogates to us who sought it many times as much fame as we really possess; and I will allow another 50,000 for those who have become aware of the object of our work through private channels. This would raise the number of the circle from whom our evidence is drawn to 300,000, or about $\frac{1}{50}$ of the adult population.³ No one, I think, will maintain on reflection, that I am taking too low an estimate. Would anyone, for instance, suppose that if he canvassed the first 1000 adults whom he met in the streets of any large town, he would find that 12 or 13 of them had, within the last three years, been aware of what we wanted, and of the address to which information might be sent? and for rural districts such a supposition would be even more violent. But I am further supposing that this area of 300,000 persons has been drained dry—again an extravagant concession; for though it is easily assumed that anyone who has ever had a “psychical” experience is

¹ In three of the cases the evidence is not first-hand from the percipient, but is of the nature described in p. 119.

² Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 172, 173, 175, 182, 184, 195, 202, 236, 237, 238, 249, 268, 300, 350, 695, 697, and the case described in p. 107, note. [This is the list as finally decided on by Mr. Gurney, for the purposes of the above calculation, after discussion with Professor Peirce (see papers in *Proceedings of American S.P.R.* already referred to) I have altered the calculations in the text in accordance with this decision. All these cases will be found in the present volume.—ED.]

³ In the “adult population” I mean to include all persons above fifteen years of age. In the Supplement to the 45th Annual Report of the Registrar-General, p. xix., the proportion of such persons is given as .64 of the whole; which would make their number about 24,000,000.

desirous to publish it abroad, as a matter of fact people do not usually take the trouble to write a letter about family and personal matters to perfect strangers, on the ground of a newspaper appeal; and I have already mentioned that we ourselves know of much evidence which the reluctance or indifference of the parties concerned has made unavailable for our collection; we cannot, therefore, doubt that much more remains unelicited even among those whom our appeal has reached. A further strong argument for the existence of these unelicited facts is the very large proportion of our actual cases that has been drawn from a circle of our own, unconnected with "psychical" inquiry—from the friends, or the friends' friends, of a group of some half-dozen persons who have had no such experiences themselves, and who have no reason to suppose their friends or their friends' friends better supplied with them than anybody else's.

Here, then, is the conclusion to which we shall be driven, if our coincidental cases were really purely subjective hallucinations, and the coincidence was an accident:—that a circle of 300,000 persons ought to supply altogether in the specified 12 years 348,390 examples of the type in question. That is to say, it ought to have happened on an average to everybody once, and to some people twice, within the given time, distinctly to see an absent relation or acquaintance in a part of space that was actually vacant. But the census has shown that, within the given time, only about 1 in every 248 persons has had such an experience even once. Thus the group of visual coincidental cases now in question, if ascribed to accident, would require either that the subjective hallucinations should be more than 288 times as numerous as they actually are; or else that the circle from whom our coincidental cases are drawn should amount to more than 288 times the assumed size—in other words, that our existence and objects should have been prominently before the minds of every adult member of a population $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as large as the existing one.

Another form of the estimate is as follows. The probability that a person, taken at random, will, in the course of 12 years, have the form of hallucination in question is $\frac{1}{248}$; the probability that any assigned member of the general population, and therefore any particular person whose phantasm is seen, will die within 12 hours of an assigned point of time is $\frac{220}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$; hence the probability that in the course of 12 years, a hallucination of this form *and* the death of the person whose phantasm is seen will fall within 12 hours of one another is $\frac{1}{248} \times \frac{220}{10000} \times \frac{1}{365}$, or 1 in 4,114,545. And the circle from which our coincidental cases are drawn is assumed to be 300,000. From these data it may be calculated that the odds against the occurrence by accident, of as many coincidences of the type in question as the 21 which that circle produced, are about forty million billion trillions to 1. Or, to put it yet another way—the theory of chances, which gives 1 as the most probable number of coincidences of the type in question for every 4,114,545 of the population to yield, will give 6 as the most probable number for the whole adult population to yield, within the given period. Yet we draw $3\frac{1}{2}$ times that number from a fraction of the adult population which can only by an extravagantly liberal estimate be assumed to amount to an 80th part of the whole, and which has been very inadequately canvassed.

§ 7. In the above estimates, I have allowed to the so-called coincidence the rather wide limit of 12 hours. But in most of the actual cases it has been much closer than this; and it will be worth while to show how a single case of very close coincidence may legitimately strengthen the argument. First, it must be unreservedly admitted that a single case, if it stood alone and no similar one had ever been heard of, would have no cogency whatever as evidence of the operation of anything beyond chance. The most extraordinary coincidence, as above remarked, may yet be totally insignificant. The *à priori* improbability that the tallest man of the century will be born during a transit of Venus is enormous; but such a conjunction of events, if it happened, might be at once and with moral certainty ascribed to accident; and with equal certainty might it be predicted that such a conjunction would never recur. And without resorting to imaginary examples, we often encounter conjunctions and coincidences which would have appeared, before they happened, to be extremely improbable, but the happening of which is none the less clearly accidental. The odds are very great against two of the foremost men in a century being born on the same day; yet this happened in the case of Darwin and Lincoln, and no one imagines that one birth depended on the other. "Extraordinary coincidences" are, in fact, quite ordinary things; and only when previous experience has given us ground for suspecting (however faintly) that the conjunction in time or special combination is due to some positive causal link, can we connect the *à priori* improbability of a new case with an *à posteriori* argument that cases of that type are not due to chance.¹ Now the result of § 6 may be summarised as follows. The census leads us to infer that, during the years 1874-85, out of 300,000 inhabitants of this country taken at random, $\frac{23 \times 300,000}{87,050}$ or 1209 have had a recognised visual hallucination, representing a living person, which did not coincide with the death of that person. And during the same period, out of the same number of persons (supposing our inquiries really to have extended to so wide a circle), at least 21 have had a recognised visual hallucination which did coincide—in the sense of falling within 12 hours of—the death of the person seen. That is, our of 1209+21 or 1230 hallucinations, 21, or 1 in 59, have fallen within 12 hours of the death of the

¹ In a general way, coincidences where previous experience affords some ground for suspecting (however faintly) a cause other than chance are distinguished from coincidences where no such ground exists by this fact—that the latter sort of cases, if *à priori* highly improbable, are not mentioned or described until *after* they have happened. From the mere fact that they do not belong to any known or surmised type, they do not enter into anyone's head: no one suggests, without any sort of grounds, that a particular thing will happen to some one at a particular time, or predicts any particular highly improbable coincidence, and then afterwards finds this thing or this coincidence actually occurring. Now it will scarcely be contended that the coincidence of an apparition with the death of the person seen is a combination of events which has never entered anyone's head; for it has entered the heads even of those who deny that it has ever occurred, or who ascribe its occurrence to accident. But the idea has of course had much more than this negative sort of existence; there has been a good deal of positive belief that such combinations occur, and that their occurrence implies a causal connection between the death and the apparition. And though this belief may have been rash and premature before the necessary statistics had been obtained, I have tried in the last section to show that it may now be justified by precise calculation.

person seen. Now let us apply this conclusion to case 28 (p. 152). When Mr. S. had his visual hallucination representing his friend, he would have been justified in regarding the probability that his friend would prove to have died within 12 hours of the vision as 1 in 59; whereas, if there was no ground at all for surmising that a causal connection may exist between deaths and apparitions, he would only have been justified in regarding the probability of his friend's dying on that day as about 1 in 20,440—estimated from the death-rate which tables of mortality give for men of his friend's age (48 years). But it will be observed that the death and the apparition, for aught we know, were absolutely simultaneous, and at any rate were within a quarter of an hour of one another. Since, however, the death may have occurred 12 minutes before or 12 minutes after the apparition, we must take into account the double period; or, to allow for difference of clocks, let us say half an hour. Now, on the supposition that telepathy is a reality in the world, closeness of coincidence rather increases than otherwise the probability that the death and the apparition in any particular case are causally connected; whereas the probability of a death accidentally falling in a particular half-hour is, of course, 48 times less than that of its falling on a particular day. Thus the *a priori* probability that the death, if unconnected with the apparition, would fall in the particular half-hour in which the apparition fell, was 1 in 981,120; and in considering the question of connection, it is this extremely small degree of probability which has to be contrasted with the 1 in 59 which we have taken as about the true *a priori* probability that this particular half-hour would prove to be that of the death.

But the significance of extreme closeness of coincidence may be yet more strikingly suggested, if we consider the probability of the joint event before either part of it has occurred. My census gives $\frac{1}{248}$ as the probability that a particular individual would within 12 years have a visual hallucination of a friend not known to be dead. Mr. S. has, say, x friends, of whom about a fourth would naturally die in this period; and the period comprises 210,240 half-hours. Thus the probability of Mr. S.'s hitting off by chance such a coincidence as he did hit off was $\frac{1}{248} \times \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{x}{4} \times \frac{1}{210,240}$, or about 1 in 208 millions. It might, I think, be safely said that, in the world's history, no one has ever contemplated the possible participation of himself, or of any other specified person, in an event of this degree of unlikelihood, and has afterwards found his idea realised. But apart from this, the points to be specially weighed are (1) that Mr. S.'s case was drawn from a very inconsiderable fraction of the population—a fraction liberally estimated at $\frac{1}{80}$; and (2) that this fraction of the population has supplied many other parallel instances of great closeness of coincidence. Taking only the "borderland" and waking phantasms recorded on first-hand testimony in the main body of this work, I find that 66 of them are represented as having occurred within an hour of the event on the agent's side—which event in 41 of the 66 cases was death; 15 more, according to the facts stated, were within two hours of the event, which in 10 of the 15 cases was death; and in nearly all these cases, as well as in several others, it is quite possible that the coincidence was absolutely exact. I do not forget, what I have expressly pointed out in Chapter IV, that exaggeration of the closeness of the coincidence is a likely form for exaggeration in such matters

to take; but in a considerable number of the cases mentioned, good reason is shown for believing it to have been as close as is stated.

But the huge total of improbability is nothing like complete. Nothing has been said of the aggregate strength of the cases where the phantasm was unrecognised. Nothing has been said of the large array of cases where the coincident event was not death, but some other form of crisis—a class which does not lend itself easily to a precise numerical estimate, but whose collective force, even if it stood alone, would be very great. Once more, each of the two classes of cases—the “reciprocal” and the “collective”—which still await discussion, includes specimens of visual and auditory phantasms; and some of these afford an immensely higher probability for a cause other than chance, than the more ordinary cases where only one person is impressed. For the improbability of one sort of coincidence, that between B's unusual hallucination and A's condition—has now to be multiplied by the improbability of another sort of coincidence, that between B's hallucination and a second unusual impression (whether a hallucination or of some other form) on the part of A or C. Nor even so will the argument for telepathic phantasms be nearly exhausted. For it will have been observed that throughout I have been taking into account nothing beyond the bare facts of the death and the hallucination, and altogether neglecting the correspondences of detail which in some cases add indefinitely, and almost infinitely, to the improbability of the chance occurrence.

It would be very easy to amplify this reasoning, and to extend and vary the computations themselves; but the specimens given are perhaps sufficient. They cannot possibly be made interesting; but they are indispensable if the question is ever to be set at rest, and the appeal to the doctrine of chances to be anything better than empty words. Figures, one is sometimes told, can be made to prove anything; but I confess that I should be curious to see the figures by which the theory of chance-coincidence could here be proved adequate to the facts. Whatever group of phenomena be selected, and whatever method of reckoning be adopted, the estimates founded on that theory are hopelessly and even ludicrously overpassed. With so enormous a margin to draw on, there is no particular temptation to exaggerate the extent to which the evidence for the phenomena is to be relied on. In some cases it is possibly erroneous; in many it is undoubtedly incomplete; narratives may have been admitted which a more sagacious criticism would have excluded. But after all allowances and deductions, the conclusion that our collection comprises a large number of coincidences which have had some other cause than chance will still, I believe, be amply justified.

§ 8. But I have not yet done. There are considerations of a quite different kind which still further strengthen the argument for telepathy as against chance. Though the hallucinations which may be regarded as telepathic or veridical include many cases which may differ from purely subjective hallucinations of the sane only in the fact of being veridical, yet the *group*, as a whole, presents some peculiarities. [Discussion of the proportion of visual to auditory cases is here omitted. See p. 371.—ED.]

One peculiarity worth noting, is that the proportion of cases where more

senses than one have been concerned is considerably larger in the telepathic than in the purely subjective class of hallucinations—which seems to imply what may be called a higher average intensity in the former class. Out of 590 subjective cases, I find that 49, that is, a trifle over 8 per cent. of the whole number, are alleged to have concerned more senses than one ; of which 24 were visual and auditory, 8 visual and tactile, 13 auditory and tactile, and 4 concerned all three senses. Taking the telepathic evidence, I find that, out of 423 cases where a sensory hallucination seems to have been distinctly externalised, 80, or 19 per cent. of the whole number, are alleged to have concerned more senses than one ; of which 53 were visual and auditory, 12 visual and tactile, 7 auditory and tactile, and 8 concerned all three senses. I may add that the proportion of 19 per cent. remains exactly the same if only the first-hand cases included in the body of the work be taken into account, and cannot therefore be attributed to exaggeration of the facts in those narratives in the Supplement which are given at second-hand.¹ [Two paragraphs omitted here.—ED.]

The last point to which I must call attention, as conflicting with the theory of chance-coincidence, is a characteristic not of the telepathic phantasms themselves, but of the distant events with which they and other telepathic impressions coincide ; but it none the less serves to distinguish these coincidences as due to a definite and peculiar cause. It is the very large proportion of cases in which the distant event is *death*. It is in this profoundest shock which human life encounters that these phenomena seem to be oftenest engendered ; and, where not in death itself, at least in one of those special moments, whether of strong mental excitement or of bodily collapse, which of all living experiences come nearest to the great crisis of dissolution. Thus among the 668 cases of spontaneous telepathy in this book, 401 (or among 423 examples of the sensory externalised class, 304) are death-cases, in the sense that the percipient's experience either coincided with or very shortly followed the agent's death ; while in 25 more cases the agent's condition, at the time of the percipient's experience, was one of serious illness which in a few hours or a few days terminated in death. Nor, in this connection, can I avoid once more referring to the large number of cases in which the event that befell the agent has been death (or a very near approach to it) by *drowning or suffocation*. Out of the 401 death-cases just mentioned, there are 35, or nearly 9 per cent., where the death was by drowning—clearly a very much higher proportion than deaths of this particular form bear to all deaths, for even of accidental deaths among the male population, only 5 per cent. are due to drowning—and in 6 other cases the agent's escape from such a death was a narrow one. And if we do not insist on the form of death, but only on its suddenness, the above proportion still remains a very striking fact ; since deaths by accident, even among males, are only a little over 4 per cent. of the total of deaths.

We do not know why the conditions of death generally, or of sudden

¹ If only the subjective cases received from the canvassed group of 5705 persons be considered, those which concerned more than one sense amount to less than 4 per cent. ; while of the 29 special coincidental cases auditory and visual used in estimating the improbability of chance coincidence, 5, that is 17 per cent., concerned more than one sense.

death, or of any particular form of death,¹ or of excitement or collapse, should be effective; but we at all events know that the conditions are themselves *unusual*. Similarly in most cases of experimental thought-transference, the agent's mind is *unusually* occupied by its concentrated fixation on a single object; and whether it be in the curiosities of an afternoon or in the crises of a lifetime that telepathy finds its occasion, the peculiarity of the agent's state has at any rate that degree of explanatory power which succeeds in connecting the rare effect with the rare cause. In neither case can we trace out the actual process whereby the percipient is influenced; but we have the same sort of ground for refusing to attribute to chance the oft-repeated apparitions at the time of death, as the oft-repeated successes in guessing cards and reproducing diagrams.

The only way of meeting this argument would be to show that similar coincidences have been frequently met with in connection with definite events which produced *no* unusual physical or mental state in the person to whom they occurred. For instance, if B at a distance has a vision of A on the day that A scratches his finger or orders a new pair of boots, it would seem wholly irrational to connect the two facts. Accordingly, if many, or even several, such coincidences were on record, I should have to admit that the operations of chance altogether overpass my estimate, and that the data on which the previous argument rested must, therefore, be somehow defective. Or, to take a case where some emotional disturbance *is*, as a rule, involved, if it proved to be not extremely uncommon to have a vision of an absent friend on the morning of his marriage, I should feel that my argument was so far weakened; for it would be difficult to suppose that the emotions connected with that one morning stood distinctly apart from those of other seasons dedicated to happiness and the affections. But in point of fact we do *not* find that coincidences of these types prevail. The coincidental phantasms seem limited to seasons of exceptional crisis or excitement on the agent's part; and this limitation, in once more marking out these phantasms as a distinct group of natural phenomena, strongly confirms the substantial accuracy of the statistical results.

I am not forgetting, in these final remarks, what I have expressly stated before (p. 77), that the action of telepathy must not be dogmatically confined to those examples of striking coincidence which are suitable to be quoted in demonstration of it; and even in respect of such extreme affections as hallucinations of the senses, I should hesitate to assert that they *cannot* be due to an absent agent whose condition is not markedly abnormal. I regard it, however, as so unlikely that this is often their source—I regard the probability as so enormous that a phantasm seen or heard by A only, and representing B who is at the time living a piece of ordinary life, is of purely subjective origin—that the above argument remains in my view a fair one; and it is at any rate fairly addressed to those (whom of course I have had chiefly in view throughout the present chapter) who have not hitherto admitted or considered the case for telepathy even as based on the markedly coincidental examples.

¹ At the same time, with respect to drowning, one cannot but recall the peculiar vividness and concentration of psychical life which (from the accounts of many persons who have been ultimately rescued) seem to characterise the earlier stages of that form of death.

[NOTE.—Gurney appended to his concluding chapter an appeal for help in extending his statistics of sensory hallucinations by canvassing another known number of persons taken at random. He did not live to carry out the work, but it was subsequently done by the Society for Psychical Research, and the results published in vol. x. of the *Proceedings*. Much interesting information may there be found about sensory hallucinations in general, and about the proportion of veridical ones in particular. The number of persons canvassed—17,000—was thought to be sufficiently large to make it unnecessary to go outside the census itself for coincidences with death, or consequently to make any assumption as to the size of the circle from which they were drawn. The result fully confirmed the conclusion come to in this chapter that the number of death coincidences cannot be attributed to chance.—ED.]

CHAPTER XIV

FURTHER VISUAL CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT

§ 1. IN Chapter XII, a good many specimens of telepathic phantasms were quoted, in illustration of certain special points; and particularly as showing what part in the phenomena we may attribute to the obscure action of the agent's and of the percipient's mind respectively, and how the original impulse may become modified *in transitu*. A still larger number of cases remain, of which only a few present specially noticeable characteristics of dress, or development, or phantasmal imagery; but which have their share with the others in the cumulative proof of telepathy, and include, moreover, several fresh features and types. The present chapter will be devoted to visual examples.

In the "General Sketch of Hallucinations" (pp. 305-8 and 312), I mentioned the various degrees of externalisation that the phenomena may present; beginning with the ideal picture which is not a sensory hallucination at all—which is realised as a purely internal impression, as seen by the "mind's eye"; and ending with the actual percept, which, though equally the product of the percipient's mind, seems to take its place in the external world on a par with all the other objects within his range of vision. Now between these first and last stages there seems a wide gap; and if our review of telepathic incidents had to pass at one step from the vivid pictures flashed from mind to mind, to the phantasmal figure "out in the room," there might be a certain difficulty in conceiving two such different-seeming phenomena as having a similar origin. It is satisfactory, then, to be able to point to several intermediate stages. That such stages are found in the telepathic, as well as in the purely subjective or pathological, class of phantasms, is only a fresh indication that telepathic phantasms, in spite of their peculiar origin, are worked (so to speak) by the ordinary mechanism of hallucination.

The percipient may himself [in looking back] be doubtful as to the degree of externality that the phantasmal appearance had, but I should regard this indistinctness of memory as a tolerably sure sign that the impression was not of the truly sensory (that is, of the most unique and startling) sort, but rather a vivid mental picture of the type noticed in p. 151, and further exemplified in the 6th chapter. [Case 218, illustrating this, is here omitted.] In the stage next above this, the observer may still find it hard to say whether what impresses him is purely ideal, or whether his sense-organs are partly concerned—there being a sense of externality, but not exactly a projection into the surrounding world.

Case 66 [in Chapter VI, not here quoted] was really an example in point—the scene having apparently been something more than a vivid mental picture but not confounded with the objective world, or located in the actual place where the percipient was at the time. Very similar is an experience which befell a master at a large public school, in the summer of 1874 or 1875. Having been detained at home while a party of boys, accompanied by some masters and ladies, made a steamer excursion, he was, he says,

(219) “ Standing vacantly at the door of his house, doubtless thinking of the absentees and conjecturing how they were then employed. Suddenly he seemed to see a boy slip, when crossing the landing stage from the quay to the vessel, and fall into the water, wounding his mouth as he fell. There the vision ended. Mr. A. [the narrator] returned to his work, in which he was absorbed, until the return of Mrs. A. ; but so vivid was the impression on his mind of the reality of the occurrence that he had looked at his watch and noted the time exactly.

“ On his wife’s return Mr. A. at once said to her, ‘ Did you get that boy out of the water ? ’

“ Oh, yes; there was no harm done beyond the fright. But how should you know anything about it ? I am the first to arrive ; *they* are walking. *I* drove.’

“ ‘ Well, how about his lip ? Was it badly cut ? ’

“ ‘ It was not hurt at all ; you know X. has a harelip.’

“ Mr. A. has no explanation to offer : these are the facts.”

[Mr. A. was under the impression that the coincidence was precise. But the time of the vision was about 7 p.m. ; and we learn from the wife of the head-master, who was present, that the accident occurred before luncheon ; therefore, if telepathic, the case was one of the deferred class. This lady remembers that some of the party were afraid that the boy had cut his face, till the fact of the harelip was recalled. If we suppose the agent to have been Mrs. A., then the impression of the scene would seem to have been transferred, so to speak, ready-made—and to have received no development from the percipient.]

The following case, though undoubtedly sensory, seems still to belong to a somewhat indescribable stage of visualisation. If interpreted as telepathic, it is further of interest as illustrating that rarer type where the phantasm is not merely representative of the agent, but visibly reproduces some actual percept or idea which is prominently present at the time to the agent’s consciousness (see Chapter XII, beginning of § 5). The account is from Mr. F. Gottschalk, of 20, Adamson Road, Belsize Park, N.W., and is dated February 12th, 1886.

(220) Mr. Gottschalk begins by describing a friendship which he formed with Mr. Courtenay Thorpe, at the rooms of Dr. Sylvain Mayer, on the evening of February 20th, 1885. On February 24th, being anxious to hear a particular recitation which Mr. Thorpe was shortly going to give, Mr. Gottschalk wrote to him, at the Prince’s Theatre, to ask what the hour of the recitation was to be. “ In the evening I was going out to see some friends, when on the road there seemed suddenly to develop itself before me a disc of light, which appeared to be on a different plane to everything else in view. It was not possible for me to fix the distance at

which it seemed to be from me.¹ Examining the illumined space, I found that two hands were visible. They were engaged in drawing a letter from an envelope which I instinctively felt to be mine and, in consequence, thought immediately that the hands were those of Mr. Thorpe. I had not previously been thinking of him, but at the moment the conviction came to me with such intensity that it was irresistible. Not being in any way awe-struck by the extraordinary nature and novelty of this incident, but in a perfectly calm frame of mind, I examined the picture, and found that the hands were very white, and bared up to some distance above the wrist. Each forearm terminated in a ruffle; beyond that nothing was to be seen. The vision lasted about a minute. After its disappearance I determined to find out what connection it may have had with Mr. Thorpe's actual pursuit at the moment, and went to the nearest lamp-post and noted the time.

"By the first post the next morning, I received an answer from Mr. Thorpe, which began in the following way: 'Tell me, pray tell me, why did I, when I saw your letter in the rack at the Prince's Theatre, know that it was from you?' [We have seen this letter, which is dated 'Tuesday night'; and February 24th, 1885, fell on a Tuesday.] Mr. Thorpe had no expectation of receiving a letter from me, nor had he ever seen my writing. Even had he seen it, his knowledge of it would not affect the issue of the question, as he assured me that the impression arrived the moment he saw there was a letter under the 'T clip,' before any writing was visible. [Mr. Gottschalk explains that from the construction of the rack, which he has examined, the address on the envelope would be invisible.]

"On the evening of February 27th, by arrangement, I again met him at the rooms of Dr. Mayer, and there put questions to him with a view to eliciting some explanation. As near as possible, I give them as they were put at the time, and add the answers. It is necessary for me here to state that he and the Doctor were in complete ignorance of what had happened to me. Having first impressed upon him the necessity of answering in a categorical manner and with the greatest possible accuracy, I commenced:—

"'When did you get my Tuesday's letter?' 'At 7 in the evening, when I arrived at the theatre.' 'Then what happened?' 'I read it, but, being very late, in such a hurry that when I had finished I was as ignorant of its contents as if I had never seen it.' 'Then?' 'I dressed, went on the stage, played my part, and came off.' 'What was the time then?' 'About 20 minutes past 8.' 'What happened then?' 'I talked for a time with some of the company in my dressing-room.' 'For how long?' 'Twenty minutes.' 'What did you then do?' 'They having left me, my first thought was to find your letter. I looked everywhere for it, in vain. I turned out the pockets of my ordinary clothes, and searched among the many things that encumbered my dressing-table. I was annoyed at not finding it immediately, especially as I was anxious to know what it was about. Strangely enough I discovered it eventually in the coat which I had just worn in the piece "School for Scandal." I immediately read it again, was delighted to receive it, and decided to answer at once.' 'Now

¹ Cf. a remark in M. Marillier's account of his interesting subjective experiences, referred to in p. 338: "Je ne pourrais indiquer ni la place de l'image que j'ai objectivée, ni la distance à laquelle elle se trouve." The *indescritableness* of a certain sort of externalisation is well brought out in the same writer's description of his vision of parts of his body which could never actually be seen by him—e.g., the back of his head.

be very exact. What was the time when you read it on the second occasion ? ' ' As nearly as I can say 10 minutes to 9.'

" Thereupon I drew from my pocket a little pocket-diary in which I had noted the time of my vision, and asked Dr. Mayer to read what was written under the date 24th February.

" ' Eight minutes to 9.'

[Mr. Gottschalk has kindly allowed us to inspect his diary, which confirms all the dates given.]

" Having established in this way, without any assistance, the coincidence of time between his actually opening the envelope and my seeing him do so, I was satisfied as to the principal part, and proceeded to analyse the incident in detail. The whiteness of the hands was accounted for by the fact that actors invariably whiten their hands when playing a part like the one Mr. Thorpe was engaged in—' Snake ' in the ' School for Scandal.' The ruffles also formed part of the dress in this piece. They were attached to the short sleeves of the shirt which Mr. Thorpe was actually wearing when he opened my letter.

" This is the first hallucination I ever had. I have had one since of a similar nature, which I will recount separately.

" FERDINAND GOTTSCHALK."

Dr. Mayer, of 42, Somerset Street, Portman Square, W., corroborates as follows :—

" March 1, 1886.

" I well remember having read something [*i.e.*, in Mr. Gottschalk's diary]—the exact words memory will not allow me to give—which tallied almost exactly with the story told by Courtenay Thorpe ; and can bear positive testimony of the above conversation having taken place.

" SYLVAIN MAYER."

[We cannot lay any stress on Mr. Thorpe's impression as to the letter and its writer, since that may easily have been accidental. But it is a point to be noticed that he read the letter with very decided pleasure, after a considerable hunt for it—in other words, that the reading of the letter stood out rather distinctly from the general run of such experiences. Though the incident is trivial, the close correspondence of time and detail is strongly suggestive of telepathic clairvoyance. In the second case mentioned, an illuminated disc was again seen, which " seemed not to belong to the surroundings " ; but the details were not quite as distinctive as in the above instance.]

The fragmentary nature of the hallucination in this case has parallels, as we have seen, in the purely subjective class.¹ The " disc of light " is also to be noticed. (See Chapter XII, § 7, and compare the " bright oval " in p. 325, the " large flickering oval," p. 470, and the face " in the centre of a bright, opaque, white mass," in case 184. The exact description—a

¹ P. 325. The case in the *Phrenological Journal*, referred to below (p. 397, note), included visions of parts of figures, faces, half-faces, and limbs. There are many degrees of incompleteness. Thus, one of my correspondents, when out of doors, was startled by the sight of a man whose bearded face was clearly distinguished, but whose form stopped short at the knees ; another, on waking, saw " a shadow " bending over her, but with a face that was distinct. A very interesting case is that of the quarter-length Mr. Gabbage, cited by M. Ribot, *Maladies de la Personnalité*, p. 111. For further telepathic examples, see cases 161, 240, 350.

"disc of light"—recurs in the dream-case No. 464. [Not here reproduced.]

In the next stage of visualisation the percipient sees a face or figure projected or depicted, as it were, on some convenient surface—the image being thus truly externalised, but in an unreal and unsubstantial fashion, and in a bizzare relation to the real objects among which it appears. In this respect it might be compared to the "after-image" of the sun, or of some object that has been intently scrutinised through a microscope, which we involuntarily import into our views of the surrounding scene. The following example is taken from the *Memoirs of Georgiana, Lady Chatterton*, by E. H. Dering (1878), pp. 100–2. It exemplifies again the peculiarity observed in the last case—the blood being a feature in the vision which we may confidently refer to the agent's mind. Lady Chatterton narrates :—

(221) "My mother [the wife of the Rev. Tremonger Lascelles, Prebendary of Winchester], had not been very well, but there was nothing alarming in her state. I was suffering from a bad cold, and went early to bed one night, after leaving her in the drawing-room in excellent spirits, and tolerably well. I slept unusually well, and when I awoke, the moon was shining through the old casement brightly into the room. The white curtains of my bed were drawn to protect me from the draught that came through the large window ; and on this curtain, as if depicted there, I saw the figure of my mother, the face deadly pale, with blood flowing on the bed-clothes. For a moment I lay horror-stricken and unable to move or cry out, till, thinking it might be a dream or a delusion, I raised myself up in bed, and touched the curtain. Still the appearance remained (although the curtain on which it was depicted moved to and fro when I touched it) as if reflected by a magic-lantern. In great terror I got up, and throwing on a cloak, I rushed off through some rooms and a long passage to my mother's room. To my surprise, I saw from the further end of the passage that her door was open, and a strong light coming from it across the passage. As she invariably locked her door when she went to bed, my fears were increased by the sight, and I ran on more quickly still, and entered her room. There she lay, just as I had seen her on the curtain, pale as death, and the sheet covered with blood, and two doctors standing by the bedside. She saw me at once and seemed delighted to see me, though too weak to speak or hold out her hand. 'She has been very ill,' said the doctor, 'but she would not allow you to be called, lest your cold should be made worse. But I trust all danger is over now. . . . The sight of you has decidedly done her much good.' So she had been in danger, and would not disturb me ! Oh ! how thankful I felt to the vision of fancy, or whatever it may have been."

Mrs. Ferrers, of Baddesley Clinton, Knowle, a niece of Lady Chatterton's, wrote to us on October 24th, 1883, "This account is taken from a diary of my aunt's." She adds later :—

"I have often and often heard my aunt relate that vision, but it was not, so far as I know, recorded in any contemporary diary.

"Lady C. related the story to Lockhart and his daughter about 1843, and then wrote it down in her diary. The entry is not dated ; the date before it is May, 1843, that which follows, 1842, but it was evidently written down between 1839 and 1848. The book is very badly arranged as to chronology. I can't fix the date of Lady C.'s mother's death from it except that it was prior to 1836.

"R. H. FERRERS."

Here the picture, though not producing the impression of a solid and independent object, was clearly no mere illusion, no mere momentary translation of the folds or pattern of the drapery into a human face; it was accurate and persistent enough to resist a touch which shook the curtain on which it was shown. It is a point of interest that (besides a second veridical case given in Chapter XII, § 7) Lady Chatterton mentions having experienced another hallucination which, like the one just quoted, appeared *on a flat surface*.¹ On the theory of telepathic phantasms explained in Chapter XII, § 5, it is of course quite natural that a veridical and a non-veridical vision, or that several veridical visions, occurring to the same person, should present this amount of likeness, as, *e.g.*, in Mr. Gottschalk's experience. But the point is one that we can rarely observe, as few of our telepathic percipients have had any second hallucination of the senses at all.

But yet further stages remain, on the path to the final one of natural solid-looking externality. In the following case the image appeared with somewhat more of apparent relief than in Lady Chatterton's, but certainly not yet as co-ordinate in any natural fashion with the real objects in view. The account is from Mr. Richard Searle, barrister, of Home Lodge, Herne Hill, who tells us that he has had no other experience of a hallucination.

“ November 2nd, 1883.

(222) “ One afternoon, a few years ago, I was sitting in my chambers in the Temple, working at some papers. My desk is between the fireplace and one of the windows, the window being two or three yards on the left side of my chair, and looking out into the Temple. Suddenly I became aware that I was looking at the bottom window-pane, which was about on a level with my eyes, and there I saw the figure of the head and face of my wife, in a reclining position, with the eyes closed and the face quite white and bloodless, as if she were dead.

“ I pulled myself together, and got up and looked out of the window, where I saw nothing but the houses opposite, and I came to the conclusion that I had been drowsy and had fallen asleep, and, after taking a few turns about the room to rouse myself, I sat down again to my work and thought no more of the matter.

“ I went home at my usual time that evening, and whilst my wife and I were at dinner, she told me that she had lunched with a friend who lived in Gloucester Gardens, and that she had taken with her a little child, one of her nieces, who was staying with us; but during lunch, or just after it, the child had a fall and slightly cut her face so that the blood came. After telling the story, my wife added that she was so alarmed when she saw the blood on the child's face that she had fainted. What I had seen in the window then occurred to my mind, and I asked her what time it was when this happened. She said, as far as she remembered, it must have been a few minutes after 2 o'clock. This was the time, as nearly as I could calculate, not having looked at my watch, when I saw the figure in the window-pane.

¹ She records—apparently in her journal—that, when sleeping as a child in a “haunted room,” she woke in the middle of the night, and saw a brilliant light on the wall, and figures of men passing over it, as in a panorama, fighting. She inferred from the words and gestures of her nurse, who was apparently sitting up in her sleep with fixed and open eyes, that she saw the same scene; and the nurse may possibly have been the “agent” of the child's impression (see Chap. xviii., § 5).

"I have only to add that this is the only occasion on which I have known my wife to have had a fainting-fit. She was in bad health at the time, and I did not mention to her what I had seen until a few days afterwards, when she had become stronger. I mentioned the occurrence to several of my friends at the time.

"R. S."

Mr. Paul Pierrard, of 27, Gloucester Gardens, W., writes as follows:—

"4th December, 1883.

"It may be interesting for special observers to have a record of an extraordinary occurrence which happened about four years ago at my residence, 27, Gloucester Gardens, W.

"At an afternoon party of ladies and children, among whom were Mrs. Searle, of Home Lodge, Herne Hill, and her little niece, Louise, there was a rather noisy, bustling, and amusing game round a table, when little Louise fell from her chair and hurt herself slightly. The fear of a grave accident caused Mrs. Searle to be very excited, and she fainted.

"The day after, we met Mr. Searle, who stated that in the afternoon of the preceding day he had been reading important cases in his chambers, No. 6, Pump Court, Temple, when a peculiar feeling overcame him, and he distinctly saw, as it were in a looking-glass, the very image of his wife leaning back in a swoon, which seemed very strange at the moment.

"By comparing the time, it was found that this extraordinary vision was produced at the very same instant as the related incident.

"We often spoke of the case together, and could not find any explanation to completely satisfy our minds; but we registered this rare fact for which a name is wanted.

"PAUL PIERRARD."

Here there was more than the mere representation of the agent; she was represented apparently in the aspect which she actually wore, but in which the percipient had never seen her, and in which she would hardly be consciously picturing herself. We are scarcely driven, however, in this case, to the difficult conception of "telepathic clairvoyance" set forth in Chapter XII, § 8; for it is possible to suppose that the *idea* of fainting, impressed on Mr. Searle's mind, worked itself out into perception in an appropriate fashion.

The stage of visualisation in the next case is particularly interesting. The narrator is Mrs. Taunton, of Brook Vale, Witton, Birmingham.

"January 15th, 1884.

(223) "On Thursday evening, 14th November, 1867, I was sitting in the Birmingham Town Hall with my husband at a concert, when there came over me the icy chill which usually accompanies these occurrences.¹ Almost immediately, I saw with perfect distinctness, between myself and the orchestra, my uncle, Mr. W., lying in bed with an appealing look on his face, like one dying. I had not heard anything of him for several months, and had no reason to think he was ill. The appearance was not transparent or filmy, but perfectly solid-looking; and yet I could somehow see the orchestra, not through, but behind it. I did not try turning my eyes to see whether the figure moved with them, but looked at it with a fascinated expression that made my husband ask if I was ill. I asked him not to speak to me for a minute or two; the vision gradually

¹ This refers to a few other experiences of a different character, one of which, however, involved a hallucination of sight. For the cold sensation described see footnote to case 28.

disappeared, and I told my husband, after the concert was over, what I had seen. A letter came shortly after telling of my uncle's death. He died at exactly the time when I saw the vision.

" E. F. TAUNTON."

The signature of Mrs. Taunton's husband is also appended.

" RICH. H. TAUNTON."

We find from an obituary notice in the *Belfast News-Letter* that Mr. W. died on November 14th, 1867.

The phantasm here was perfectly external, and is described as " perfectly solid-looking "; yet it certainly did not hold to the real objects around the same relation as a figure of flesh and blood would have held ; it was in a peculiar way transparent. This feature is noticeable, as it is one which occasionally occurs also in hallucinations of the purely subjective class.¹ It may thus be taken as one of the numerous minor indications of the hallucinatory character of telepathic phantasms (see Chapter XII, § 10).

§ 2. In the remaining cases the illusion seems to have been practically complete. They constitute what may be called the normal type of these abnormal phenomena. The hallucination goes through no gradual process of formation, and is externalised as fully and naturally as a real object ; the agent contributes to it little, if any, of the actual detail of his condition ; the percipient contributes to it no special imagery or setting of his own.

The following narrative is from M. Gaston Fournier, of 21, Rue de

¹ Of many subjective hallucinations, it has been specially noticed that they hid whatever was behind the place which they appeared to occupy ; and the rule seems to be that when the percept is completely externalised, it is solid-looking. But exceptions are not infrequent. Whitish transparent figures were a feature in a pathological case first published in the *Phrenological Journal and Miscellany* (Edinburgh), No. vi., p. 290, etc., and described in the well-known article on " Spectral Illusions " in *Chambers' Miscellany*. Wundt (*Op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 357) records the experience of an overseer of forests, who saw heaps of wood all round him in his house, but also saw the furniture and carpet just as usual. Miss Morse, of Vermont, a careful observer, who has had hallucinations at rare intervals during a good many years, tells me, that at first " they seemed to be pictured just *within* instead of before my eyes." Lately, however, " they have usually been projected into space ; but however real the apparitions at first appear, a close inspection reveals that they have no solidity—that objects can be seen through them." Another of my informants, who on waking had a hallucination of a tall female figure, noticed that he could see a towel through her ; and similarly in one of my cases of persistent dream-images, Professor Goodwin reports that with him they " retain an appearance of solidity for some seconds after waking, the furniture of the room being distinctly recognised through these figures, like a dissolving view." Another correspondent describes such images as seen " as it were with one eye asleep, the other awake." In one of Paterson's cases (*Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* for Jan., 1843), the phantasm appeared as though seen through gauze. Mr. Lowell [see note, p. 153] tells me that though the figures he saw were sometimes quite natural-looking, at other times they were of the semi-transparent sort here described, allowing the wall or furniture to be seen through them. He spoke of these as looking as if composed of " blue film "—a description which is of great interest, when taken in connection with some of the telepathic cases, e.g., Nos. 194, 311. I have mentioned that the *disappearance* is occasionally through a stage of increased tenuity and transparency.

Berlin, Paris, an intimate friend of our esteemed collaborator, M. Ch. Richet. He has antedated the occurrence by about 18 months.

" 16 Octobre, 1885.

(224) " Le 21 février, 1879, j'étais invité à dîner chez mes amis, M. et Mme. B——. En arrivant dans le salon, je constate l'absence d'un comensal ordinaire de la maison, M. d'E——, que je rencontrais presque toujours à leur table. J'en fais la remarque, et Mme. B—— me répond que d'E——, employé dans une importante maison de banque, était sans doute fort occupé en ce moment, car on ne l'avait pas vu depuis deux jours. A partir de ce moment, *il ne fut plus plus question de d'E——*. Le repas s'achève fort gaiement, et sans que Mme. B—— donne la moindre marque visible de préoccupation. Pendant le dîner, nous avions formé le projet d'aller achever notre soirée au théâtre. Au dessert Mme. B—— se lève pour aller s'habiller dans sa chambre, dont la porte, restée entr'ouverte, donne dans la salle-à-manger. B—— et moi étions restés à table, fumant notre cigare, quand, après quelques minutes à peine, nous entendons un cri terrible. Croyant à un accident, nous nous précipitons dans la chambre, et nous trouvons Mme. B—— assise, prête à se trouver mal. Nous nous empressons autour d'elle; elle se remet peu à peu, et nous fait alors le récit suivant.

" 'Après vous avoir quittés, je m'habillais pour sortir, et j'étais en train de nouer les brides de mon chapeau devant ma glace, quand tout-à-coup j'ai vu dans cette glace d'E—— entrer par la porte.¹ Il avait son chapeau sur la tête; il était pâle et triste; sans me retourner je lui adresse la parole, "Tiens, d'E——, vous voilà; asseyez-vous donc"; et comme il ne répondait pas, je me suis alors retourné et je n'ai plus rien vu; prise alors de peur, j'ai poussé le cri que vous avez entendu.'

" B——, pour rassurer sa femme, se met à la plaisanter, traitant l'apparition d'hallucination nerveuse, et lui disant que d'E—— serait très flatté d'apprendre à quel point il occupait sa pensée; puis, comme Mme. B—— restait toute tremblante, pour couper court à son émotion, nous lui proposons de partir tout de suite, alléguant que nous allions manquer le lever du rideau. 'Je n'ai pas pensé un seul instant à d'E——,' nous dit Mme. B——, 'depuis que M. F.—— m'a demandé la cause de son absence. Je ne suis pas nerveuse, et je n'ai jamais eu d'hallucination; je vous assure qu'il y a là quelque chose d'extraordinaire, et quant à moi, je ne sortirai pas avant d'avoir des nouvelles de d'E——. Je vous supplie d'aller chez lui, c'est le seul moyen de me rassurer.' Je conseille à B—— de céder au désir de sa femme, et nous partons tous les deux chez d'E——, qui demeurerait à très peu de distance. Tout en marchant nous plaisantions beaucoup sur les frayeurs de Mme. B——.

" En arrivant chez d'E——, nous demandons au concierge, 'D'E——, est-il chez lui?' 'Oui, messieurs, il n'est pas descendu de la journée,' D'E—— habitait un petit appartement de garçon; il n'avait pas de domestiques. Nous montons chez lui, et nous sonnons à plusieurs reprises sans avoir de réponse. Nous sonnons plus fort, puis nous frappons à tour de bras, sans plus de succès. B——, émotionné malgré lui, me dit, 'C'est absurde, le concierge se sera trompé; il est sorti; descendons.' Mais le concierge nous affirme que d'E—— n'est pas sorti, qu'il en est absolument sûr. Véritablement effrayés, nous remontons avec lui, et nous tentons

¹ The vision in the glass is, of course, itself the hallucination in this case (cf. p. 277, note), and does not imply either actual reflection, or even a corresponding phantasm to be seen in the room, had Mme. B. turned her head. That such a phantasm might have appeared is, however, shown by the case in p. 296, note.

de nouveau de nous faire ouvrir ; puis n'entendant rien bouger dans l'appartement, nous envoyons chercher un serrurier. On force la porte, et nous trouvons le corps de d'E——, *encore chaud*, couché sur son lit, et troué de deux coups de revolver.

"Le médecin, que nous faisons venir aussitôt, constate que d'E—— avait d'abord tenté de se suicider en avalant un flacon de laudanum, et qu'ensuite, trouvant sans doute que le poison n'agissait pas assez vite, il s'était tiré deux coups de revolver à la place du cœur. D'après la constatation médicale, la mort remontait à une heure environ. Sans que je puisse préciser l'heure exacte, c'était cependant une coïncidence presque absolue avec la soi-disant hallucination de Mme. B——. Sur la cheminée il y avait une lettre de d'E——, annonçant à M. et Mme. B—— sa résolution, lettre particulièrement affectueuse pour Mme. B——.

"GASTON FOURNIER."

In conversation with Mr. Myers, M. Fournier expressed himself uncertain as to the correctness of his date. We have procured a copy of the *Acte de Décès*, which records that the date of d'E——'s death was October 7, 1880 ; also that it took place at 10 a.m. If this was so, it would still be quite possible that the body, which was clothed, should be found warm in the evening. Probably the hour could not be stated with anything like precision ; and it is as likely that the official record fixed it too early as that M. Fournier's medical authority (supposing him to be correctly quoted) fixed it too late. But we clearly cannot assume the coincidence to have been nearly as exact as M. Fournier imagined.

Mme. B. is dead. M. B. is unfortunately in South America ; and though we hope to obtain his account of the occurrence, it has not arrived in time for insertion.

[Omitting cases 225 and 226,] the next case—a recent one—is of a very unusual type as regards the effect on the percipient, and, perhaps, on that very account suggests the telepathic explanation rather more strongly than the facts warrant. But as regards the facts themselves, there can be little doubt. The evidence, though it does not come from the percipient, is of the sort which is as good as first-hand ; and this is the more fortunate, in that, as it happens, there never was a moment at which the first-hand evidence could have been given. The account is in the words of Mr. H. King, of the Royal Military College, York Town, Farnborough, Hants.

"March, 1885.

(227) "On Thursday night, October 30th [1884], H. M. and I went to dine at Broadmoor. We stayed till 10 p.m. or so, and on leaving the house were talking of different things, M. being quite as usual ; when, after five minutes' walk, M. suddenly stopped, and said, 'Look, look ! oh, look !' We thought nothing of it at first, but he still kept pointing with his finger at some imaginary thing in the darkness. The spot we were in was very dark, with a wood on our right and a field on our left, separated from us by a railing. Thinking M. saw somebody hiding behind a bush I went forward, but saw nothing. M. now, still saying 'Look at her, look at her,' fell back against the railing and lay motionless with his back against it. We ran to him, asking him what was the matter, but he only moaned. After a while he seemed better. We wanted him to come on, but he said, 'Where is my stick ?'—which he had dropped. 'Oh, never mind your stick,' I said, for I was afraid of not being at the

college before the shutting of the doors ; but he would look for his stick, which he found by lighting a match. We walked on together, M., notwithstanding all my efforts to get him into conversation, not saying a word. After walking for about a quarter of a mile, he suddenly said, 'Where were they carrying her to ? I tell you they were carrying her ; didn't you see them carrying her ?' I tried to quiet him, but he kept on saying, 'I tell you they were carrying her.' In a short time he was pacified and walked quietly on for half a mile or so, when he said, looking round in surprise, 'Hullo ! we must have come a short cut. I know this house.' I said we hadn't ; but he said, 'We must have run then. It seems only a minute ago since we left the house.' He several times expressed his surprise at the quickness we had done the last half-mile in. He was all right from this to the college.

"On Sunday morning he told me that something very bad happened on Thursday night. An old lady who was very fond of him, but whom he hadn't seen for a long time, had died suddenly of heart disease. She had been out somewhere and had come home, when, as she was receiving some friends, she fell dead, and, to use his words, she was carried out. I immediately asked him at what hour did she die ? He said at between 10 and 11. (It was a little after 10 when he saw his vision.) I could not get the exact hour of the lady's death, as he didn't like the subject. When he told me this, he knew nothing of what occurred on the walk home. When he was told of it, he didn't remember a thing about the vision ; but said if he hadn't known that he hadn't drunk anything (which was true), he would have said he had been drunk. He seemed to have been in a sort of stupor all the time. I think I ought to mention that he told me long before this that he had seen a vision of a girl who had been drowned.¹ This is a true account of what happened.

(Signed) "H. KING (the writer of the above).

"A. HAMILTON-JONES."

Mr. H. King adds, "My friend [Mr. Jones] remembers perfectly M.'s not being surprised at the news [of the death], and his saying it seemed to have happened before."

[Mr. R. A. King, of 36, Grove Lane, Denmark Hill, uncle of the narrator, through whose kindness we obtained this account, says : "M. has such a horror of the whole affair that my nephew does not let me write to ask him about the old lady's death." We are thus unable to verify the date of the death independently. M.'s name is known to me. He has left the Military College.]

The next case is from the Rev. F. Barker, late Rector of Cottenham, Cambridge.

"July 2nd, 1884.

(228) "At about 11 o'clock on the night of December 6th, 1873, I had just got into bed, and had certainly not fallen asleep, or even into a doze, when I suddenly startled my wife by a deep groan, and when she asked the reason, I said, 'I have just seen my aunt. She came and stood beside me, and smiled with her old kind smile, and disappeared.' A much-loved aunt, my mother's sister, was at that time in Madeira for her health, accompanied by my cousin, her niece. I had no reason to think that she was critically ill at this time, but the impression made upon me was so great that the next day I told her family (my mother among them) what I had

¹ This other vision followed closely on an accident which had much distressed the percipient.

seen. Within a week afterwards we heard that she had died on that very night, and, making all allowance for longitude, at about that very time.

"When my cousin, who was with her to the last, heard what I had seen, she said, 'I am not at all surprised, for she was calling out for you all the time she was dying.'

"This is the only time I have experienced anything of this nature. I think, perhaps, this story first-hand may interest you. I can only say that the vivid impression I received that night has never left me.

"FREDERICK BARKER."

We find the date of death confirmed in the *Times* obituary.

Mrs. Barker's account is as follows :—

"I recollect the circumstances well, upon which my husband wrote to you. It must have been somewhere about 11 o'clock. He was not asleep (for he had only just spoken), when he groaned deeply. I asked what was the matter, and he said his aunt, who was then in Madeira, had appeared to him, smiling at him with her own kind smile, and then vanished. He said she had 'something black, it might have been lace, thrown over her head.' The next day he told many relations of the occurrence, and it turned out she died that very night. Her niece, Miss Garnett, told me she was not at all astonished that he should have seen her aunt, for that while she was dying she was calling out for him. He had been to her almost like a son.

"P. S. BARKER."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Barker says, "My recollection is of some lace-like head-gear, as of a black lace veil thrown round the head."

The following statement is from Miss Garnett, who was with Mr. Barker's aunt at the time of her death :—

"Wyreside, near Lancaster.

"October, 1885.

"I beg to certify that I was with my aunt, Miss——, at the time of her death in Madeira, December 6th, 1873. On hearing that my cousin, the Rev. F. Barker, now living in Stanley Place, Chester, had had some kind of a vision of my aunt at a time almost exactly corresponding with that of her death, I told my uncle, from whom I heard of the occurrence, that I was not surprised, since my aunt had so frequently expressed a wish to see Mr. Barker during the last few days of her life.

"LOUISA GARNETT."

The following case [from the Additional Chapter] is from Mr. Teale, of 50, Hawley Road, Kentish Town, N.W.

"June, 1886.

(695) "In 1884, my son Walter was serving in the 3rd King's Royal Rifles Regiment, in the Soudan. The last we had heard from him was a letter informing us that he was about to return to England, which he expected would be about Christmas time. Things were in this position on the 24th October, 1884, when on returning home in the evening, I said (noticing my wife looking very white), 'Whatever is the matter with you?' and she said she had seen Walter, and he had stooped down to kiss her, but owing to her starting he—like—was gone, so she did not receive the kiss.

"After that we had a letter from the lady nurse at Ramleh Hospital to say that the poor boy had a third relapse of enteric fever; they thought

he would have pulled through, but he had been taken, and when we had that letter, it was a week after he died. But the date when the letter was written corresponded with the date of the day when Walter appeared, which was on the 24th October, 1884.

[When Mr. Teale used these words, he had not referred to the letter, and was under the impression that it had been written on the very day of the death, which (as will be seen below) was October 24.]

"My son Frederick, Selina, and Nelly were in the room, but none of them saw Walter; only Fred heard his mother scream, 'Oh!' and Fred asked her what was the matter. I thought, having heard many tales of this kind, I would set it down; so I put the date on a slip of paper. He was in his regimentals, and she thought he had come on furlough to take her by surprise—knowing the back way; but when she saw he was gone, and the door not open, she got dreadfully frightened.

"FRED. J. TEALE."

Mrs. Teale herself died in April, 1886, after an illness due in great measure to the shock of the bereavement.

Mr. Teale has shown me the letters which were received during August, September and October, 1884, respecting his son's condition. A letter, dated August 20, which the son dictated and signed, states that he is in hospital, down with enteric fever. The next letter, dated September 7, which was similarly dictated and signed, states that he has had a very serious illness, but is much better, and hopes soon to be home. The next letter, dated October 12, from Sister Thomas, states that he had had a bad relapse a fortnight previously, but "is getting on very nicely now." This was the last letter received before October 24. In a letter dated October 25, Lieutenant W. H. Kennedy states that the death had taken place on the preceding day; and in a letter dated October 28, Sister Thomas states that the death occurred about 2 o'clock p.m., on Friday, October 24. This date has been confirmed to us by an official communication from the *Depôt* at Winchester.

In conversation, Mr. Teale explained to me that his wife's experience took place between 7 and 8 in the evening—which would be between 7 and 8 hours after the death. She was at the time sitting at the table, talking. The son who was present is at a distance; but Miss Teale showed me how the persons in the room were placed, and described to me how she saw her mother start, and heard her exclamation. Mr. Teale is certain that his wife never experienced any other visual hallucination; and he says that she was of anything but a brooding temperament, and was not at the time anxious about her son. His note of the date of the vision was on the back of an envelope, which he carried in his pocket-book. He thought that this envelope was lost; but was kind enough, at my request, to make a search, which brought it to light. The envelope, which lies before me, bears his address, and the post-mark London, N., Feb. 22, 84; the pencil note on the back of it is 24-10-84.

[Cases 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, are omitted here.] The next case is from Miss Bale, of Church Farm, Gorleston.

"September 17th, 1885.

(236) "In the June of 1880, I went to a situation as governess. On the first day of my going there, after retiring for the night, I heard a noise which was like the ticking of a watch. I took no particular notice of it, but I noticed that every time I was alone I heard it, more especially at

night. I even went so far as to search, thinking there must be a watch concealed somewhere in the room. This continued until I grew quite accustomed to it. It was on the 12th of July, when I was coming from the dining-room with a tray of glasses that I saw what appeared to me to be a dark figure standing just outside the door, with outstretched arms. It startled me, and when I turned to look again it was gone.

"On the 23rd September I received news that my brother was drowned on the 12th of July. I heard the ticking up to the time I had the letter, but never once afterwards.

"F. A. BALE."

Writing again, Miss Bale says :—

"I enclose the letter informing us of my brother's death, also one from the captain of the ship, for your perusal.

"I made no entry in my diary of the apparition I saw on the 12th of July, but I distinctly remember the time. I sat down a little while to recover my fright, and then I looked at the time; it was 20 minutes past 6. I enclose the address of a friend who I am sure remembers it as well as I do. You will see by enclosed where my brother was when he met with his death.

"The apparition did remind me of my brother, as I last saw him in a long dark ulster, and it was about his height, but that was all I could discover, for when I looked a second time it was gone. What made me mention the ticking was the peculiarity of its following me *everywhere*, providing I was *alone*."

The enclosed letter, written by the Rev. W. A. Purey-Cust on board the ship "*Melbourne*," announced that Mr. William Bale's death occurred at 6 p.m. on July 12, 1880, about 150 miles south of Tristan d'Acunha, longitude 12° 30' W. Mr. Purey-Cust has since told us that on that day—and on that day only—the position of the ship had to be found by dead reckoning, the sun not being visible. The error in time arising in this way could not, however, have amounted to more than a minute or two, and Mr. Purey-Cust gives particulars which make it almost impossible that he can be mistaken in stating that the accident occurred at 6 p.m. by the ship's clock.

Mrs. Hart, of Baker Street, Gorleston, writes to us :—

"September 28th, 1885.

"On the night of the 12th of July, 1880, Miss Bale came to my house to supper, and she told me that she was coming from the drawing-room and she saw a dark figure standing just outside the door; she appeared very nervous. She said it reminded her of her brother, and remarked to me then that she knew something must have happened to him. I asked her if she noticed the time she saw it, and she told me that the apparition had startled her very much, and she had sat down a little time to recover the fright it gave her, and then she looked at the time; it was 6.20. She had previously told me of a ticking she heard everywhere she went, so long as she was alone, but directly anyone joined her it ceased; and she told me she heard it up to the day she received the news of her brother's death, but not afterwards.

"H. HART."

Miss Bale adds :—

"September 24th, 1885.

"There was one incident I did not tell you, thinking it too trivial, as I did not notice the date or hour, but I know it was shortly before I heard the news of my brother's death. I had been in bed a short time, and I

heard a tremendous crash like the smashing of a lot of china. I felt too nervous to go and see what it was, but nothing was broken or disturbed in the morning, and for three nights in succession I heard the same. I am not inclined to think that it was in any way corresponding with my brother's death. I certainly have never heard imaginary voices nor seen imaginary figures except the apparition I saw the day my brother was drowned."

[There seems to be no reason for connecting the ticking sound with Mr. Bale's death, any more than the crash of china; and it is probable that it was due to a merely physical affection, to which the shock of receiving the news perhaps put an end. It seemed right, however, to mention it; since, if it was a hallucination, it would tend to show that Miss Bale was for some time in a condition favourable to purely subjective hallucinations—which would slightly weaken the force of the coincidence of the visual hallucination with her brother's death. It will be noticed that, allowing for longitude, the death occurred—according to the statements made—about half an hour after the apparition. But as the difference is so small,—it seems more probable that it is due to error in Miss Bale's observation or memory, or in the time of her clock, than that so close a coincidence was purely accidental.]

The next few cases, though depending in the first instance on witnesses in a humbler station, are, as far as I can judge, faithfully reported. The narrator of the first of them is Ellen M. Greany, a trusted and valued servant in the family of Miss Porter, at 16, Russell Square, W.C.

" May 20th, 1884.

(237) " I sat one evening reading, when on looking up from my book, I distinctly saw a school-friend of mine, to whom I was very much attached, standing near the door. I was about to exclaim at the strangeness of her visit, when, to my horror, there were no signs of any one in the room but my mother. I related what I had seen to her, knowing she could not have seen, as she was sitting with her back towards the door, nor did she hear anything unusual, and was greatly amused at my scare, suggesting I had read too much or been dreaming.

" A day or so after this strange event, I had news to say my friend was no more. The strange part was I did not even know she was ill, much less in danger, so could not have felt anxious at the time on her account, but may have been thinking of her; that I cannot testify. Her illness was short, and death very unexpected. Her mother told me she spoke of me not long before she died, and wondered I had not been to see her, thinking, of course, I had some knowledge of her illness, which was not the case. It may be as well to mention she left a small box she prized rather, to be given to me in remembrance of her. She died the same evening and about the same time that I saw her vision, which was the end of October, 1874.

" ELLEN M. GREANY."

In answer to an inquiry, Ellen Greany adds that this hallucination is the only one she has ever experienced. She tells Miss Porter that she went to see her dead friend before the funeral, which accords with her statement that she heard the news of the death very soon after it occurred; and there is no reason to doubt that, at the time when she heard the news, she was able correctly to identify the day of her vision.

Her mother corroborates as follows :—

" Acton, July, 1884.

" I can well remember the instance my daughter speaks of. I know she was not anxious at the time, not knowing her friend was ill. I took

no notice of it at the time, as I do not believe in ghosts, but thought it strange the next day, when we heard she was dead, and died about the same time that my daughter saw her.

"MARGARET GREANY."

[I have seen Ellen Greany, who is a superior and intelligent person. She went over her story without prompting, giving an entirely clear and consistent account, and standing cross-examination perfectly. But the favourable effect of such an interview on one's own mind cannot, of course, be conveyed to others.]

The following account was first published in *The Englishman*, on May 13th, 1876.

(238) "A labourer named Duck, employed by Mr. Dixon, of Mildenhall Warren Farm, near Marlborough, was in charge of a horse and water-cart on the farm, when the animal took fright and knocked him down. The wheel went over his chest, and he died shortly afterwards. Immediately after the accident, Mr. Dixon despatched a woman to Ramsbury, where Duck lived, to make known the fact to his wife. On arriving at her home the messenger found her out gathering wood, but shortly after a girl, who was her companion, arrived, and, without being told of what had occurred, volunteered the statement that Ria (Mrs. Duck) was unable to do much that morning, that she had been very much frightened, having seen her husband in the wood. Shortly afterwards Mrs. Duck returned without any wood, and being informed by a neighbour that a woman from Mildenhall Woodlands wished to see her, ejaculated 'My David's dead then.' Inquiry has since been made by Mr. Dixon of the woman, and she positively asserts that she saw her husband in the wood, and said, 'Hallo David, what wind blows you here?' and that he made no answer. Mr Dixon inquired what time this occurred, and she replied about 10 o'clock the time at which the fatal accident occurred."

On the appearance of this account, our friend, Mr. F. W. Percival, of 36, Bryanston Street, W., wrote to Mr. Dixon to inquire into the facts, and received from him the following confirmation:—

"May 25th, 1876.

"As soon as it happened (Duck's death), I sent one of my female servants to inform his wife of the sad occurrence, to a place called Ramsbury, about four miles from where it occurred. But when she got there, his wife was gone to get wood at a distant wood, the woman stopping for her return at an adjoining cottage. But Maria returned without any wood, saying she had seen her husband, and asked him how he came there—telling the woman that she knew her business, that she was come to inform her of her husband's death, and that she had seen him as plain as ever she did in her life, and said to him, 'Hallo, David, what wind blew you here?' but as she saw him no more, she became much frightened, and left the wood."

"June 1st, 1876.

"The woman I sent told me, when she got to Ramsbury to Duck's house, her neighbour told her that she was gone to get wood and her (the neighbour's) little girl was gone with her. The girl soon returned saying Maria Duck was much frightened in the wood, and had seen her husband and spoken to him, but as he made no reply she became faint, and told the girl to go home, as she knew something had happened to David. That was before she knew the woman was sent. When she got home and found the

woman waiting for her return she said she knew her errand, and asked her if her husband was not dead, and seemed much frightened, the woman telling her he was very ill, and thought he would not be living to see her again. When she got to Warren, she found him dead, and told us the time she saw him, which was exactly the time he lost his life ; therefore I think the public is bound to believe it, although it seems to us quite a mystery. Duck's wife is now in Hungerford Union, her home broken up by his death. The woman I sent is Mary Holick, has been living with me some time, and her word is to be relied on. " BENJAMIN DIXON."

Mrs. Duck has since died ; but Mrs. Holick dictated and signed the following account :—

" January 26th, 1886.

" I well remember about poor old David Duck. I am never likely to forget it. The cart-wheel passed over his chest and killed him, and I was sent down by Mr. Dixon to tell his wife at Ramsbury. She was not at home ; she was out gathering wood with the little girl of a neighbour ; so I went to this neighbour's house to wait. Presently the little girl came in, and said that Mrs. Duck was in a great way because she had seen her husband in the wood, and when she spoke to him and said, ' What wind blows you here, Davie ? ' he disappeared away, and she fell back on the bank half fainting with fright ; and the little girl ran down and found her like it. So she had gathered very little wood. If the little girl had not told me first, I never could have really believed that she had seen him. But when she came back, about half an hour after the little girl (who had come on in front, full of what Mrs. Duck had seen), it was all true. I shall never forget her ; she came in with her hands stretched out, and said, looking at me, ' She has come to tell me that my Davie is killed. I knew he was ; I have seen his ghost. I didn't need anyone to tell me.' And then she told us, afterwards, how she had suddenly seen him in front of her, in his usual clothes ; and how she spoke to him, and he vanished. She lived about half a mile from the woman I was waiting with ; and we sent another woman to her house to tell her, when she came home, that a person from Mr. Dixon's wanted to see her. So directly she told her, she said, ' She has come to tell me my poor Davie is killed ; but I didn't want anyone to tell me, for I *know* ; I have just seen his ghost.' And the woman said, ' Don't give way now, but come with me, there's a good woman.' And they came ; and I shall never forget her as she came stumbling up the steps, and looked at me and said, ' For God's sake tell me ; my Davie is dead.' She had seen him just as natural as life, every bit ; but the little girl never saw anything, only she knew Mrs. Duck had, when she helped her off the bank, where she fell when he disappeared. She was a very good woman, I think, and her husband was a very quiet man ; and she was as strong as any man, and worked hard from early morning."

We find from the Register of Deaths that David Duck died on March 31, 1874.

[Mrs. Holick's account fairly comes into the class of evidence reckoned as on a par with first-hand (p. 119) ; as, though she did not actually receive a description of the apparition from Mrs. Duck's own lips before Mrs. Duck heard the fatal news, she saw her in the state of agitation, and heard her express the conviction, which the apparition had produced. Mrs. Holick is quite clear that she herself was the first to communicate the news.]

In the next example accident has made the evidence for the facts very fairly strong ; but the case is to some extent weakened by the percipient's knowledge that the person whose phantasm he saw was ill. The case was first described to us by a clergyman as follows :—

“ March 5th, 1885.

(239) “ Some 18 or 19 years ago, I remember calling on a working maltster, whose employer was living at Lincoln. His employer was ill at the time, and I asked the man if he had heard from him lately. ‘ No,’ he said, ‘ but I am afraid he is dead.’ And on my inquiring why he thought so, he replied that on going out that morning early, he had seen his employer standing on the top of the steps that lead up to the kiln door, as plainly as he ever had seen him in his life.

“ It was as he expected : the first news that came reported his employer's death.

“ I have no doubt the man I speak of either saw this appearance, or *believed* he saw it.”

In answer to inquiries, this informant says :—

“ March 12th, 1885.

“ Since receiving your letter, I have had the curiosity to look over my old diaries, thinking I might have made a note of the occurrence, and under the date of Thursday, the 22nd of October, 1863, I find the follow-
Dead.

ing :—‘ Report of Mr. W.'s death.

M. saw his “ wraith ” on

▲

Tuesday morning about 5 o'clock.’

“ This differs somewhat from what I told you in my last letter, for I said that the man had seen the appearance that same morning in which I spoke with him. Here it seems it was two days before. But still he had told me *before* it was known for a certainty that Mr. W. was dead. For you observe the word ‘ dead ’ put in over the ▲. This I know from my own habit was put in afterwards. There is no communication between this place and Lincoln, except on the market day, Friday. At that time of year, moreover, the carriers who go to Lincoln would not get back before night, and consequently I should most probably not have learned the certainty of the report until some time on Saturday. Then, instead of making a new note of it, I simply put in the word ‘ dead ’ to show that the report was true when I first heard it. Moreover, I used the Scotch word ‘ wraith ’ instead of ‘ ghost ’ or ‘ spirit,’ as I had an idea that the former word was applied to appearances before death.

“ I observe that the man said ‘ about 5 o'clock.’ Of course, this would be a vague expression for any time up to 5.30, or thereabouts, when the morning would not be very clear perhaps, but sufficiently so to enable one to see an object some 10 or 12 yards off, and I am not sure it was quite so much.

“ I cannot say that Mr. W. was dead at the time M. saw the appearance, but he was certainly dead at the time he told me of it, otherwise I should not have inserted the word ‘ dead ’ where I did.

“ I may add that Mr. W. had formerly lived in this village, and I had known him well. He had gone to live in Lincoln only a short time before his death. His malt kiln was his only means of providing for his wife and family—five or six young children—and he had been in the habit of coming over to see how things went on, twice a week. There is nothing

more natural than that his thoughts (and they must have been very anxious thoughts) should have been fixed on that one place."

The following is the percipient's own account :—

" Ridley's Yard, North Gate, Newark, Notts., March 16th, 1885.

" I have received your letter asking me to forward you what I said about my dear Mr. Wright, for he was a very good master. I said I saw him standing on the steps, with one hand on the handrail ; my light went out, and I saw no more, and he died, and I hope he is at rest. That was at 4 o'clock in the morning, before he departed from us.

" J. MERRILL."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Merrill adds, on April 6, 1885 :—

" I am very sorry to let you know that I do not remember the date that dear Mr. Wright died, but I think it was the latter end of 1863. I looked my old books over, but, with the trade being carried on in the same way, I have nothing to go by. I saw him as plain as in the middle of the day, for he stood just the same as he did when he came at noon, looking on to the house for me to go to him. I never saw anything before, to my mind." [The last sentence is in answer to the question whether the above was his only experience of a hallucination.]

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mr. Wright died on Oct. 22, 1863, of "gastric fever." The apparition therefore took place two days before the death, but no doubt at a time of critical illness. In conversation, Mr. Merrill's wife stated that she remembered laughing at her husband's account of his strange experience when he returned home. Neither of them seems to have then connected the apparition with the idea of death.

The following case was written down by our valued helper, Miss Porter, from the account of Mrs. Banister, of Eversley, mother of the percipient, Mrs. Ellis, of Portesbery Road, Camberley, who has signed it as correct.

" August 5th.

(240) " In September, 1878, I, then residing in York Town, Surrey, three times during the day distinctly saw the face of an old friend, Mr. James Stephenson, who I afterwards heard died that day in Eversley, five miles off. I saw it first about half-past 10 in the morning ; the last time it was nearly 6 o'clock. I knew him to be ill.

(Signed) " MARY ELLIS."

A memorial card shows that Mr. Stephenson died on Sept. 19, 1878.

Mr. Stephenson had not been on friendly terms with Mrs. Banister or her daughter ; but Mrs. Banister, by his desire, went to see him just before his death. [Mr. Gurney states in reply to criticism by Professor Peirce¹ that " There had been no ' reconciliation ' between the percipient and the dying man ; nor was she aware of her mother's visiting him."—ED.]

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Ellis says :—

" I told my husband, and a young man, whose name is Swiney, at the tea-table the same afternoon, and after leaving the table to go into another room I saw it again—which was the last time. I did not hear of Mr.

¹ *Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research*, 1888, vol. i., p. 297.

Stephenson's death until the next day, nor did I know that he was so near death. My husband remembers it well, but the children were then too young to notice such a thing. I have never seen anything like it before or since, and I hope I never shall again. "MARY ELLIS."

Mr. Ellis writes :—

"I quite well remember my wife speaking of the figure that she had seen during the day. The next day we heard of Mr. Stephenson's death. "E. J. ELLIS."

Mr. Herbert Swiney, writing on September 29th, 1885, from Tregarthen House, Romford Road, Forest Gate, says that he only faintly recollects the matter.

If correctly reported, this case presents two of the rarer features which are common to telepathic and to purely subjective hallucinations; the *fragmentary* nature of the percept—a face only—and the *repetition* after an interval of some hours.¹

The next case must be reckoned as one of non-recognition, as the resemblance between the phantasm and the person who died was not remarked until the fact of death was known. The narrator, Mr. S. J. Masters, of 87, Clifford Crescent, Southampton, will hardly be accused of excessive sentimentality.

"December 14th, 1882.

(241) "Last Easter Sunday, I was retiring to bed, just after 11 o'clock, and had stepped off the stairs on the landing that led to my room (my parents' bedroom door being in front of me, about 10 or 12 ft., and my door being about 2 ft. to the right, so that I had to pass it to get to my room). I saw their bedroom door was open, and I was riveted to the spot by seeing standing in the room doorway in front of me, a figure of a female; although I could not distinguish the dress, I could plainly see the features, and especially the eyes. I must have stood there at least 20 seconds, for my mother, hearing me stop suddenly before reaching my room, at last opened the door (below) and asked what was the matter. I then came downstairs and stopped with them till we all retired together. The figure collapsed when my mother called upstairs, and the light I held in my hand shone through the doorway to the opposite wall, which had been obscured by the figure, as if it had had a tangible body.

"It was not till the following Wednesday that my mother, on reading the mid-weekly local paper, saw the death of a young lady with whom I had once kept company for a short time. On inquiry, I found she died about the same time as I saw the apparition. I feel convinced it was her, for the eyes had the same expression, although I could not recognise her at the time; not having seen the girl for quite six months, I had almost forgotten her existence. She died in decline, which accounts for her not being about the town before her death.

"S. J. MASTERS."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on March 5, 1882. This was a Sunday, but not Easter Sunday. The mention of the *Wednesday* paper seems also to be a mistake; as the death does not appear in the Wednesday issue of either of the two bi-weekly South-

¹ As to the first point, see p. 393, note; as to the second, see p. 278.

ampton papers, though it appears in the Saturday issue of one of them, on March 11th. These mistakes are not important. For even apart from Mr. Masters' observation of the coincidence at the time, Easter Sunday seems a very unlikely day to have been named, if the experience had really fallen on a week-day; and if it fell on a Sunday, there is no reason to doubt that it fell on the Sunday before the announcement of the death—*i.e.*, on the day of the death.

The narrator's mother corroborates as follows :—

" I remember, perfectly well, the circumstance, and the effect it produced on my son at the time. He is not of a nervous disposition, nor a believer in anything at all approaching Spiritualism, as we all belong to the Church. His father and I thought it might betoken the death of some near friend or relative, having heard of such things, but never had seen so direct an appearance ourselves.

" ELIZABETH MASTERS."

[Mr. Masters has reason to think that the young lady's attachment to him had continued. He reports that on more exact inquiry, he finds the death to have occurred within a quarter of an hour of the apparition—probably after rather than before it. Asked if he had ever experienced any other hallucinations, he replied in the negative.]

The next case is one of the most singular in our collection. It is from Mrs. Clerke, of Clifton Lodge, Farquhar Road, Upper Norwood, S.E.

" October 30th, 1885.

(242) " In the month of August, 1864, about 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon, I was sitting reading in the verandah of our house in Barbadoes. My black nurse was driving my little girl, about 18 months or so old, in her perambulator in the garden. I got up after some time to go into the house, not having noticed anything at all—when this black woman said to me, ' Missis, who was that gentleman that was talking to you just now ? ' ' There was no one talking to me,' I said. ' Oh, yes, dere was, Missis—a very pale gentleman, very tall, and he talked to you, and you was very rude, for you never answered him.' I repeated there was no one, and got rather cross with the woman, and she begged me to write down the day, for she knew she had seen someone. I did, and in a few days I heard of the death of my brother in Tobago. Now, the curious part is this, that I did not see him, but she—a stranger to him—did; and she said that he seemed very anxious for me to notice him.

" MAY CLERKE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Clerke says :—

" (1) The day of death was the same, for I wrote it down. I think it was the 3rd of August, but I know it was the same.

" (2) The description, ' very tall and pale,' was accurate.

" (3) I had no idea that he was ill. He was only a few days ill.

" (4) The woman had never seen him. She had been with me for about 18 months, and I considered her truthful. She had *no object* in telling me."

In conversation, I learned that Mrs. Clerke had immediately mentioned what the servant said, and the fact that she had written down the date, to her husband, Colonel Clerke, who corroborates as follows :—

" I well remember that on the day on which Mr. John Beresford, my wife's brother, died in Tobago—after a short illness of which we were not aware—our black nurse declared she saw, at as nearly as possible the time

of his death, a gentleman, exactly answering to Mr. Beresford's description, leaning over the back of Mrs. Clerke's easy-chair in the open verandah. The figure was not seen by any one else. "SHADWELL H. CLERKE."

We find it stated in Burke's *Peerage* that Mr. J. H. de la Poer Beresford, Secretary for the Island of Tobago, died on August 3, 1863 (not 1864).

If this incident is to be interpreted telepathically, it is scarcely possible to suppose that Mrs. Clerke's own presence did not play a part in the phenomenon. The case would then be comparable to some of the "collective" cases (to be cited in Chapter XVIII), where one of the percipients is a stranger to the agent; the difference being that here the person who should (so to speak) have been the principal percipient was as unconscious of the impression which she received as we have found the percipient to be in some of the experimental cases.¹ Another instance of the same kind is No. 355 (p. 510, and see p. 515).

¹ As one more example of the psychological identity of hallucinations and dreams Chap. xii., § 5), I may quote an account of a dream which is an exact parallel to the above waking case.

In the last week of February, 1885, Miss Harris, of 9, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, W.C., wrote to us as follows:—

"On Thursday night, the 19th of February, 1885, I dreamed the following dream. A servant, a Lincolnshire woman, has lived in our house for two years; and of her, whom I never see in the day, I dreamt, as portentously as if her troubles were my own. There is nothing remarkable in this young woman's character or experience. She is but an ordinary rather rough specimen of a village girl, quiet and respectable.

"In my dream a long country lane was before me; in this I walked with the Lincolnshire cook, without speaking; yet I knew that my companion was going with me as a sort of escort to some errand of my own. Then a face appeared over the hedge, a solemn, silent face, exactly resembling that of the one who noiselessly moved beside me; the sternest suffering was impressed upon the plain hard-lined countenance. From beside me the country servant instantly departed to follow the warning voiceless form through the hedge, into a little house. Only a long minute passed, and the servant rushed from the hedge, absolutely wringing her hands, crouching to the ground in dumb agony. 'Tis my sister called me, she beckoned me in; but she will not speak: she will not have me with her.' As she spoke the vision returned. It looked over the low hedge, with the same indescribable expression of sadness unspeakable—of a terrible woe impossible of utterance. It flung back its sleeve, and, lifting one arm, pointed to a single white spot in the centre of a finger. And as suddenly as I had fallen on this dream, so suddenly I awoke. I tried to cast off the shadow the dream had cast on me. But the same evening came the news that the country cook's sister was very ill, and had prematurely been confined with a child born dead.

"EMILY MARION HARRIS."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Harris adds:—

"Certainly I repeated my dream even before I left my room. I asked the housemaid whether she knew of any reason her fellow-servant might have to fear, or to hear bad news. She said, 'No,' and after that I told my sister. Nothing was said about the dream during Friday. On Saturday morning, when I returned from a class—having dismissed the occurrence from my mind for the time—my sister immediately told me that the coincidence of dream and fact were marvellously similar. The poor woman whom I saw with such dumb appeal on her countenance, was alone, unable to speak, meeting her trouble alone, her husband, who is a policeman, being on night duty. She thought it was impossible to be heard, till she found a stick of his, and contrived to knock on the floor."

Miss Harris's sister corroborates as follows:—

"March 16th, 1885.

"It was directly I came out of my room, before I went downstairs, that my sister told me the dream she wrote to you about, and which she had dreamed between night and morning.

"CLARA DE H. HARRIS."

§ 3. I will now give a group of cases in respect of which the hypothesis of *mistaken identity* has to be taken into account. The apparition in all of them was seen out-of-doors, and in several of them in the street—which is the place where such mistakes are most liable to occur. Now, with respect to mistakes of identity, made at the time when the person who seems to be seen is really dying at a distance, one general remark has to be made—namely, that cases in which they have occurred are not thereby at once put out of court, for the purpose of my argument. For if telepathic hallucinations are facts in nature, the possibility of *telepathic illusions* cannot reasonably be excluded. Illusions, as I have remarked (p. 288), are merely the sprinkling of fragments of genuine hallucination on a background of true perception; and it is surely not more difficult to suppose that a mind which is telepathically affected can project its sensory delusion on some real figure which bears a general resemblance to the agent, than that it can project it in vacancy. But of course the coincidence with A's death of an *illusion* in which the perceiver mistook B for A would have far less force as evidence for telepathy than the coincidence with A's death of a *hallucination* representing him, simply because purely subjective mistakes as to identity are far commoner things than purely subjective hallucinations. To find the probability that a person will by accident make a particular mistake of identity on a particular day of his life, we must multiply the fraction $\frac{1}{\text{number of days of his life}}$ by the number of similar mistakes, in similar circumstances of light, distance, &c., that he makes altogether; and we must divide the result by the number of acquaintances any one of whom, if chance alone acted, is as likely as the one who died on the particular day to be the one wrongly identified on that day. This process may reduce the probability of a telepathic explanation of the coincidence from odds of millions to 1 (as found in the case of hallucinations) to odds of thousands to 1; but in a cumulative argument, odds of that magnitude are clearly not to be neglected. However, with regard to the following specimens, or most of them, such considerations are hardly needed. They seem pretty certainly to be cases of hallucination, and stand, for instance, on different ground from the incidents mentioned above (p. 103), where the hypothesis of mistaken identity seemed fairly plausible.

The first account is from the Chevalier Sebastiano Fenzi, of the Palazzo Fenzi, Florence, a corresponding member of the S.P.R. The peculiar melancholy described as preceding the vision may possibly exemplify the *gradual* emergence of telepathic impressions into consciousness, which was exemplified in Chapter XII, § 3.

“ November 13th, 1883.

(243) “ Some months before his demise, my brother (Senator Carlo Fenzi) one day, as we were driving to town together from our villa of St. Andrea, told me that if he should be summoned first, he would endeavour to prove to me that life continued beyond the chasm of the grave, and that I was to promise him the same in case I went first; ‘*but,*’ said he, ‘I am sure to go first, and, mind you, I feel quite sure that before the year is out—nay, in three months—I shall be no more.’ This was said in June and he died on the 2nd of September, the same year, 1881.

“ Now, on that fatal morning (the 2nd of September), I was some 70

miles away from Florence, namely, at Fortullino, a villa of ours on a rock on the sea, 10 miles south-east of Leghorn. Well, at about half-past 10 in the morning, I was seized with a fit of deep melancholy—a thing very unusual with me, who enjoy great serenity of mind. I had, however, no reason for being alarmed about my brother, who was then in Florence—as, although he had not been very well, the latest news of him was very good, as my nephew had written to say, ‘*Uncle is doing very comfortably, and it cannot even be said that he has really been ill*’—so that I could not account for this sudden gloomy impression; yet the tears stood in my eyes, and in order not to burst out crying like a baby before our family party, I rushed out of the house without my hat on, although it was blowing a hurricane, and the rain fell in torrents, accompanied by permanent flashes of lightning, and the loud and unceasing roar of the sea and of thunder.

“I ran and ran, and only stopped when I had reached the end of a spacious lawn, from whence are seen, close on the other side of a small stream (the Fortulla), the huge stones or rocks heaped on one another, and stretching for a good half-mile along the sea coast. I there gazed to try and see a youth, a cousin of mine, who, having been born among the Zulus, retained enough of love for savage life to have yielded to the wish of going out in that terrible weather, ‘to enjoy,’ he said, ‘the fury of the elements.’ Judge of my surprise and astonishment when, instead of Giovanni (such is my cousin’s name), I saw my brother, with a top hat and his big white moustachios, stepping leisurely along from one rock to another, as if the weather were fair and calm! I could not believe my eyes; and yet, there he was—he, unmistakably! I thought of rushing back to the house to call every one out to give him a hearty welcome, but then preferred waiting for him, and meanwhile waved my hand to him and called out his name as loud as I possibly could, although with the awful noise of wind, and sea, and thunder combined, nothing could naturally be heard. He meanwhile continued to advance, until, having reached a rock larger than the rest, he slipped behind it. The distance between myself and the rock was, as nearly as I can judge, not more than 60 paces. I waited for him to reappear on the other side—but to no purpose, and I only saw Giovanni, who was just then emerging from a wood, and stepping on to the rocks. Giovanni, tall and slight, with a broad-brimmed hat and dark beard, was altogether a very different type, and I thought that my having seen Charles, my brother, must have been a freak of my sense of vision, and felt rather annoyed, and almost blushed at the idea that I could have been so deceived by a sort of phantom of my own fancy; yet could not help telling Giovanni, ‘There must be some family likeness, for I must positively have taken you for Charles, although I cannot make out how you could have gone from behind the huge rock into the wood without my seeing you cross over.’ ‘*I never was behind the rock,*’ he said, ‘*for when you saw me, I had but just put my foot on the rocks.*’

“Meanwhile we went home, put on fresh clothes, and then joined the rest to breakfast. My melancholy had left me, and I conversed merrily with all the young people. After breakfast a telegram came, telling me and my daughter Christina to hasten home, as Carlo had suddenly been taken very ill. We made preparations to at once depart, and meanwhile another telegram came, urging us to make all possible haste, as the illness was making rapid strides, but although we caught the nearest train, we only arrived in Florence at night; where we found, to our horror, that my brother had died just at the time when in the morning I had seen him on the rocks, when, feeling that his moments were numbered, he had been continually asking for me, regretting not to see me appear.

"In kissing his cold forehead with intense sorrow, as we had lived together, and loved one another during our whole lives, I thought, '*Poor dear Charlie; he kept his word!*'"

"SEBASTIANO FENZI."

In answer to inquiries, Chevalier Fenzi tells us that his "eyesight is excellent, especially at moderate distances." He has had one other experience of visual hallucination—representing an unrecognised figure—which was probably subjective.

The "Giovanni" of the narrative corroborates as follows:—

"Athens, (English address, 131, Tavistock Street, Bedford).

"May 3rd, 1884.

"My cousin, Sebastiano Fenzi, of Florence, has sent me your letter of 13th March last, with a request that I would give you my recollections of the strange circumstance attending the death of his brother, Carlo Fenzi, in September, 1881, a circumstance which made (and has left) a deep impression on my mind. I will endeavour to recall the whole circumstance. Nearly three years, it is true, have since passed, but my recollection of the event, on account of its strangeness, remains clear.

"Passing through Italy in the autumn of 1881, I profited by the occasion to visit my relatives. At Milan I learnt that the major portion were at Fortullino, my cousin's seaside villa. Thither I accordingly went, arriving the last days of August. Fortullino is a charming villa, situated on the top of a cliff on the sea, and surrounded by deep growths of trees and shrubs. The weather, during the beginning of my stay, was very bad, rain, thunder, strong winds, and heavy sea. I remember that on the morning of my cousin's death—none then dreamed the end was near—indulging in a favourite weakness (?).—I started off alone for an escapade along the shore. Descending by the hillside to the beach, I passed on, leaping from boulder to boulder, climbing over, or passing round them when too huge, past a bend, which hid me from a view of the villa, for some distance along the shore.

"Returning for breakfast, I found the rain (driven into my face by the wind) blinding, and, fearing an accident, entered the wood. The undergrowth of the shrubs, and the wet state of the ground, urged me to try the open again. This I did, emerging just inside the bend, in full sight of the house. To my surprise I saw my cousin standing on the edge of the cliff. When I approached him he remarked that there must be a strange family likeness, as he had mistaken me for his brother Carlo, being on the rocks, but wondered how I had managed to enter the wood unseen by him, and then suddenly leave it again. I replied that he had not seen me on the rocks before leaving the wood (for I was out of sight). The matter shortly afterwards dropped. Scarcely was breakfast over than a wire arrived, summoning him and his daughter Christina to Florence,—Carlo was very ill. They left at once, I staying, at their request, with the younger members at Fortullino. Our next news was that Carlo Fenzi had died—about the very time that Sebastiano had fancied to have mistaken me for his brother.

"JOHN DOUGLAS DE FENZI."

[Even apart from the evidence that "Giovanni" was not in sight when the figure was seen, it would be difficult to regard this as a case of mistaken identity. For Chevalier Fenzi, being specially on the look out for "Giovanni," would be specially unlikely to mistake him for someone else.]

Here we encounter a feature of which there are altogether nine examples

in the present collection¹—a previous compact between the parties that the one who died first should endeavour to make the other sensible of his presence. Considering what an extremely small number of persons make such a compact, compared with those who do not, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that its existence has a certain efficacy. The cause of this might be sought in some quickening of the agent's thought, in relation to the percipient, as the time for fulfilment approached. But considering how often spontaneous telepathy acts without any conscious set of the distant mind towards the person impressed, it is safer to refer the phenomenon to the same sort of blind movements as seem sometimes, at supreme crises, to evoke a response out of memories and affinities that have long lapsed from consciousness (see Chapter XII, § 9); on which view, the efficacy of the compact may quite as readily be conceived to depend on its latent place in the percipient's mind as in the agent's.

In the next case—from Major Owen, of 4, Grove Road, Eastbourne—the tie between the two parties was, we learn, one rather of blood than of affection.

“ November 17th, 1883.

“(244) In the year 1870, I went one morning from my then home, in Clifton, to order various eatables for the day. On my way, I saw coming towards me, on the same side of the street, J. E. H., a male cousin. To avoid meeting him, I went across to the other side, and walked into a fishmonger's shop, and watched him pass on. I remained in the same place, looking into the street, and I saw him (or it) pass back again. I felt so annoyed at the idea of J. E. H. being in Clifton that I hurried home to tell my wife that I had seen J. E. H., and that he was evidently making inquiries as to our residence, and would certainly be here directly. I stayed at home all that morning, but J. E. H. never appeared.

“The next day, or day after, I received a letter from a son of J. E. H., telling me his father had died the very day I had seen the apparition.

“ H. M. ARTHUR OWEN.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Owen says :—

“ I have ascertained from the widow of J. E. H. that he died Tuesday, November 2nd, 1869, not as I wrote to you, 1870, between 2 and 3 p.m. I saw, as I believe to this moment, J. E. H., certainly before noon on that day. My wife can testify to the fact of my having seen J. E. H. before I heard of his death, as I went back to my house to tell her J. E. H. was in Clifton, and she must expect to see him any moment.”

Mrs. Owen corroborates as follows :—

“ I perfectly recognise the circumstance detailed to you by my husband of his having, as he thought, seen J. E. H. walking in the streets of Clifton ; indeed, he came home on purpose to prepare me for his coming to our house, and the whole day we were expecting he would appear.

“ M. OWEN.”

[Major Owen has had no other hallucination, and his sight is excellent. In conversation, Mrs. Owen described J. E. H.'s figure to Mr. Podmore as unmistakable ; very tall and thin, with small black eyes and a very small head.]

¹ See among cases [in the present edition] 146, 194 ; also Mr. Cooper's “ ambiguous ” case, p. 327. In case 197 there had been a promise on the side of the person who died.

[Four other somewhat similar cases of persons seen in the street—Nos. 245, 246, 247, 248—are here omitted.] The next case is from Mr. T. H. Carr, of 1, The Terrace, Carlton Hill, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds.

" February 18th, 1886.

(249) " I cannot make you fully understand the case unless you are acquainted with the Friends' Meeting House premises. In passing through the front gate, the Meeting House is on the left, and my house, the first of 5 terrace houses, up a few steps on the right hand ; but they stand back a few feet at the end of a high wall. And on account of the height of this wall we could only just see the top part of the head and hat of any gentleman coming.

" It was when I was standing at my front window on Christmas Day, 1884, that I saw the head of a gentleman walking up the yard which I thought was Daniel Pickard coming up, but on getting nearer I saw that the hair was whiter than Daniel's ; and on looking again, I thought it was the head and hat of Mr. X. But to see him right, I thought he would think me rude to be standing close to the window and watching him turn the corner, so I walked backwards a couple of paces, expecting to see him pass close to the terrace. But, to my surprise, he vanished in a moment, and I saw no more. I was struck with the affair, and took out my watch, and it was just 4 o'clock.

" A couple of hours after, B. Geddard, the caretaker, came down the yard, and said, ' Hast thou heard that Mr. X. is dead ? ' I said, ' No ; when has he died ? ' He replied, ' To-day at 4 o'clock.'

" THOMAS H. CARR."

We find from a newspaper obituary that Mr. X. died on December 25th, 1884, after an illness of less than a week.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Carr adds that for distant objects his eyesight is excellent ; that he has never on any other occasion experienced any sort of hallucination of the senses ; and that, though he knew Mr. X. to be ill, he had no idea that the illness was serious.

The following corroboration is supplied by Mr. and Mrs. Coates, of 156, Waperton Road, Bradford, who were with Mr. Carr at the time :—

" June 23rd, 1886.

" We shall only be able to confirm the statement of Mr. T. Carr. So far as we can remember, while we were sitting in the room, T. C. came from his chair to the window, and, while looking out of the window, he made the remark, ' Ah, there is [X.] coming to see us,' and stepped back from the window, waiting to hear a knock at the door, which, however, did not come. T. C. remarked that he must have gone up the yard, and looked at the clock to see what time it was. We afterwards heard that at the time we thought [X.] was in the yard, he was just about dying.

" CHARLES COATES.

" ANNIE COATES."

In conversation, Mr. Coates gave the time as about 4 p.m., and spoke of Mr. Carr's consulting his *watch*.

It was impossible to judge of this case without an actual observation on the spot. Mr. Carr's house stands in an enclosure which is divided from the street by open railings ; and nobody would be walking along the line which the figure appeared to be taking, unless he were coming to the small row of houses of which Mr. Carr's is the first—in which case his whole figure would be visible in a very few seconds after the upper part

of it came into view. To disappear as it did, the figure would have had to retire by the way that it came, *but closer to the wall*. Mr. Carr was perfectly familiar with the aspect of Mr. X., who used frequently to come to see him, and whose head and tall hat were quite sufficient to distinguish him from other people known to enter this private enclosure. The broad brim of the hat was peculiar; and Mr. X. also walked with a peculiar droop of the head. Moreover, the fact that at the first moment Mr. Carr took the person he saw for some one else, and then corrected his judgment, shows at any rate that his recognition of Mr. X. was not that of a mere hasty glance. He was extremely startled by the sudden disappearance of his friend, and at once hurried out to see what could have become of him, but no one the least resembling him was in view. The incident perplexed and disturbed him at the moment far more than the words "I was struck with the affair" might seem to imply.

[The next case—250—is omitted.]

§ 4. The next type that presents itself is different from any that has yet been mentioned. We have encountered several cases, which there seemed strong grounds for considering telepathic, where the phantasmal form was not recognised; and we have seen that on the theory that the telepathic impulse may take place on various levels, or even below any level, of consciousness, and may be projected into sensory form by the percipient with various degrees of distinctness, this lack of recognition is not surprising. But all the visual cases so far examined have presented a *human* appearance; the hallucination has been developed at any rate up to that point. It will be remembered, however, that there have been instances where the human appearances developed out of something of a formless kind, which gradually assumed outline and detail (Chapter XII, § 3); and this might naturally lead us to expect that other cases might occur of a more rudimentary type—hallucinations, as we might say, of arrested development, and not suggestive or but faintly suggestive of any human likeness. Instances of the undeveloped type are met with among the purely subjective hallucinations of the sane; but they are very rare in comparison with the hallucinations which represent a definite figure;¹ it need not, therefore, surprise us to find that the analogous group, which there are grounds for regarding as very possibly telepathic, is a small one. Physiologically, we might compare these undeveloped flashes of hallucination to a *motor* effect which, instead of taking the complex form of automatic writing, is limited to a single start or twitch. The experiments

¹ In my collection of purely subjective hallucinations of the sane, the only visual examples that I find of a quite rudimentary type are a star, and two or three appearances of shapeless cloudy masses; to which I might add a few of the "collective" cases in Chap. xviii., § 5. But since this chapter was written, M. Marillier's paper, above cited, has supplied me with a case eminently in point. After describing some most distinct and complete hallucinations from which he suffered at one period of his life, he continues: "Depuis lors, je n'ai plus eu d'hallucinations très nettes; parfois encore je vois des lueurs, j'entends des craquements, des bruissements, je sens en moi ce sentiment d'attente anxieuse qui précède d'ordinaire l'apparition d'une hallucination; mais rien ne paraît: l'hallucination est réduite avant même qu'elle ait eu le temps de se produire." This seems exactly to illustrate "arrested development." See also case 311 below, where a hallucination of light develops into human form; and case 332, where it seems probable that what appeared to one percipient as a complete and recognised figure appeared to another as a formless luminous cloud.

in Chapter II, § 13, seemed to indicate that the sequel of a telepathic impulse might be a single tremor or vibration, sent down to the motor centre from the higher tracts of the brain ; just so may we suppose the speech-centre to have been stimulated in the case of the percipient's cry in case 147 [see p. 257, but the case is not quoted in full.—Ed.] ; and in the rudimentary hallucinations the stimulation of the sensory centre may be conceived as of the same simple and explosive sort.

The following case stands in an intermediate position, as there was a suggestion, but not exactly a representation, of human form. The account is from a witness whom we believe to have stated the facts correctly. She is the wife of an Inspector on the G.N. Railway, and resides at 4, Taylor's Cottages, London Road, Nottingham.

" April 23rd, 1883.

(251) " We received a letter a few days since, asking me to give you the account of our dear little girl's death, which took place on the 17th of May, 1879. I beg to state it is as fresh on my mind as if it only occurred a few days ago. The morning was very bright, and I think the sun shone more bright than I had ever seen it before. The child was four years and five months old, and a very fine girl. A few minutes after 11 she came running into the kitchen and said to me, ' Mother, may I go and play ? ' I said, ' Yes.' She then went out. Soon after I spoke to her, I went and fetched a pail of water from the bedroom. As I was walking across the yard, the child came in front of me like a bright shadow, and I stopped quite still and looked at her, and turned my head to the right, and saw her pass away. I emptied my water, and was coming in. My husband's brother, who was staying with us, called to me, and said, ' Fanny have got runned over.' I then came through the house and went just across the road, and found her. She was knocked down by the horse's feet, and the wheel of a baker's cart had broken the brain at the back of her neck. She only breathed a few minutes in my arms.

" This is just as the sad accident occurred. I have been looking for the piece of paper with it in, but I cannot find it.

" ANNIE E. WRIGHT."

The accident occurred at Derby. The *Derby and Chesterfield Reporter* gives a full account of it, which completely corresponds with the above.

[In a conversation with Mr. and Mrs. H. Sidgwick on December 16th, 1883, Mrs. Wright explained that the apparition was " like a flash of lightning in the form of a child's shadow." It could not have been a real child ; it was " not the least like one," nor did she recognise in it the image of any particular child ; but it gave her a kind of shock and made her think, " I wonder where those children are." It lasted long enough for her to gaze steadily at it—" about half a minute"—and " moved away to the right, with her eyes upon it," and so disappeared. Not more than a quarter or three-quarters of a minute passed before her brother-in-law called to her. It must have been 5 or 7 minutes since the child had gone to play, when the accident happened. Mrs. Wright afterwards learnt from an eye-witness what the child had been doing out in the road for some minutes previously to the accident. While holding the dying child in her arms, she said to the people standing by, " This is her death-blow. I saw her shadow in the yard." She has had no hallucination of vision on any other occasion.]

It is open to doubt, of course, whether the experience here was of a

sufficiently marked kind to have remained in the percipient's mind, had no accident occurred. But the description of the phantasm appears at any rate to point to something more than a mere illusion caused by the sunlight; nor is it of a sort that seems specially likely to have been unconsciously invented or exaggerated after the event.

The next two cases, of a much more rudimentary type, [are omitted.]

§ 5. The types that next claim notice are peculiar in that they involve no coincidence with any ostensibly abnormal condition of the agent. Evidence that certain hallucinations are telepathic, and not purely subjective, in origin may be afforded by coincidences of a different sort. Thus, a person may have a hallucination representing a friend in some costume in which he has never seen him or imagined him, but which proves to have been actually worn by him at the time. Or again, several persons, at different times, may have had a hallucination representing the same person, though that person was apparently experiencing nothing unusual on any of the occasions when his form was thus seen. Clearly it would be difficult to regard a repetition of this sort as accidental. It being comparatively a rare event for a sane and healthy person to see the form of an absent person at all, that two or more sane and healthy persons at different times should see the form of the *same* absent person, is, on the theory of chances, so unlikely as to suggest a specific faculty on the absent person's part for promulgating telepathic impulses.

This latter type is important from its bearing on the question whether the peculiarity of organisation which conduces to telepathic transferences belongs rather to the percipient or to the agent, or (as experiment would lead us to suppose) in some measure to both. To decide this question we should naturally ask which happens the more frequently—that the same *percipient*, or that the same *agent*, is concerned in several telepathic incidents. Now of repetitions to the same percipient we have several examples;¹ but that the same agent should figure repeatedly is made unlikely by the very nature of the ordinary type of case, which implies (over and above any natural peculiarity of organisation) an exceptional *crisis*—indeed, more often than not the crisis of death, through which no one can pass more than once. The only chance for a dying agent to show a special faculty for originating telepathic impressions is by impressing *several persons*; and cases of simultaneous or collective percipience, which may possibly be so explicable, will be considered later (in Chapter XVIII). Meanwhile the cases where telepathic impressions seem now and

¹ The evidence for one instance may of course be better than for another or others which may have fallen to the experience of the same percipient; but the following cases [included in this volume] seem at any rate worth considering in respect of this feature of repetition: Nos. 21, 38, 56, and 184; 44 and 116; 77 and 263; 126 and 201; 191 and 280; and perhaps Nos. 99, 692. See also the account which Thomas Wright, of Birkenshaw (the champion of the Wesleyans in the North of England), gives of his aunt's experiences (*Autobiography*, pp. 5-7). Mrs. Newnham affords another instance, but with her the agent has always been her husband (pp. 50-57, and cases 18 and 35). Compare in this respect cases 90 and 700. [The percipients in cases 73, 74, 80, 86, 161, 274, 311 had other experiences included in the original edition but not here; and there are percipients mentioned by Gurney in this connection none of whose experiences are included in the present volume.—Ed.]

again to be thrown off at haphazard, and independently of death or any other crisis, are theoretically of at least equal interest. For they tend to confirm what experiment would lead us to suppose, that agency as well as percipience depends on specific conditions as yet unknown; and this dependence on peculiarity of constitution in *two* people would go far to account for an otherwise puzzling fact—the rarity, in comparison with the number of deaths and crises that take place, of spontaneous telepathic incidents connected with them.

Of the class of *repeated* hallucinations representing the same person, we have about five presentable records. [Three of them are given here; 255 and 258 being omitted.—ED.] Most of the incidents therein described seem to illustrate what may be called purely casual agency; but in a few of them the agent's state was more or less abnormal—which is so far of course in favour of a telepathic explanation of the phenomena. The first account is from Mrs. Hawkins, of Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds.

“ March 25th, 1885.

(254) “ I send you my cousins' accounts of my apparition.

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

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

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

“ LUCY HAWKINS.”

Mrs. Hawkins prefaces her cousins' accounts thus :—

“ The event described in the enclosed accounts took place at Cherington near Shipston-on-Stour, in Warwickshire, the residence of my uncle, Mr. William Dickens, who was for many years chairman of Quarter Sessions in the county. The ladies who saw the appearance are two of his daughters, one of them a little older than myself, the other 3 or 4 years younger. I was then just 17.

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

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

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

“ Georgie [Mrs. Malcolm] is coming here on Friday, and I propose then to show her your letters, and Mr. Gurney's, and that we should each write our impressions of what we saw independently, and see how far they agree, and we will send the result to you. It is all very fresh in my memory, and I can at this moment conjure you up in my mind's eye,

as you appeared under that tree and disappeared in the yard. I even recollect distinctly the dress you wore, a sort of brown and white, rather large check, such as was in fashion then, and is now, but was in abeyance in the intermediate years."

Shortly afterwards Miss Dickins wrote :—

" Cherington, Shipston-on-Stour.

" September 29th, 1884.

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

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

" S. F. D."

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

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

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

" In astonishment you said you never had been near the place. Of

course I supported my little sister in her assertion ; whilst our brother supported *you*, saying he had been hiding with you, and that, being tired, you had both remained hidden in one place until the bell warned you that the game was over—that place being a washhouse in a distinct part of the premises from the cow or fold-yard, into which we believed we had chased you.

“ G. M. (*née* Dickins).”

In answer to inquiries, both Miss Dickins and Mrs. Malcolm say that they have never had any other experience of visual hallucination.

Mrs. Hawkins continues :—

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

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

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

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

“ LUCY HAWKINS.”

The following account is from Mrs. Hawkins’ son :—

“ June 20th, 1885.

“ In the autumn of 1877, I was living at my father’s house, Beyton Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds. The household consisted of my father, mother, three sisters, and three maid servants. One moonlight night I was sleeping in my room, and had been asleep some hours, when I was awakened by hearing a noise close to my head, like the chinking of money. My waking idea, therefore, was that a *man* was trying to take my money out of my trousers pocket, which lay on a chair close to the head of my bed. On opening my eyes, I was astonished to see a *woman*, and I well remember thinking with sorrow that it must be one of our servants who was trying to take my money. I mention these two thoughts to show

that I was not thinking in the slightest degree of my mother. When my eyes had become more accustomed to the light, I was more than ever surprised to see that it was my *mother*,¹ dressed in a peculiar silver-grey dress, which she had originally got for a fancy ball. She was standing with both hands stretched out in front of her as if feeling her way ; and in that manner moved slowly away from me, passing in front of the dressing-table, which stood in front of the curtained window, through which the moon threw a certain amount of light. Of course, my idea all this time was that she was walking in her sleep. On getting beyond the table she was lost to my sight in the darkness. I then sat up in bed listening ; but hearing nothing, and, on peering through the darkness, saw that the door, which was at the foot of my bed, and to get to which she would have had to pass in front of the light, was still shut. I then jumped out of bed, struck a light, and instead of finding my mother at the far end of the room, as I expected, found the room empty. I then for the first time supposed that it was an ' appearance,' and greatly dreaded that it signified her death.

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

" EDWARD HAWKINS."

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

The following account is from Miss Hopkinson, of 37, Woburn Place, W.C. It will be seen that in this case the evidence is not first-hand from any of the percipients ; nor is this case and most of the next case strictly covered by the rule (p. 119) which admits to the body of this work the evidence of persons to whom the percipient's experience has been described before the arrival of news of the agent's exceptional condition.² But that there was here no such exceptional condition does not in any way increase the probability that the narrator has imagined that she was informed of experiences of which in fact she was not informed. And the news that some one has had a waking vision of *oneself* being calculated to make rather a special impression on the mind and memory, the agent in these instances is at any rate in a different position from an ordinary second-hand witness.

" February 20th, 1886.

(256) " In the course of my life I have been accused four times of appearing to people ; neither can I account for those supposed visits."

Asked to give details, and to obtain corroboration, Miss Hopkinson replied :—

" It would be really quite excusable if you did not believe one word of my statements. I can get you no further information to support them. In the first instance of my supposed appearance, which happened some years ago, the young lady died very shortly afterwards. Her parents, too, are also dead. In the second, I gave the gentleman on whom I called to understand that he had made a mistake—I could not ask him

¹ This is an excellent instance of *delayed recognition* ; cf. case 249 above, and Chap. xii., §§ 2 and 3.

² Miss Hopkinson's case, however, as regards one incident in it—the third—is not even an apparent exception to the rule.

about it now. In the third, though the lady only a day or two ago repeated to me her original account of my visit to her, she totally declined writing it out for me, or letting me use her name, on the idea, which I find very common, that these sort of things are irreligious. The fourth time rather differed from the others ; but the young lady in that case died soon after. I am conscious that in all these cases I was thinking intensely of the individuals."

The following are the fuller details :—

" Case 1 occurred many years ago. A young lady, sleeping in a house next door to the one I was in, declared that I visited her during the night when she was lying awake, and that I performed some slight service for her. She was so positive in her statements that my denial was not believed by those around her. I was perfectly certain I had never left my room, nor could I have done so without its being known. I will not draw on my memory for further particulars ; I might be wrong after so long a time.

" Case 2. Seven years ago. I had gone into the City (a place I always avoid) on a small matter of business connected with a relative of mine, and I was very anxious he should know nothing about it ; my thoughts therefore were occupied by him. I was almost startled from my reverie by the clock of Bow Church striking 3. In the evening I saw my relative, and the first thing he said was, ' L., where did you go to-day ? ' I saw you come in to my place, but you passed my office and I don't know what became of you.' I said, ' At what time were you ridiculous enough to think I should call upon you ? ' ' As the clock struck 3,' he replied. I turned the subject—nor have I ever reverted to it since. This gentleman knew my dress and general appearance most intimately. Of course, I was not likely to visit him except on business, and by appointment.

" Case 3. About 6 years ago. I was staying in a country town 100 miles from London, at a busy, matter-of-fact home, with bright young people. One morning I came down to breakfast oppressed with a sensation I could not understand nor shake off. It resolved itself towards the afternoon in an absorbing thought of a relative in London, and I then wrote to ask her what she was doing. But a letter from her crossed mine, to ask me the same question. When I next saw her she told me what only last week she exactly repeated again : she was sitting quietly working, when the door opened, and I walked in, looking as usual ; and though she believed I was miles away, she concluded I had come back, and did not realise to the contrary till I turned and walked out of the room.

" Case 4. Four years ago. A young lady asserted I stood at the bottom of her bed (she was not well at the time) and told her distinctly to get up and dress herself, and that I thought her well enough to do so. She obeyed. I told her she was quite mistaken ; I had done nothing of the sort. She evidently thought I was denying the fact for some reason. I was about 20 minutes' walk from this young lady's room at the time. She was perfectly clear in her statement ; and I would not argue the point with her. Her illness was not in the least mental.

" LOUISA HOPKINSON."

The next account is from Mrs. Stone, of Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport.

" 1883.

(257) " On three occasions, each time by different persons, I have been seen when not present in the body. The first instance that I was thus seen

was by my sister-in-law, who was sitting up with me, the night after the birth of my first child. She looked towards the bed where I was sleeping, and distinctly saw me and my double; the first my natural body, the second spiritualised and fainter; several times she shut her eyes, but on opening them there was still the same appearance, and the vision only faded away after some little time. She thought it a sign of my death. I did not hear of it for many months.

"The second instance was by my niece; she was staying with us at Dorchester. It was rather early on a spring morning; she opened her bedroom door, and saw me ascending the flight of steps opposite her room, fully dressed in the morning black gown, white collar, and cap, which I was then wearing for my mother-in-law. She did not speak, but saw me, as she thought, go into the nursery. At breakfast she said to her uncle, 'My aunt was up early this morning, I saw her go into the nursery.' 'Oh! no, Jane,' my husband answered, 'she was not very well, and is going to have her breakfast before coming down.'

"The third instance was the most remarkable. We had a small house at Weymouth, where we occasionally went for the sea. A Mrs. Samways waited on us when there, and took care of the house in our absence; she was a nice quiet woman, thoroughly trustworthy, the aunt of my dear old servant Kitty Balston, then living with us at Dorchester. She had written to her aunt the day before the vision occurred, telling her of the birth of my youngest child, and that I was going on well. The next night Mrs. Samways went to a meeting-house, near Clarence Buildings; she was a Baptist. Before leaving she locked an inner door leading into a small courtyard behind the house, and the street-door after her, carrying both keys in her pocket. On her return, unlocking the street-door, she perceived a light at the end of the passage, and on going nearer saw, as she thought, the yard-door open. The light showed the yard and everything in it, but in the midst she clearly recognised me, in white garments, looking very pale and worn. She was terribly frightened, rushed into a neighbour's house (Captain Court's), and dropped in the passage. After recovering, Captain Court went with her into the house, which was exactly as she had left it, and the yard-door securely locked. I was taken very faint about the same time, and lingered for many weeks, hovering between life and death."¹

Professor Sidgwick has visited Mrs. Stone, and after thoroughly questioning her on her narrative, he writes (September 23rd, 1884):—"She certainly understands thoroughly the importance of accuracy. She said she had heard of her apparition direct from the seers, in the two first cases mentioned. She had never heard of her sister-in-law having had any other hallucination before this time (1833) or afterwards, until very lately, when she has had an apparition of a dead person. She is old, and Mrs. Stone is unwilling to trouble her on the matter. Nor does she think

¹ Taken in connection with these instances, the following experience of Mrs. Stone's own is of considerable interest. (See p. 363, note.)

"When about 9 or 10 years old I was sent to a school in Dorchester as a day boarder; it was here my first curious experience occurred that I can clearly remember. I was in an upper room in the school, standing with some others, in a class opposite our teacher, Miss Mary Lock; suddenly I found myself by her side, and looking towards the class saw myself distinctly—a slim, pale girl, in a white frock and pinafore. I felt a strong anxiety to get back, as it were, but it seemed a violent and painful effort, almost struggle, when accomplished. I was much frightened, but did not mention it till many years after."

I may mention that Mrs. Stone's daughter has had a similar experience; so that here is perhaps another example of hereditary tendency.

that her niece, Jane Studley (who is dead), ever had any other hallucination. As regards the third instance, Mrs. Stone only heard it after her recovery, from Kitty Balston, whose account—as repeated by Mrs. Stone—was that Mrs. Stone was taken ill in the evening, or rather just before the evening, and was quite unconscious at the time when she was seen by Mrs. Samways.”

In the last of Mrs. Stone's cases, we should naturally conclude that the appearance, if telepathic, was connected with her illness; but the other two appearances seem to have been purely casual. Possibly, however, the first may have been due to her sister-in-law's failing to focus the two eyes together, which is a common infirmity in some cases of debility; but we should expect a person who suffered in this way to be aware that she was in the habit of seeing objects double.

Since this case was printed, a hallucination representing the same person has been seen by a fourth percipient. Mrs. Glanville writes from Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport, on Aug. 23, 1886:—

“After breakfast this morning, I was outside the breakfast-room window, looking about, when I saw Mrs. Stone walking up one of the paths by the side of the lawn. I followed her. The path is long and winds round. I saw her turn the corner into a path that led through the orchard, but when I came there I could not see her. I wondered at her walking so quickly as to go out of sight, and strolled on, following the path, which led me back to the house. Here I saw Mrs. Stone talking to the gardener. She was surprised when I asked her how I could have missed her, and said she had not been walking at all, had not left her plants. Well, I saw her, her black dress, her white cap, her walk, Mrs. Stone certainly, but whether out of herself, or by an impression on my brain, I cannot tell—but I never saw anything more distinctly.” [A plan of the paths was enclosed.]

Mrs. Stone writes, Aug. 25, 1886:—

“You wish me to give an account of my proceedings when Mrs. Glanville saw my double. About 10 on the morning of Monday, August 23rd, I had gone direct from the house to water some flowers in a greenhouse marked in Mrs. Glanville's plan. My mind was rather disturbed at not hearing from my son. I was watering in a rather dazed, mechanical way, but did not lose consciousness. Walking from the place I met Mrs. Glanville, who said, ‘How could you get here without my seeing you?’ I had not been near the spot where she saw me.”

The percipient in this case has had one other visual hallucination representing a living person, which was very likely telepathic. She thus describes it:—

“I remember one experience of the same sort happening when I was a girl. I certainly *did* see an old gentleman in the street who was then on his death-bed, but nobody would believe it. He was standing outside his shop-door; there were two other men with him. I can see him now in my mind's eye—a tall thin man; I knew his face quite well. When I said at dinner that Mr. Worth was better, for I had seen him in the street, my father told me he had just called, and Mr. Worth was very ill, in fact dying, and I *must* be mistaken.”

§ 6. Of the other class mentioned, where peculiarities of dress or aspect afford the only presumption that a hallucination was more than purely

subjective—i.e., was due to an absent agent who, nevertheless, was in a perfectly normal state at the time—the following examples may serve.¹ The first is from Captain A. S. Beaumont, of 1, Crescent Road, South Norwood Park.

“February 24th, 1885.

(259) “About September, 1873, when my father was living at 57, Inverness Terrace, I was sitting one evening, about 8.30 p.m., in the large dining-room. At the table, facing me, with their backs to the door, were seated my mother, sister, and a friend, Mrs. W. Suddenly I seemed to see my wife bustling in through the door of the back dining-room, which was in view from my position. She was in a *mauve* dress. I got up to meet her, though much astonished, as I believed her to be at Tenby. As I rose, my mother said, ‘Who is that?’ not (I think) seeing anyone herself, but seeing that I did. I exclaimed, ‘Why, it’s Carry,’ and advanced to meet her. As I advanced, the figure disappeared.² On inquiry, I found that my wife was spending that evening at a friend’s house, in a *mauve* dress, which I had most certainly never seen. I had never seen her dressed in that colour. My wife recollected that at that time she was talking with some friends about me, much regretting my absence, as there was going to be dancing, and I had promised to play for them. I had been unexpectedly detained in London.

“ALEX. S. BEAUMONT.”

The following corroboration is from the friend who was present :—

“11, Grosvenor Street, W.

“March 5th, 1885.

“As far as I can recollect, Captain Beaumont was sitting talking, when he looked up, and gave a start. His mother asked him what was the matter. He replied, ‘I saw my wife walk across the end of the room, but that is nothing; she often appears to people; her servants have seen her several times.’ The room we were in was a double dining-room, one end was lit with gas, and the other, where Mrs. Beaumont appeared, was comparatively dark. No one else saw her except her husband. Mrs. Beaumont was at the time in Wales, and this happened in Inverness Terrace, Bayswater.

“FLORENCE WHIPHAM.”

Mrs. Beaumont says :—

“I distinctly remember hearing from my husband, either the next day or the second day after his experience; and in his letter he asked, ‘What were you doing at such an hour on such a night?’ I was able to recall that I was standing in a group of friends, and that we were regretting his absence. I was in a *mauve* dress, which I am confident that he could never have seen.

“C. BEAUMONT.”

¹ As regards the connection of these appearances with the agent’s subconscious sense of his own aspect, I need not repeat the remarks already made (Chap. xii., § 8) in respect of the far stronger group where there were similar peculiarities *plus* some exceptional condition of the agent.

² The disappearance of the figure on sudden speech or movement is a feature which occurs both in subjective and telepathic phantasms, and there could not well be a clearer indication of the hallucinatory character of the latter. In my large collection of subjective cases I have only three or four distinct instances, e.g., the first narrative in Chap. xii., § 2; but then it is only in a few cases that the percipient, by speaking or distinctly moving, has afforded the condition. The point was one of those observed in Dr. Jessopp’s well-known case (*Athenæum* for Jan. 10, 1880). For telepathic examples [in the present volume], see cases 26, 201, 241.

Captain Beaumont adds that he has never had any other hallucination of the senses except on the occasion next described. This other case, in which the same agent and percipient were concerned, and a third case appended to it (in which the sameness of agent and difference of percipient recall the *repetitions* of the preceding section), would be quite without evidential value if they stood alone ; but they are of interest in connection with the foregoing stronger example.

“ February 24th, 1885.

(260) “ In 1871 I was staying at Norton House, Tenby, for the first time, and had just gone to bed, and was wide awake. I had the candle on my right side, and was reading. At the foot of the bed and to the right was a door, which was locked, and, as I learnt afterwards, pasted up on the other side.

“ Through this I saw the figure of my future wife (the lady of the house) enter, draped in white from the head to foot. Oddly enough, I was not specially startled. My idea was that some one was ill, and that she had come to get something out of the room. I averted my head, and when I looked up again the apparition was gone. I suppose that I saw it for two or three seconds.

“ ALEX. S. BEAUMONT.”

Mrs. Beaumont says :—

“ February 24th, 1885.

“ In 1872, two or three months after my marriage, Captain Beaumont and I returned from London to Tenby. I went up into my dressing-room and gave the keys of my luggage to my servant, Ellen Bassett. I was standing before the looking-glass with my back turned to her, and I heard her utter a little sharp cry. I turned round, saying, ‘ What’s the matter ? ’ and saw her with my nightcap in her hand. She said, ‘ O, nothing, nothing,’ and I went downstairs. The day after, my husband saw her taking off the paper which pasted up the door between my bedroom and the dressing-room. He said, ‘ What are you doing ? ’ She said she was opening that door. He said, ‘ Why, the first night that I slept in this house, I saw your mistress walk through that door.’ (I must explain that Captain Beaumont had been a guest in this house on a good many occasions before our marriage. On the occasion mentioned, he had imagined that perhaps someone was ill in the house, and that I had entered his room to get something, thinking him sure to be asleep.) Then the maid told him that she had seen me the night before we came home—she did not know exactly what day we were coming, and had been sleeping in the same bed as he had been in when he saw me. She was just going to step into bed, when she saw me enter ‘ through the door,’¹ with a nightcap on, and a candle in my hand. She was so terrified that she rushed out of the room by the other door, and told the other servants she was sure I was dead. They comforted her as well as they could, but she would not return to the room. The cause of her crying out, when I heard her do so, was that, in unpacking, she recognised the identical nightcap that the apparition had worn. The curious point is that the nightcap was one that I had bought in London, and had not mentioned to her, and was perfectly unlike any that I had ever worn before. It had three frills. I had been accustomed to wear nightcaps of coloured muslin without frills.

“ The same servant, some months after the nightcap incident, went into the kitchen and said to the other servants, ‘ We shall have news of

¹ See p. 272, note.

missus to-day ; I've just seen her standing in the dining-room door ; she had on a black velvet bonnet and black cloak.' (We had been in London some weeks.) This occurred about 9 o'clock a.m. About 10.30 she received a telegram from us to say we should be home that evening ; the telegram was sent from Paddington Station as we waited for our train. The bonnet and cloak had been bought in town without her knowledge.

"The maid was with me for years, and was certainly not nervous or hysterical. I have now parted with her for some years.

"C. BEAUMONT."

The next case is from Mrs. Murray Gladstone, of Shedfield Cottage, Botley, Hants.

"January 18th, 1886.

(261) "I went on Saturday afternoon [last] to see an old man and woman named Bedford, who live in a cottage about half a mile from our house. Mrs. Bedford was ill in bed, and I went upstairs to see her. I sat down by the bedstead, and talked to her for a few minutes. Whilst I was there, the thought struck me that the light from the window, which was opposite the foot of the bed, was too strong for the invalid ; and I determined, without saying a word about it to either Mr. or Mrs. Bedford, to give her a curtain. This (Monday) afternoon I again went to see the old couple ; but this time I only saw Mr. Bedford in the room downstairs. And after a few remarks he said, ' My wife has seen you yesterday (Sunday) morning ; she turned her head towards the side of the bed and said, "Is that her ?" ' (I did not speak, as I thought she was dreaming.) "Yes," she went on, "it is Mrs. Gladstone, and she is holding up a curtain with both her hands" (imitating the posture), "but she says it is not long enough. Then she smiled and disappeared." ' When Mr. Bedford had told me the above, I exclaimed, ' That is just what I did yesterday morning whilst I was dressing. I went to a cupboard in my room and took out a piece of serge, which I thought would answer the purpose, and held it up with both hands to see the length, and said to myself, "It is not long enough." ' I may mention that I had only once before been to visit Mrs. Bedford, about a year ago, before I went on Saturday ; and, of course, both times wore my walking dress. But when seen by Mrs. Bedford in this vision, she particularly noticed that I wore no bonnet, which must have been the case, as this occurred before 9 o'clock.

"AUGUSTA GLADSTONE."

Mrs. Gladstone adds :—

"Mrs. B. described me as being in white, and I asked her what I had on my head. She said, ' A thing like this '—taking hold of a woollen cap which I had given her. It was the facsimile of one which I must have had on at the time ; and they were not common, for I had knitted them of wool and of a particular shape."

Mrs. Bedford has had one other hallucination, when she saw the figure of a young grandchild standing by her bedside. This, however, happened at night, and may have been half a dream.

When Mrs. Bedford described her experience to the present writer, she did not use the word *curtain*, and she did not recall the *remark* about the stuff not being long enough ; which suggested that these items might have crept into the narrative *after* Mrs. Gladstone's side of the affair had been related. Mr. Bedford is, however, positive that they formed part of what his wife told him at the time, and before he saw Mrs. Gladstone ; and Mrs. Gladstone is equally positive that they were included in his account to her, and also that she has herself heard of them from Mrs. Bedford.

The next example is from Colonel Bigge, of 2, Morpeth Terrace, S.W., who took the account out of a sealed envelope, in my presence, for the first time since it was written on the day of the occurrence.

(262) "An account of a circumstance which occurred to me when quartered at Templemore, Co. Tipperary, on 20 February, 1847.

"This afternoon, about 3 o'clock p.m., I was walking from my quarters towards the mess-room to put some letters into the letter-box, when I distinctly saw Lieut.-Colonel Reed, 70th Regiment, walking from the corner of the range of buildings occupied by the officers towards the mess-room door; and I saw him go into the passage. He was dressed in a brown shooting jacket, with grey summer regulation tweed trousers, and had a fishing-rod and a landing-net in his hand. Although at the time I saw him he was about 15 or 20 yards from me, and although anxious to speak to him at the moment, I did not do so, but followed him into the passage and turned into the ante-room on the left-hand side, where I expected to find him. On opening the door, to my great surprise, he was not there; the only person in the room was Quartermaster Nolan, 70th Regiment, and I immediately asked him if he had seen the colonel, and he replied he had not; upon which I said, 'I suppose he has gone upstairs,' and I immediately left the room. Thinking he might have gone upstairs to one of the officers' rooms, I listened at the bottom of the stairs and then went up to the first landing place; but not hearing anything I went downstairs again and tried to open the bedroom door, which is opposite to the ante-room, thinking he might have gone there; but I found the door locked, as it usually is in the middle of the day. I was very much surprised at not finding the colonel, and I walked in to the barrack-yard and joined Lieutenant Caulfield, 66th Regiment, who was walking there; and I told the story to him, and particularly described the dress in which I had seen the colonel. We walked up and down the barrack-yard talking about it for about 10 minutes, when, to my great surprise, never having kept my eye from the door leading to the mess-room (there is only one outlet from it), I saw the colonel walk into the barracks through the gate—which is in the opposite direction—accompanied by Ensign Willington, 70th Regiment, in precisely the same dress in which I had seen him, and with a fishing-rod and a landing-net in his hand. Lieutenant Caulfield and I immediately walked to them, and we were joined by Lieut.-Colonel Goldie, 66th Regiment, and Captain Hartford, and I asked Colonel Reed if he had not gone into the mess-room about 10 minutes before. He replied that he certainly had not, for that he had been out fishing for more than two hours at some ponds about a mile from the barracks, and that he had not been near the mess-room at all since the morning.

"At the time I saw Colonel Reed going into the mess-room, I was not aware that he had gone out fishing—a very unusual thing to do at this time of the year; neither had I seen him before in the dress I have described during that day. I had seen him in uniform in the morning at parade, but not afterwards at all until 3 o'clock—having been engaged in my room writing letters, and upon other business. My eyesight being very good, and the colonel's figure and general appearance somewhat remarkable, it is morally impossible that I could have mistaken any other person in the world for him. That I *did* see him I shall continue to believe until the last day of my existence.

"WILLIAM MATTHEW BIGGE,

"Major, 70th Regiment."

— On July 17th, 1885, after Colonel Bigge had described the occurrence

but before the account was taken from the envelope and read, he was good enough to dictate the following remarks to me :—

“ When Colonel R. got off the car about a couple of hours afterwards, Colonel Goldie and other officers said to me, ‘ Why that’s the very dress you described.’ They had not known where he was or how he was engaged. The month, February, was a most unlikely one to be fishing in. Colonel Reed was much alarmed when told what I had seen.

“ The quartermaster, sitting at the window, would have been bound to see a real figure ; he denied having seen anything.

“ I have never had the slightest hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.”

[It will be seen that these recent remarks exhibit two slips of memory. It is quite unimportant whether Colonel Reed was seen walking in at the gate or getting off a car. But in making the interval between the vision and the return two hours instead of ten minutes, the late account unduly diminishes the force of the case. If there is any justification at all for the provisional hypothesis that the sense of impending arrival is a condition favourable for the emission of a telepathic influence, it is of importance that, at the time when the phantasmal form was seen, Colonel Reed was not busy with his fishing, but was rapidly approaching his destination ; for thus the incident, at any rate, gets the benefit of analogy with other cases. This illustrates what was said above (pp. 107-8), that where memory errs, it is not always in the direction of exaggeration.]

§ 7. The last case quoted might equally well serve as an example of the next and concluding group, the peculiarity of which is that the real person whom the phantasm represents is—unknown to the percipient—actually approaching. When these “ arrival cases ” were referred to above (p. 335), it was noted that the mere sense of returning home cannot be held to constitute an abnormality in the least degree parallel to death, or the other recognised conditions of spontaneous telepathy ; and our first-hand specimens are in themselves too few for complete assurance that we have in them a genuine type of transfer. At the same time they find a parallel in the *impression*-cases quoted on p. 182 ; and taken in connection with the two preceding groups, they at any rate increase the probability that impressions from a *normal* agent may be occasionally capable of acting as the germ of a telepathic phantasm.

The first example is from Mr. James Carroll, who gave the account quoted on p. 195. The agent was the same twin-brother who was concerned in that former case.

“ September, 1884.

(263) “ In the autumn of 1877, while at Sholebrook Lodge, Towcester, Northamptonshire, one night, at a little after 10 o’clock, I remember I was about to move a lamp in my room to a position where I usually sat a little while before retiring to bed, when I suddenly saw a vision of my brother. It seemed to affect me like a mild shock of electricity. It surprised me so that I hesitated to carry out what I had intended, my eyes remaining fixed on the apparition of my brother. It gradually disappeared, leaving me wondering what it meant. I am positive no light or reflection deceived me. I had not been sleeping or rubbing my eyes. I was again in the act of moving my lamp when I heard taps along the window. I looked towards it—the window was on the ground-floor—

and heard a voice, my brother's, say, 'It's I; don't be frightened.' I let him in; he remarked, 'How cool you are; I thought I should have frightened you.'

"The fact was, that the distinct vision of my brother had quite prepared me for his call. He found the window by accident, as he had never been in the house before; to use his own words, 'I thought it was your window, and that I should find you.' He had unexpectedly left London to pay me a visit, and when near the house lost his way, and found his way in the dark to the back of the place."

In reply to inquiries, Mr. Carroll says:—

"You are quite right in supposing the hallucination of my brother to be the only instance in my experience."

In another letter, Mr. Carroll says:—

"As to the apparition of my brother in Northamptonshire, at a place and window where he had never before been,—I think I said the room was very light indeed, the night very dark. Even had I looked out of the window I could not have seen him. With my head turned from the window, I distinctly saw his face. I was affected and surprised. It seemed like a slight shock of electricity. I had not recovered from the effects when the second surprise came, the reality—my brother. I did not mention the subject to him then, being rather flattered at his astonishment at my cool demeanour. The coolness was caused by the apparition first of him. The window my brother came to was at the back of the house. He found my window out only by accident, or, as he said, he thought it was my window."

[Mr. Carroll is a clear-headed and careful witness. He is quite positive as to this being his only experience of a hallucination. In conversation, he stated that there were no mirrors in the room, and that the figure was seen *not* in the direction of the window. He thinks that the interval between the hallucination and his brother's appearance was about a minute.]

Here the *gradual* disappearance, if correctly remembered, is interesting as a feature which is occasionally met with in purely subjective hallucinations (Chapter XII, §§ 2 and 10).¹ [Three other arrival-cases—264, 265, 266, two of them auditory—are omitted.]

¹ Compare cases 185, 194, 207, 263, 311, 331, 350; also the account in p. 283, note, where the expression "melted away" is used.

CHAPTER XV

FURTHER AUDITORY CASES OCCURRING TO A SINGLE PERCIPIENT

§ 1. In examining cases of auditory phantasms which have strikingly corresponded with real events, we have two main points to look to. First, there is the phantasm regarded merely as a sensory phenomenon, on a par with the visual phantasms. This, of course, is the sound in itself; which is occasionally of an inarticulate sort, a simple noise; but which in the large majority of instances represents the tone of a human voice—the voice, like the visual phantasm, being either recognised or unrecognised. But, secondly, when the phantasm is a voice, there is a further element, which has as a rule no analogue in the visual class—namely, what the voice says; and this is likely to afford us some clue as to whether a complete and definite idea has been telepathically conveyed from the agent or merely an impulse or germ which the percipient has developed in his own way. We find that the auditory cases, like the visual, present various stages of apparent externalisation;¹ but the discriminations here are less marked—it being more difficult in the case of sounds than of sights to decide, in recalling them, how far the impression seemed inward, and how far outward; while even if the special stage be clear in the percipient's mind, it is not easy to find words to describe it.

I will begin with recognised voices; and will first quote a few cases where the analogy to experimental thought-transference is strongest, inasmuch as what the percipient heard seems to have represented the actual sensation of the agent,² the very words which he was hearing while he uttered them—in one instance, however, so dulled as to be indistinguishable as words. The following account is from Mrs. Stone, of Wal-ditch, Bridport, the narrator of case 257, above.

“ January 29th, 1883.

(267) “ On the 13th of January, 1882, my eldest son, who had been paying us a visit, left by a morning train for his home; but I did not know the exact time at which he would reach his destination. In the afternoon of that day, my daughter having gone to the neighbouring town (Bridport), I was sitting at work by a window of which the upper ventilator was open. Suddenly I heard my son's voice distinctly; I could not mistake it; he was speaking eagerly, and as if bothered; the voice seemed wafted to me by an air current, but I could not distinguish words.

¹ See the account of some of these stages as exemplified in purely subjective hallucinations, pp. 305–6.

² See p. 349, note.

I was startled, but not very much frightened; the voice did not seem to indicate accident or calamity. I looked at my watch, which pointed to three minutes past 3. In perhaps a few seconds, his voice began again, but soon became faint, and died away in the distance. When my daughter came in, I told her, and mentioned the hour; she said that was just the time my son expected to arrive, if the train was punctual. I also mentioned it to my son who is living with me. The next morning I was very thankful to get a post-card from my eldest son; 'Arrived all right, train very punctual, just three minutes past 3; but, to my annoyance, I found no carriage waiting for me, or my luggage, only Frank on his bicycle. He explained that they had made a mistake by looking at the station clock (which was an hour too slow), and had driven away again.' I wrote the whole account to my son, but he is rather sceptical on these subjects; he could not but own it was a strange coincidence, but asked, 'Why, mother, didn't you hear Frank's voice too?'

"LUCIA C. STONE."

Miss Edith Stone has confirmed verbally what is recorded of her in the above account. Another son, Mr. Walter Stone, also recollects having been told of the incident.

On February 16th, 1885, Mrs. Stone wrote as follows:—

"A few days since, I came upon my son's letter, written rather more than a week after the occurrence. The post-card mentioned was lost, and it was by chance this letter turned up. I enclose the first page for what it is worth, very trivial save for the impression it made on me. I am more than ever convinced of the value of verifying matters of this kind."

The first page of the son's letter ran as follows:—

"Eton, January 22nd, 1882.

"DEAREST MOTHER,—If you heard my voice it must have been when I was waiting for the arrival of the carriage, and expressing loudly my surprise at its not having arrived at the station to meet me. I think I told you that Frank was there, on his bicycle, and we both jabbered considerably. You ought to have heard him too."

[Mrs. Stone has had no other hallucination of a recognised voice, except on one occasion, 20 years ago, soon after a bereavement (see pp. 330-2). More than five years ago, she had on several evenings the impression of hearing voices in the room below her own. This slight predisposition to auditory hallucination would hardly affect the case; but the coincidence is of course rendered less striking by the reflection that Mr. Stone may have spoken "eagerly and as if bothered" on a good many other occasions.]

The next case is more complete, inasmuch as the actual word used by the agent was distinguished by the percipient. The account is from Mr. R. Fryer, of Bath, brother of our valued friend and helper, the Rev. A. T. Fryer, of Clerkenwell, who tells us that he "distinctly remembers being told of the occurrence within a few weeks of its happening." He explains that "Rod" was the name by which his brother, the percipient, was called in the family.

"January, 1883.

(268) "A strange experience occurred in the autumn of the year 1879. A brother of mine had been from home for 3 or 4 days, when, one

afternoon, at half-past 5 (as nearly as possible), I was astonished to hear my name called out very distinctly. I so clearly recognised my brother's voice that I looked all over the house for him ; but not finding him, and indeed knowing that he must be distant some 40 miles, I ended by attributing the incident to a fancied delusion, and thought no more about the matter. On my brother's arrival home, however, on the sixth day, he remarked amongst other things that he had narrowly escaped an ugly accident. It appeared that, whilst getting out from a railway carriage he missed his footing, and fell along the platform ; by putting out his hands quickly he broke the fall, and only suffered a severe shaking. ' Curiously enough,' he said, ' when I found myself falling I called out your name.' This did not strike me for a moment, but on my asking him during what part of the day this happened, he gave me the time, which I found corresponded exactly with the moment I heard myself called."

In answer to an inquiry, Mr. R. Fryer adds :—

" I do not remember ever having a similar experience to the one narrated to you ; nor should I care to, as the sensation, together with the suspense as to the why and wherefore of the event, is the reverse of pleasant."

In conversation, he has explained that he had frequently expostulated with his brother on the latter's habit of alighting from trains in motion ; and the automatic utterance of his name, on this occasion, might thus be accounted for by association.

The agent's account of the matter is as follows :—

" Newbridge Road, Bath.

" November 16th, 1885.

" In the year 1879, I was travelling, and in the course of my journey I had to stop at Gloucester. In getting out of the train, I fell, and was assisted to rise by one of the railway officials. He asked if I was hurt, and asked if I had anyone travelling with me. I replied ' No ' to both questions, and inquired why he asked. He replied, ' Because you called out " Rod." ' I distinctly recollect making use of the word Rod.

" On arriving home, a day or two afterwards, I related the circumstance, and my brother inquired the time and date. He then told me he had heard me call at that particular time. He was so sure of its being my voice that he made inquiries as to whether I was about or not.

" JOHN T. FRYER."

Curiously similar is the next case [269, but it is here omitted, as are also 270 and 271].

In the next case it is very possible that the agent actually used the words heard, but proof of this fact is unattainable. If he did not, we must suppose some idea of his distress to have been objectified by the percipient in the " agonised tone." The account is from Mr. Lister Ives, master at the Grammar School, Stockport.

" 1883.

(272) " About midday of the 24th July, 1875, I was in the baths at Llandudno, when I suddenly and distinctly heard my boy's voice calling loudly and in an agonised tone. So assured was I of it being his voice, that I hastily got out of the bath and looked out of the nearest window, thinking he must be on the rocks beneath—the bath-house stands on a rock, though since then much has been cut away—though I believed him

at the time to be, as indeed he was, at the other side of the Orme's Head, three or four miles away. The boy was killed at that very time by a fall from the rocks."

We find from a report of the accident in the *Stockport Advertiser* that the date was the 26th (not the 24th) of July. The boy had joined his parents on the 24th, which may perhaps account for the mistake.

Mrs. Ives says:—

"Until late at night, when the boy did not return, my husband had thought no more of the circumstance. When the boy could not be found he exclaimed, 'We shall never see him alive again,' for he remembered the sound of the voice; but it was not until some time afterwards that he told me that he felt assured he had heard the last cry, not a supernatural warning, but a cry for help when none could reach him. I made memoranda of all the circumstances connected with the unhappy affair, and of that [*i.e.*, the voice] among the rest. With regard to the distance which the sound came, I can scarcely give absolute information. The headland is of peculiar form; but according to local maps, if they are to be relied upon, if it were possible to take a direct line *through* the mountain from the Crab Rocks, where my boy was found, to the baths where Mr. Ives was, it would measure something over 3,000 yards; round by the path, as it then was, about 3 miles; over the summit, I cannot tell how far."

Mr. C. Kroll Laporte, of Birkdale, Southport, says:—

"Mr. Ives told me all this [*i.e.*, the incident of the voice] the day after the funeral, and I noted it down."

[Our colleague, Mr. Richard Hodgson, has had an interview with Mr. and Mrs. Ives. Mr. Ives has had no other hallucinations. The time of the boy's death was *estimated* only. He was expected back to dinner at 1 p.m., and it was between 12 and 1 p.m. that Mr. Ives was bathing and heard the cry. The words he heard were, 'Papa! mamma!' in an agonised tone. The boy was 18 years of age. He appeared to have fallen on the rocks face downwards, from a height of about 80 feet. The cliff at the spot begins at the summit with a sloping bank of grass, which suddenly, however, is followed by an almost sheer precipice, not seen from the top of the bank.]

§ 2. We come now to cases where the name heard was probably not actually spoken. The fact that the impression so often takes the form of a call of the percipient's name might be connected with the fact that this is also the commonest form of purely *subjective* auditory hallucination; and might be taken as a fresh indication—parallel to the indications which have been noted in the visual class—that the telepathic phantasm, as a sensory phenomenon, truly belongs to the class of hallucinations. But it is in the very nature of this form of communication that it should strongly suggest—what in some instances is positively affirmed—a certain occupation of the agent's thoughts with the percipient. We have often independent reason to suppose a similar condition in the visual cases; but there is seldom anything in the visual phantasm of the agent to make it apparent. [Six cases are given, of which I select three as the best evidentially; 275, 276, 278 are omitted.—ED.]

The first case is from Mr. G. A. Witt, of Fontenay House, Grove Park, Denmark Hill, S.E.

"September 26th, 1885.

(273) "When I left Bombay, on March 1st, 1876, by ss. 'Persia,' for Naples, an elder brother of mine was living in Germany, and in very bad health, though I did not, at the time, anticipate his early death. When in the Red Sea one day, sitting on deck and reading the *Saturday Review*, with other passengers—and I think Mrs. Fagan also—sitting near me and reading, I fancied I heard my brother's voice calling me by my Christian name. It seemed so distinctly his voice, and I thought I heard my name so clearly called, that it quite startled me, and made such an impression on me that I mentioned it to some of my fellow-passengers, and at their suggestion took note of the hour and day it occurred.

"On arriving at Naples, some 12 or 14 days later, I found a letter there from my mother, bearing the same date as the one I had put down in the Red Sea, in which she told me that she was sitting writing by my brother's deathbed, &c., adding in a postscript the same day that he had just passed away.

"I never ascertained whether the hour I had put down was the same in which my poor brother had died, and now really all I remember is what I have just stated.

"G. A. WITT."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Witt says :—

"I was, at the time, not at all anxious about my brother; and the 'voice' at the time impressed me as very strange, as I really had not thought of him for some time. My brother died in Kiel, Holstein. The date was the 13th of March, 1876. This was the date of my brother's death; and I remember that that was what caused me to mention the matter again to those whom I had told on board the steamer that I thought I had heard my brother's voice. I must repeat, however, that what I am stating now is from memory only, and the 'note' I had made of the occurrence at the time no longer exists.

"It is also the only time that, as far as I remember, anything of the kind has happened to me." [This is in answer to the question whether he had experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion.]

Mrs. Fagan, of 26, Manchester Square, W., writes to us as follows :—

"August 28th, 1885.

"On board ship, coming from India, one morning I passed Mr. Witt, who was reading on deck. He stopped me and said that a strange thing had happened to him, and on my asking what it was, said that he had heard his brother's voice calling him," 'Gustave,' more than once (three times, I think, but am not sure). He added that he had heard, before leaving Bombay, that his brother was very seriously ill,¹ and thinking that perhaps he was then dying, or just dead, he made a note of the date. I asked him to let me know afterwards if the brother really died about that time, and he said he would do so.

"On meeting him in London afterwards, I inquired if his conjecture had proved correct, and he said it had. I do not know whether the time when Mr. Witt heard the voice coincided exactly with the brother's death, as

¹ This of course was true, in a sense; but, in view of the possible suggestion that the hallucination was due to mere anxiety, it is important to notice that Mr. Witt had regarded his brother as a *chronic* invalid, and expressly affirms that, so far from being anxious about him, he had not even thought of him for some time.

the difference in the local time made it difficult to decide that point without calculation; and I did not hear that any calculation was made. But the two events occurred at about the same time. Mr. Witt offers no explanation or opinion on the matter, only saying that it was very strange."

We have procured, through the Bürgermeister of Kiel, an official certificate of the death of Mr. John T. Witt, which shows that it occurred on March 13, 1876, at 9.30 p.m. Supposing therefore that Mr. G. A. Witt's experience was immediately mentioned by him, and that Mrs. Fagan is right in her recollection that this was in the morning, it must have preceded the death by a good many hours. If either of these suppositions is incorrect, the coincidence may have been closer.

The next account is from Mrs. Stella, of Chieri, Italy, who was the percipient in a visual case, No. 198 [not here reproduced].

"December 29th, 1883.

(274) "On the 22nd of May, 1882, I was sitting in my room working with other members of my family, and we were talking of household matters, when suddenly I heard the voice of my eldest son calling repeatedly 'Mamma.' I threw down my work exclaiming, 'There is Nino,' and went downstairs, to the astonishment of every one. Now my son was at that time in London, and had only left home about a fortnight before, for a two months' tour, so naturally we were all surprised to think he had arrived so suddenly. On reaching the hall, no one was there, and they all laughed at my imagination. But I certainly heard him call, not only once, but three or four times, impatiently. I learnt, a few days afterwards, that on that day he had been taken ill in London at the house of some friends, and that he had frequently expressed a wish that I should come and nurse him, as not speaking English he could not make himself understood."

Mrs. Stella tells us, on inquiry, that this is her only experience of an auditory hallucination.

The following corroboration is from a lady who was present at the time:—

"Breslau, February 18th, 1884.

"Mrs. Stella asked me to give you an account of an episode which occurred in my presence, while on a visit to her two years ago; and the following are the facts as nearly as I can remember them. We were sitting working together, when Mrs. Stella said she heard the voice of her son, who was absent in England at the time, calling her. This caused us some surprise, as he was not expected home, nor had we heard any sounds of an arrival.

"On going downstairs to meet him, we found no one, which astonished us, as Mrs. Stella had been so positive that she had heard him call. We afterwards heard that on that day he had been taken ill in London. I may here remark that young Mr. Stella is very much attached to his mamma, and especially dependent upon her in sickness.

"CLARA SCHMIDT."

The next case is from Miss Burrows, residing at Hollard Hall, Stretford Road, Manchester.

December, 1884.

(277) "I can furnish you with an instance of my name being called by my mother, who was 18 miles off, and dying at the time. I was not aware she was ill, nor was I thinking about her at the time. No one here

knew my name, and it was her voice calling, as I was always addressed at home, 'Lizzie.' I can give you more exact information if you require it.

"E. BURROWS."

Later Miss Burrows writes :—

"March 18th, 1885.

"In regard to the voice which I heard call my name on the 19th February, 1882, I recognised it instantly as being that of my mother. It was *very loud*, sharp, and impetuous, as if frightened at something. Our house is detached, very quiet, and the only inmates of the house beside myself were two gentlemen, aged respectively 58 and 37, and a widowed daughter-in-law [of the elder gentleman] who had lived with them five years; and not one of them knew my Christian name. I was thunder-struck, and ran out of my room to see if I could account for the voice. *I told the lady the same morning.*

"I never saw anything I thought supernatural, and only once before had anything like a similar hallucination. [This other experience took place 12 years previously, when Miss Burrows and her mother heard some sounds which seemed to them unaccountable.] My father and mother were not superstitious people, and a healthier family could not possibly be than ours."

In answer to inquiries, Miss Burrows adds :—

"I heard the voice call my name on the Sunday morning at 8. My mother was dying, and quite unconscious, from the Saturday night (the night before) until the Monday at 8 a.m. when she died."

The narrator has explained to me that her mother was taken ill on the Saturday night, and lay all that night and the next day on the sofa, muttering to herself, but not thought to be dying.

We find from an obituary notice in the *Bury Guardian* that Mrs. Burrows died on Monday, February 20, 1882.

Mrs. Griffiths, of 31, Rosaville Road, Fulham Road, S.W., confirms as follows :—

"March 25th.

"I am very glad to be able to corroborate the statement made by Miss Burrows, about hearing herself called by name at the time of her mother's death. I cannot remember the exact date, but it was a Sunday morning in February, 1882, and when I came down to breakfast she told me about it, and said that a voice called 'Lizzy' distinctly, and it sounded just like her mother's. The next morning she had the news of her mother's death; and she had not any idea that she was ill before, so that it could not have been fancy.

"H. GRIFFITHS."

It will be seen that Miss Burrows gives February 19th as the date of her experience, and Mrs. Griffiths mentions independently that the day was a Sunday in February. The 19th of February, 1882, fell on a Sunday.

§ 3. I now turn from recognised to unrecognised auditory phantasms. [Of five cases given 279 and 281 are here omitted.] The next account is from Mr. Goodyear, now of Avoca Villa, Park Road, Bevois Hill, Southampton, who refers in it to a visual case quoted in Chapter XII, § 3.

"February 9th, 1884.

(280) "I am very fond of shooting, and one evening I had gone out with my bag and gun. I was crossing some open meadows, when suddenly

a fearfully shrill cry of 'Tom' rang in my ears. I instantly answered loudly, 'Yes, yes,' turning sharply round to see who was in pain, but there was no one near, and again the scream rang out terribly loud. I answered again, 'Yes, yes,' and then I heard no more. I retraced my steps, for I was quite unstrung; but later on, when it was dark, I went over to see the keeper in whose woods I was going to shoot, and told him what had happened. He said 'Bad news,' and he was right; for next morning summoned me to join my bereaved sweetheart, who at that very time, certainly to within a very few minutes, lost her father. I knew her father was ill, had been for some 18 months, but was not thinking about them at the time. I do not know whether these cases are particularly striking, or whether there are heaps of similar ones, but they are just what happened and will for ever live fresh in my memory. "T. W. GOODYEAR."

We find from the Register of Deaths that the death took place on March 7, 1876, after a 2 years' illness.

Asked if this is the only auditory hallucination that he can recall, Mr. Goodyear replies in the affirmative.

Asked whether the lady really uttered his name at the time, he replies, "My wife does not think she uttered my name aloud, though for several reasons she was thinking intensely of me." He has told me in confidence special circumstances which caused the mind of the dying man to be much occupied with him, and which caused the mind of his *fiancée* to be directed towards him with a special longing for his presence.

The narrator of the next case is Mrs. Wyld, of 59, Devonshire Road, Birkenhead.

"May 10th, 1885.

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

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

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

"I wonder I did not associate it with her, for she had written me some very pitiable letters beforehand. I had not the least idea her mind was affected. We were school-fellows together for nearly three years and great friends.

"MARY WYLD."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Wyld adds:—

"I never have had a hallucination of the senses at any other time. It was about 8 o'clock in the evening, I fancy, when I heard the voice. She was not found till 2 o'clock the next morning when the tide turned on the river; she then had been dead several hours, having slipped out, I fancy, between 7 and 9 the previous evening."

We have verified the date given, and the circumstances of the death, in two local newspapers. It appears that though the body was not re-

covered till early next morning, it was seen, and the shawl that was round it was even seized and drawn into a boat, at 10 p.m.

Mrs. Wyld afterwards found that she *had* mentioned her experience at the time to her mother, who writes to us on March 19, 1886 :—

“ Mrs. Wyld was staying with me in Scarborough, when she heard the voice in which you are interested. She was alone in the house (excepting servants), and when I returned, an hour after, she related what had seemed to her peculiar. The date I do not now remember ; but Mrs. Wyld left Scarborough the next day ; and in two or three days after, she wrote to tell me of the sad event having taken place that evening.

“ M. BALGARNIE.”

[The *non-recognition* here rather tends to strengthen the case, by increasing the improbability that the hallucination was due to anxiety about the absent friend.]

The following case is from Miss Harriss, of 25, Shepherd's Bush Road, W.

“ January 25th, 1884.

(283) “ Exactly the hour in the afternoon that my mother died, being out for a long walk in the country with a companion, and having parted from her to pick wild flowers, I heard myself distinctly called several times. With a feeling as if some ill were approaching, I looked at my watch instinctively, and found it half-past 4. I cannot tell why I did so, for I was then only a school-girl, and calling to my companion I found she had not addressed me. I dreamed of my mother's death the same night.

“ A. HARRISS.”

In answer to inquiries, Miss Harriss adds :—

“ My mother died on 25th September, 1875. She was in better health than I had seen her for years when I left her about six weeks before, which was the reason of my doing so. She died suddenly of heart disease. I had heard from her only two days before, in good health and spirits. The hour of death was stated in the letter and telegram ; I think I have both still.

“ I never had another auditory hallucination. I never had another dream of death besides that about my mother ; it was very vivid and distressing. I saw her dying.”

The following is an extract, copied by the present writer, from a letter written to Miss Harriss by her father, and dated September 25, 1875 :—

“ Ashfield.

“ MY DEAR ANNIE,—You will be much surprised that your dear mamma passed away this afternoon about 3.45, so gently that we could not believe that she was really gone. . . . I think she was not quite conscious at the time.—Your affectionate father,

“ J. H. HARRISS.”

The friend who was with Miss Harriss at the time writes to us on July 12, 1884, from 58, Cornwall Gardens, S.W. :—

“ The following is an answer to your inquiries regarding my recollection of a certain incident relating to the death of Miss Harriss' mother. I remember her coming down one morning much disturbed at a very vivid dream she had during the night, in which she saw her mother lying dead. About an hour after she told us, the post came in, bringing Miss Harriss

the news of her mother's death. The previous day Miss Harriss had been in the woods with me, and came and asked me why I called her, and what was the matter. On finding I had not, she told me she had been quite sure some one was calling her, and wanted her. I believe afterwards we were struck at the curious coincidence of her mother being taken ill that afternoon, and being actually dead about the time of her dream.

"EDITH DARWIN."

[In conversation, Miss Harriss assured me again that she is positive that the hour at which she heard the voice was the hour of her mother's death. If her recollection of the time which she noted by her watch is correct, this is an instance of exaggeration of correctness, as there was an interval of three-quarters of an hour.]

Here we can hardly attribute the dream to any excitement caused by the previous hallucination, since that does not appear to have suggested her mother to Miss Harriss. If we regard both incidents as telepathic, and as due to a common cause, the case would be an interesting instance of "deferred impression"—the dim impulse which immediately after the death emerged as an unrecognised phantasm, developing into more definitely "veridical" shape in sleep.

§ 4. And now we come to cases where the auditory impression was of a complete sentence, conveying either a piece of information or a direction. [Cases 284 and 285 are omitted.]

The following example, from a clergyman who unfortunately withholds his name from publication, is very similar [to 285], the *inward* nature of the sound being again noticeable.

(286) "In March, 187-, I went to the curacy of A., and had been, as well as I remember, about a month there, when the following happened. I am a native of a town in the North of England, and in my childhood had a friend of my own age whom I will call C. Our friendship lasted till manhood, though our circumstances and walks of life were very different; and I had always a great deal of influence over him, insomuch that he would allow himself to be restrained by me when he would not by others. He became, towards his 20th year or so, rather addicted to drink, but I always had the same friendship for him, and would have done anything to serve or help him.

"In 187- his family were living at X. (near Z.), and as all my other old friends had long left the neighbourhood of Z., my native town, I always used to go to them whenever I visited that part, as I was and am still on sufficiently friendly terms with them to go at any time without notice. On the day in question I had been visiting some of the parishioners, and having made an end of this, came to a cross-road of two of the lanes near the church; and not only was I *not* thinking of my friend, whom I had not heard of for some years, but I distinctly remember what I *was* thinking of, which was whether to go home to my lodgings for my tea, turning to the left, or whether to trespass on the hospitality of a lady who lived to the right of the crossing. When thus standing in doubt, a kind of shudder passed through me, accompanied by a most extraordinary feeling, which I can only compare to that of a jug of cold water poured on the nape of the neck, and running down the spine;¹ and as this passed off, though I

¹ Cf. case 28, and the note thereon.

cannot say I *heard* a voice, I was distinctly conscious of the words, 'Go to Z. by this evening's train,' being said in my ear. There was no one at the time within 100 yards of me. I was not very flush of money just then, and could not well afford the expense, besides not wishing to absent myself from duty so soon after taking it up. But it seemed so distinct that I almost made up my mind to obey it; but on announcing the fact to my landlady, to whom, of course, I could not tell my true reason, she remonstrated so earnestly that, coupling this with the affairs of my duty, &c., I did conclude to disregard it. I could not, however, settle to anything, read, write, or sit in comfort, till the time was elapsed when I could have caught the train, when the uneasy, restless feeling gradually went off, and in a few hours I was ready to laugh at myself.

"Three or four days after, I received the sad news that my friend had on that day gone down home from London, had been taken ill, and two days afterwards had, in a fit of temporary insanity, put an end to his life. I have no doubt in my own mind that had I obeyed the intimation I might have saved his life; for I must have gone to their house, no other in the neighbourhood being available; and had I found him in the condition in which he was, you may be very sure he would never have got out of arm's length of me until all danger was over. I have ever since reproached myself with it, and have made up my mind that should I ever have such another experience I will do what is directed, seem it never so absurd or difficult."

In reply to inquiries, the narrator adds:—

"I was in health just as usual, no better and no worse. I had good health all the time I was at A., and in particular I never have suffered from indigestion since I was a child. I have never at any other time had such a physical sensation, or such a sensation of a voice; and nothing has ever happened to me which would lead at all satisfactorily to the conclusion that any abnormal phenomena were present."

The narrator has privately told us the year of the occurrence, and the place where the suicide took place; and we have verified these details in the Register of Deaths. The event took place later in the year than he imagined—in November. In conversation, he has explained that "Go to Z." practically meant the same for him as "Go to these friends," as he would be quite certain to stay with them. Their place of business was still at Z. At the time of his experience, his friend was in a very critical condition.

[In § 5 Gurney gives a case where the sound heard, though vocal, was not articulate. This is here omitted. He calls attention to the *scream* case, No. 34, p. 163, as the "strongest example in our collection that can be thus described."—ED.]

§ 6. We now come to a few specimens of the non-vocal sound-phantasms—the mere noises or shocks—which are the parallel among auditory hallucinations to the rudimentary visual hallucinations which were considered in the last chapter. But the auditory cases need a far more jealous scrutiny, before we are justified in regarding them as even probably telepathic in origin. Odd noises, especially at night, are very common phenomena; and though the particular cause of them is often hard to detect, the physical conditions of our indoor life are prolific of possible causes. Most of us are in constant proximity to wind that may blow

through crevices, and rattle or flap or dislodge loose parts of our windows and walls and chimneys ; and to water in pipes or cisterns that may leak, or burst, or may contain bubbling air ; and to slates that may fall ; and to wooden furniture and floors that may crack and creak. And if any one should say that he has heard a noise which, from its nature or its position, could not be accounted for by any such ascertainable cause, he might be reminded that sounds are the hardest things in the world to localise ; and that no one who has not given special attention to the subject can realise how easy it is to mistake the source and character of an auditory impression.¹ . . . Still, unaccountable noises are not of such daily and hourly occurrence but that a sufficiently large and well-established group of the coincidences in question might be taken as possible indications of telepathic action, especially as we have the analogy of rudimentary visual hallucinations to point to. Moreover, there is no doubt that surprising noises and crashes, though often due to undiscovered external causes, are also a form of purely subjective hallucination²—which make it at least probable, if telepathy be a reality, that they will also be a form of telepathic hallucination.

[Gurney quotes three cases—289, 290, 291—but as they all happen to be somewhat remote, and the class is in itself not a strong one, they are omitted here.—Ed.]

¹ I may mention, as a marked instance of this, a personal experience which I have again and again repeated. The dripping of a small fountain, heard from some yards off, produces on my ears the precise effect of a heavy waggon which is being slowly dragged up a gravelly road at a considerable distance.

² See the statistics given, p. 325.

CHAPTER XVI

TACTILE CASES AND CASES AFFECTING MORE THAN ONE OF THE PERCIPIENT'S SENSES

§ 1. In the chapter on "borderland" cases, and again in Chapter XII, when illustrating the development of hallucinations by the percipient's own imagination under the stimulus of a telepathic impulse, I quoted several instances in which two of his senses played a part—as where an impression of sound preceded and led up to the visible phantasm. And I have mentioned (pp. 386–7) that the proportion of the telepathic cases in which the experience assumes such a complex or multiple form seems decidedly larger than obtains among the purely subjective hallucinations of the sane. The present chapter will contain those remaining telepathic instances which belong to seasons of complete waking consciousness. In some of these, as it happens, the sense of *touch* is involved; and I may take the opportunity of saying a necessary word or two on affections of that sense.

Among purely subjective hallucinations of the sane, those of touch seem to be rarer even than those of sight, and much rarer than those of hearing. My large collection includes only 68 examples (a few being cases of *repeated* experiences), of which 43 were of touch only, 8 were associated with a visual hallucination, 13 with an auditory hallucination, while 4 concerned all three senses. The canvassed group of 5705 persons (pp. 376–8) yielded only 23 distinct experiences of the sort; and of these 23, one occurred to a person who was out of health, one in association with a visual, and two in association with an auditory hallucination. Moreover, in many of the cases where touch alone has been concerned, it is easy to suppose that the sensation was caused by an involuntary muscular twitch—an instance is even on record where a hallucination of sight and sound took its origin in an objective sensation, caused by the momentary cramp of a muscle¹—so that the number of genuine tactile hallucinations would be even smaller than appears. It will not surprise us, then, to find that telepathic affections of this sense—or what might reasonably be adduced as such—are also rare. A case has been already quoted in which the touch did not suggest any human contact, while it included a peculiarity beyond the mere touch—the sense of *pain* (No. 17, p. 132). We have, however, a few cases where the mere touch is alleged to have been more or less distinctive,² of which [Gurney quotes one specimen, No. 292, here omitted.—ED.]

¹ Paterson's paper in the *Edinburgh Medical and Surgical Journal* for Jan., 1843.

² In 11 out of the 43 cases just mentioned, the touch is alleged to have been recognised, and in 7 of these the person whose presence was suggested was dead. There is no difficulty in regarding such cases as "after-images"; but see p. 331, note.

But the more conclusive cases of recognition are naturally those where a *second* sense has been concerned ; the element of touch being then a natural enough feature in a highly developed phantasmal impression. In the following case the second sense involved is that of hearing. The account is in the words of Mrs. Stone, of Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport ; it is attested, as will be seen, by the percipient.

(293) " A well-known inhabitant of Walditch, a little village near Bridport, Dorset, died suddenly last May, 1881. We were all very sorry, and felt much for those she had left. She was an honest, industrious woman, a good, affectionate wife and mother. She had been somewhat ailing for some time past, but there was no special cause for alarm, and my daughter saw her engaged (she was a washerwoman) in her usual occupation the day before her death. From her husband I heard the following narrative of facts, which he received from his son, when the latter came down to his mother's funeral :—

" ' My wife latterly was uneasy about one of her sons, Joseph Gundry, who is a pointsman on the Midland Railway, and had risen to an office of much responsibility. Not hearing from him for some time, she feared that he had fallen ill, and did not like to write till there should be no longer any cause for alarm. There was, in fact, such a press of business that he could not find time to write. On the night, or rather morning, of his mother's death, he had the night-duties, and, there being no train about, he sat down for a short time, leaning his arms on a table. He was not asleep and had hardly settled himself, when a hand was placed on his shoulder, and a voice said distinctly : ' Joe, your mother wants you.' As far as we can ascertain this was about the time that his mother passed away. He did not recognise the voice, and saw no one. As there is no post from Bridport that could reach him under two days, his father telegraphed. When the telegram was brought to him, he said, " I know what it is, my mother is dead." ' "

The percipient writes :—

" Hay Street, Sawley, Derby.

" February 16th, 1883.

" I have perused the attached [*i.e.*, the above account] and find it to be substantially correct. I attest the accuracy of the report as printed, and I am prepared to bear it out.

" JOSEPH GUNDRY."

Mr. Gundry further informs us that he has never on any other occasion experienced any sort of hallucination of the senses.

In the next case [omitting 294], the second sense involved is that of sight. The narrator is Mrs. Randolph Lichfield, of Cross Deepes, Twickenham. Her husband was precluded from attesting the account in writing, by a painful affection of the hand.

" 1883.

(295) " I was sitting in my room one night, before I was married, close before a toilet-table, on which the book I was reading rested ; the table fitted into the corner of the room, and the wide glass on it reached nearly to the ceiling, so that any one in the room could be seen full length. The book I was reading was not at all calculated to affect my nerves, or excite my imagination in any way. I was perfectly well, in good spirits,

and nothing had occurred since receiving my morning's letters, to remind me of the person concerned in the strange experience you have asked me to relate.

"My eyes were fixed on my book, when suddenly I *felt*,¹ but did not see, some one come into my room. I looked straight before me into the glass to see who it was, but no one was visible. I naturally thought that my visitor, seeing me deep in my book, had gone out again, when, to my astonishment, I felt a *kiss* on my forehead—a lingering, loving pressure. I looked up, without the least sensation of fear, and saw my lover standing behind my chair, stooping as if to kiss me again. His face was very white and inexpressibly sad. As I rose from my chair in great surprise, before I could speak, he had gone, how I do not know; I only know that, one moment I saw him, saw distinctly every feature of his face, saw the tall figure and broad shoulders as clearly as I ever saw them in my life, and the next moment there was no sign of him. For the first minute I felt nothing but surprise; *perplexity* expresses better what I mean; fear, or the idea I had seen a spirit, never entered my mind; the next sensation was that there must be something the matter with my brain, and a feeling of thankfulness that it had not conjured up some terrific vision, instead of an agreeable one. I remember praying that I might not fancy anything that would frighten me.

"The next day, to my great surprise, there was not my usual morning's letter from him; four posts came in and no letter; all the next day, no letter. I naturally objected to the novel feeling of finding myself neglected, but should not have thought of letting the neglecter know it, so would not write to inquire the cause of his silence. On the third night—still no letter all day—as I was going upstairs to bed, thinking of something totally unconnected with R., as I put my foot on the top stair, I felt, suddenly, but most intensely, that he was in my room, and that I could see him just as I had done before. For the first time came the fear that something had happened to him. I knew well how intense his desire to see me would be, and thought—'Could it have been really that I saw him the other night?'

"I went straight to my room, convinced I should see him; there was nothing to be seen. I sat down and waited, and the sensation that he was there, and striving to speak to me, and to make me see him, became stronger and stronger. I waited till I became so sleepy I could not sit up any longer, and went to bed and to sleep. By the first morning's post I wrote and told him I feared he must be ill, as I had not had a letter for three days. I said not one word of what I have told you in this. Two mornings after, I had a few lines, shockingly written, to tell me he had hurt his hand out hunting, and could not hold a pen till that day, but was in 'no danger.' It was not till a few days after, when he could write distinctly, that I knew the whole truth.

"This is it. He had been riding an Irish hunter, a splendid horse across country, but a most vicious creature. This horse was so used to getting rid of any one he found on his back, if he objected to their presence there, and had such a variety of methods of doing so, throwing grooms, huntsmen, any one, when the fit seized him, and when he found no amount of rearing, kicking, no bolting, and stopping suddenly, no 'buck-jumping' would unseat my *fiancé*, and that he had at last found his master, he became desperate. He stood still for an instant, then rushed across the

¹ If, as is probable, this *feeling* was due to a faint *auditory* hallucination (p. 344, first note), the case would be one of the rare instances of hallucination of *three* senses. Compare Nos. 185, 306.

road backwards, reared perfectly straight, and pressed his rider's back against the wall. The crush and pain were so intense, R. thought it must be death, and remembered saying, as he lost consciousness, 'May, my little May! don't let me die without seeing her again.' It was that night he had bent over and kissed me. He turned out not to be really injured, though, of course, in frightful pain, and his hand could not possibly hold a pen. The night I felt so suddenly and so certainly that I should see him, and, when I did not, felt so thoroughly he was there and trying to let me know it, he was at the time worrying himself about not writing to me, and wishing intensely that I might feel there was some reason for his silence.

"I told my mother [since deceased] all, just as I have told you, and she advised me to say nothing about his supposed visit to me till he was quite strong and well again, and I could do so personally. When he came to see me afterwards, I made him tell the whole of his account before I mentioned one word of my strange experience of those two nights.

"I have just read this over to him, and he vouches for my having exactly described his share of this strange experience."

§ 2. The remaining cases involve the senses of sight and hearing.

The following account is from Miss Paget, of 130, Fulham Road, S.W. It will be seen that the words which the percipient heard may not unnaturally be referred to the sudden idea in the agent's mind that his unforeseen accident would probably get him into a scrape.

"July 17th, 1885.

(297) "The following is the exact account of the curious appearance to me of my brother. It was either in 1874 or 1875. My brother was third mate on board one of Wigram's large ships. I knew he was somewhere on the coast of Australia, but I have no recollection of my having been thinking of him in any special way; though as he was my only brother, and we were great friends, there was a very close bond always between us. My father was living in the country, and one evening I went into the kitchen by myself, soon after 10, to get some hot water from the boiler. There was a large Duplex lamp in the kitchen, so it was quite light; the servants had gone to bed, and I was to turn out the lamp. As I was drawing the water, I looked up, and, to my astonishment, saw my brother coming towards me from the outside door of the kitchen. I did not see the door open, as it was in a deep recess, and he was crossing the kitchen. The table was between us, and he sat down on the corner of the table furthest away from me. I noticed he was in his sailor uniform with a monkey jacket on, and the wet was shining on his jacket and cap. I exclaimed, 'Miles! Where have you come from?' He answered in his natural voice, though very quickly, 'For God's sake, don't say I'm here.' This was all over in a few seconds and as I jumped towards him he was gone. I was very much frightened, for I had really thought it was my brother himself; and it was only when he vanished that I realised it was only an appearance. I went up to my room and wrote down the date on a sheet of paper, which I put away in my writing-table, and did not mention the circumstance to any one.

"About three months afterwards my brother came home, and the night of his arrival I sat with him in the kitchen, while he smoked. I asked him in a casual manner if he had had any adventures, and he said, 'I was nearly drowned at Melbourne.' He then told me he was ashore without leave, and on returning to the ship, after midnight, he slipped off

the gangway between the side of the ship and the dock. There was very little space, and if he had not been hauled up at once, he must have been drowned. He remembered thinking he was drowning, and then became unconscious.¹ His absence without leave was not found out, so he escaped the punishment he expected. I then told him of how he had appeared to me, and I asked him the date. He was able to fix it exactly, as the ship sailed from Melbourne the same morning, which was the reason of his fear of being punished, as all hands were due to be on board the evening before. The *date* was the same as the date of his appearance to me, but the hours did not agree, as I saw him soon after 10 p.m., and his accident was after midnight. He had no recollection of thinking specially of me at the time, but he was much struck by the coincidence, and often referred to it. He did not like it, and often when he went away said, 'Well, I hope I shan't go dodging about as I did that time.'

"I was about 22 at the time, and he was 20. I was always rather afraid I might see him or others after this, but I have never, before or since, had any hallucination of the sense of sight. My brother died abroad three years ago, and I had no warning then, nor do I imagine I shall ever see anything again. I am never on the look out for things of that kind, but if I ever saw anything again I would make a note of it. I destroyed the note I made of the date as soon as I had verified it, not thinking it could interest or concern anyone else.

"RUTH PAGET."

[I received a third-hand account of this incident two years before the above was written, and this older account completely agreed with the present more recent one; which shows, at any rate, that the incidents stand out with distinctness in Miss Paget's memory. In conversation, Miss Paget told me that at the moment when she mistook the apparition for her brother himself, she accounted for the *wetness*, which she so distinctly remarked, by supposing that he had got wet through with rain. She is quite sure that the coincidence of night was clearly made out when she and her brother talked the matter over—which of course makes her statement as to the coincidence of *date* technically incorrect, as the accident occurred after midnight. If longitude be allowed for, the impression must have followed the accident by about 10 hours.]

The next case is from Marian Hughes, confidential maid and secretary to Miss Julia Wedgwood, of 31, Queen Anne Street, W.

"December, 1882.

(298) "In the winter of 1878, my sister, Mrs. Barnes, was much pressed to marry a man named Benson, who was much attached to her; and, not succeeding in his suit, he told her if she would not marry him, he would take employment in India. He obtained a situation to go out to Madras.

"One Saturday night, about 9 o'clock, I, in the following spring, went to see my sister; she was much agitated, and told me that, just before I came in, she had been on her knees scrubbing the floor of a room on the ground floor (with a window that anyone could stand at and look in), when she heard herself called twice, 'Annie, Annie,' and looking up at the window, she saw what looked to her like the face of the friend who had wanted to marry her. She at once got up and rushed out, but finding no one there became convinced she had seen an apparition announcing the death of her friend. On the following Monday, she sent to the firm in the City with which he was connected, and was informed that he had been ill, but was

¹ See p. 387.

better when last heard of. Shortly afterwards, knowing Mr. H. Wedgwood's interest in this kind of story, I informed him of the occurrence, before it was known how it fared with my sister's friend in India.

"My sister, some weeks afterwards, told me that she had learnt from his employers in the City that he had died on the evening of the day she had seen the apparition in London.

"MARIAN HUGHES."

The Registrar of the Diocese of Madras writes to us that he can find no record of Benson's burial; and an exhaustive search in the records of the India Office has been equally unsuccessful. We learn, however, from the India Office that the returns do not profess to be absolutely complete.

Writing on the case on March 4, 1883, Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood says:—

"The story was told me by Marian Hughes, my daughter's confidential maid and attached friend, whose truthfulness may be entirely relied on. I wanted to hear it from her sister herself, but found that she considered it too solemn a subject to speak about. I was told of the apparition of the friend in India shortly after it occurred, and requested Marian to inform me as soon as they had news of the result." He adds:—

"My note of the case [*i.e.*, the original note made when he first heard Marian Hughes' account] was dated May 16th, 1878. I say, 'One Saturday evening about six weeks ago,' &c. On July 19th, in an article, I say, 'By the end of June it was known that Annie's friend had died suddenly on the evening of Saturday, 30th March, the day noted by Annie as the day of the apparition.'"

[Mrs. Barnes has had an auditory hallucination on one other occasion, when she heard herself called by the voice of her husband, who, it turned out, had died at a distance two days before.]

It is rare for *nautical* stories to reach the level of evidence. The following, however, is a case where the testimony seems hardly to leave room for a doubt that a hallucination of a particular kind was experienced at a particular crisis; and the question of its interpretation is a matter not of nautical but of scientific judgment. The statement (which was first published in the *Spiritualist*) was drawn up sixteen days after the incident occurred, through the prompt energy of Mr. W. H. Harrison, and on the suggestion of the late Mr. Cromwell F. Varley, F.R.S., who had questioned Captain Blacklock on the subject.

(299) "The steamship 'Robert Lowe' returned to the Thames on Tuesday, October 11th, 1870, from St. Pierre, Newfoundland, where she had been repairing one of the French Atlantic Telegraph Company's cables. An engineer on board, Mr. W. H. Pearce, of 37, Augusta Street, East India Road, Poplar, was taken ill with the typhus fever, and on the 4th of October last he died. One of his mates, Mr. D. Brown, of 1, Edward Street, Hudson's Road, Canning Town, Plaistow, a strong, healthy man, a stoker, not likely to be led astray by imagination, attended him till the day before he died. [Brown, it appears, bore the best of characters, and had a strong friendship for Pearce.] On the afternoon before his death, at 3 o'clock, in broad daylight, Brown was attending the sick man, who wanted to get out of bed, but his companion prevented him. And this is what the witness says he saw:—

" 'I was standing on one side of the bunk, and while trying to prevent Pearce from rising, I saw on the other side of the bunk, the wife,

two children, and the mother of the dying man, all of whom I knew very well, and they are all still living. They appeared to be very sorrowful, but in all other respects were the same as ordinary human beings. I could not see through them; they were not at all transparent. They had on their ordinary clothes, and, perhaps, looked rather paler than usual. The mother said to me in a clearly audible voice, "He will be buried on Thursday, at 12 o'clock, in about fourteen hundred fathoms of water." They all then vanished instantly, and I saw them no more. Pearce did not see them, as he was delirious, and had been so for two days previously. I ran out of the berth in a state of great excitement, and did not enter it again while he was alive. He died on Tuesday, not Thursday, and was buried at 4 o'clock, not 12.¹ It was a sudden surprise to me to see the apparitions. I expected nothing of the kind, and when I saw them I was perfectly cool and collected. I had never before seen anything of the kind in my life, and my health is, and always has been, good. About five minutes afterwards I told Captain Blacklock I would stop with the sick man no longer, but would not tell him why, thinking that if I did, nobody else would take my place. About an hour later, I told Captain Blacklock and Mr. Dunbar, the chief engineer, whose address is Old Mill, near Port William, Wigtownshire, Scotland.

"The other sailors on board say that they saw that Mr. Brown was greatly agitated from some cause, and they gradually drew this narrative out of him." Captain Blacklock says:—

"Brown came down into the cabin, looking very pale and frightened, and declared in a strong and decided way that he would not attend the sick man any more on any conditions—not for a thousand pounds. I told him that he ought to attend a sick and dying comrade, especially as a storm was raging, and he needed kind and considerate help, such as any of us might need one day. I pressed him all the more, as I wanted a strong steady man to attend the delirious invalid; besides, it being bad weather, the other men were fagged and over-worked. Brown would not go back, and he left the cabin, as I think, crying, so I sent him out a glass of brandy. Shortly after that, I heard he was very ill, and that his mates had some trouble in soothing and calming him.

"We the undersigned, officials on board the 'Robert Lowe,' declare the above statements to be true, so far as each of the circumstances came under our personal notice, but we none of us commit ourselves to any opinion as to the cause of the phenomenon. We give the statement simply because we have been requested to do so, rumours of the occurrence having gone abroad and caused inquiries to be made.

(Signed) "J. BLACKLOCK, Commander."

"ANDREW DUNBAR, First Engineer.

(Signatures of six other members of the crew.)

"Witness, W. H. HARRISON.

"October 20th, 1870."

[Captain Blacklock is dead. The "Robert Lowe" was lost in 1872, and only one or two of the crew escaped. The account included a description of some distressing experiences of Mrs. Pearce's, which had occurred

¹ This markedly illustrates the absence, from first-hand and immediate accounts, of the spurious marvels which have done so much to mask the facts of telepathy. It would be a tolerably safe prophecy that in any third-hand version of this occurrence the great point would be that the death and burial took place on the day and at the hour predicted.

in London during the few days before her husband's death, and filled her with anxiety on his account; but this anxiety cannot be safely assumed to have been in any way a condition of Brown's experience.]

It cannot, of course, be proved that this was not a case of purely subjective hallucination, as Brown knew the Pearce family by sight. But the vision, both in its character and its effects, was unlike any of those which were treated above (Chapter XI) as due to expectancy or anxiety. And we at any rate have the coincidence that a healthy man experienced the one hallucination of his life—and an extremely vivid and highly developed specimen—in broad daylight, at a time when the friend in whose beclouded mind the very scene evoked may well have been dominant, was dying in close proximity to him.¹

The following is another nautical case, as to which it is not easy to form an opinion. The points against it are that it is from an uneducated witness; and that it contains an account of an experience which in one respect—the length of its duration—has scarcely a parallel, as far as I know, among hallucinations of sane and healthy persons. Nevertheless, unless the account is an absolute fabrication, which seems very unlikely, the reasonable conclusion, I think, would be that a telepathic hallucination was produced, though its details may have been exaggerated. Mr. Louis Lyons, of 3, Bouverie Square, Folkestone, wrote, on October 21st, 1882 :—

(300) "Some time ago, my son told me that a friend of his, a rough and simple-minded fellow, had returned from Shields, and told him a curious tale. The man is a sailor, and had served with his father ever since he was a boy, in a collier which trades between this port and the North. The youth, having become very proficient in his calling, went on his voyages, leaving his father, now an elderly man, at home. During a stormy voyage, and not far off the Humber, the young sailor saw his father, whom he had left in excellent health, pacing the deck, and calling out several times, as he was wont to do, 'Mind your helm, Joe!' The young man wished to speak to his father, but could not; some occult power prevented him. At the end of the voyage a letter awaited the young sailor, announcing the death of the father at the precise time when he appeared to his son; but please to remark (a matter of some importance, I think) that the apparition remained on deck some three hours, until the vessel got to Grimsby. [This differs from the first-hand account.]

"I disbelieved my son's story, and requested him to ask his friend to come and take tea with me, that I might hear the account from his own mouth. He came. The simplicity of his manner, his plain, open-hearted account, and I may even say his stupidity, manifested in his peculiar diction, imparted an impress to his tale."

At our request Mr. Lyons interrogated Edward Sings more formally, the next time that the latter visited Folkestone. The following is Sings' own account :—

"Folkestone.

"December 29th, 1882.

"I left my father last about six years ago, on a Good Friday. He was in good health when I left him. We were in a gale of wind, and we were

¹ As regards the supposition that the agent was the sick man himself, cf. case 30, pp. 156-8. As to the appearance of more figures than one, see the remarks on case 202.

running in the Humber : we carried the main gaff away ; I was at the wheel steering her in. He came to me 3 or 4 times, tapped me on the shoulder, and told me to mind the helm, and I told the captain my father was drowned, or something happened to him. After we got in, when it was my watch, he was walking to and fro with me, and I went down below and told my mate I could not stop up, and I did not like to. My mate took my watch. I never could speak to my father, for something kept me from doing so. I heard of my father's death a week afterwards. No one else saw my father's spirit.¹ My father stopped on deck with me an hour, and as I could not stand it any longer I went below, and my mate took my place. We cast both anchors, and were towed into Grimsby. My mother and sister were at my father's death-bed, and they told me that my father asked several times whether I was in the harbour.

" I certify this to be a true account.

" EDWARD SINGS."

We find from the Register of Deaths that E. Sings' father died on April 7, 1877, aged 53. Good Friday fell on March 30 ; and this, it will be seen, corresponds very well with the above statement.

Mr. Lyons has kindly visited Sings' mother and sister, at 67, Tontine Street, Folkestone, and received a similar account from them.

[Cases 301 and 302 are here omitted.]

¹ See p. 176, note 2.

CHAPTER XVII

RECIPROCAL CASES

§ 1. WE have now to consider a quite new type of telepathic action. In the classes which have so far been passed in review, whether experimental or spontaneous, the parts of the agent and the percipient have been well defined, and the current of influence has set from the one to the other in an unmistakable fashion. But in several cases, it may be remembered (especially Nos. 35 and 94), we have had indications that the influence might be a *reciprocal* one—that each of the parties might receive a telepathic impulse from the other, and so each be at once agent and percipient. The cases referred to were doubtful, because the experience at one end of the line was a dream; and dreams having an almost limitless scope, it was conceivable enough that that of Mr. Newnham, for instance, though it curiously corresponded with his *fiancée's* actions and surroundings at the time, did so by accident; and that therefore his mental condition, while it affected her, was not affected by her. But had he had a *waking* vision of her, as she had of him, we should have considered it probable that the influence was mutual; since if two rare or unique events, which present so obvious a *primâ facie* connection as A's vision of B and B's vision of A, fall at the same time, we cannot readily assume the coincidence to be accidental. And if there are further and more distinct grounds for attributing B's vision to telepathy—say because A is dying at the time—it will be only reasonable to regard A's vision as part of the same complex phenomenon, rather than to suppose that A has an *accidental* vision at the same time as B has a *telepathic* one. But of course the proof of a reciprocal influence would be stronger still if, at the time of B's impression of A, A expressed in words some piece of knowledge as to B's condition which could not have been acquired in a normal manner. We thus see that a group of cases which have all the same claim to be considered telepathic, may have different claims, ranging from the very doubtful to the very conclusive, to be considered *reciprocally* telepathic.¹

¹ The numerous cases where two friends in different places prove to have been each exceptionally engrossed with the idea of the other at the same moment, must not be put forward as instances of telepathic, much less of reciprocal, action; for we may always suppose that the impressions only appeared to have been exceptionally vivid *after* the fact of the coincidence had given them a certain exceptional interest. The undue importance often attached to such incidents is to be regretted, since it confuses the subject, and to some extent excuses a similar confusion on the part of opponents—as, *e.g.*, when an eminent man of science thinks telepathy sufficiently refuted by this very consideration, that by accident friends sometimes think of one another, and even write to one another, simultaneously (*Deutsche Rundschau* for Jan., 1886, p. 45). Nor will it suffice for the exceptional character of *one* of the impressions to be established beyond doubt.

I will begin with a couple of the more doubtful cases. The following account was received through the kindness of Mr. G. J. Romanes, F.R.S., who is well acquainted with the narrator.

"March 18th, 1883.

(303) "On the night of the 26th of October, 1872, I suddenly felt very unwell, and went to bed about half-past 9, an hour earlier than usual, and fell asleep almost immediately, when I had a very vivid dream, which impressed me greatly; so much so, that I remarked to my wife, on waking, that I feared we should shortly receive bad news. I imagined I was sitting in the drawing-room near a table, reading, when an old lady suddenly appeared seated on the opposite side, close to the table. She neither spoke nor moved much, but gazed very intently on me, and I on her, for at least 20 minutes. I was much struck by her appearance, she having white hair, very dark eyebrows, and penetrating eyes. I did not recognise her at all, but thought she was a stranger. My attention was then directed to the door, which opened, and my aunt entering and seeing me and the old lady staring at each other in this extraordinary way, with much surprise and in a tone of reproach exclaimed, 'John! don't you know who this is?' and without giving me time to reply said, 'Why, this is your grandmother,' whereupon my ghostly visitor suddenly rose from her chair, embraced me, and vanished. At that moment I awoke. Such was the impression it made on my mind, that I got my note-book and made a note of this strange dream, believing that it foreboded bad tidings. However, several days passed without bringing any dreaded intelligence, when one night I received a letter from my father, announcing the rather sudden death of my grandmother, which took place on the very night and hour of my dream, half-past 10.

"About four months after her death, I went to the Isle of Wight, where she lived, to get information from my relatives as to what my grandmother was really like. My aunt and cousin described her in every particular, and their descriptions of her coincided most marvellously with the figure and face that appeared to me, the white hair and dark eyebrows being a peculiarity in her. This I particularly observed in my dream. I learnt, too, that she was extremely fussy in the arrangement of her cap, always being anxious that no part, even the strings, should be out of place, and curious to relate, I noticed in my dream that she was nervously touching her cap strings, now and again, for fear they should be out of place. My cousin, who was with her when she died, told me that my grandmother had been delirious for some time previous to her departure; and for a moment, when in that state, she suddenly put her arms round my cousin's neck, and on opening her eyes and regaining consciousness, she said with a look of surprise, 'Oh, Polly, is it you? I thought it was somebody else.' This seems to me very curious, as it was just what she did before she vanished from me in the drawing-room. I must add that I had not seen my grandparent for at least 14 years, and the last time I saw her she had dark hair, but this had gradually changed to white, leaving her eyebrows dark, and I am positive that nobody ever mentioned this peculiarity to me."¹

"J. H. W."

¹ In respect of this last feature, the case may be classed with those of Chap. xii. § 8. The nervous fidgeting with the cap-strings may possibly be regarded as a distinctive habit, sufficiently deeply organised to be a feature in the person's latent representation of her own physique. See the remarks at the end of the section referred to.

Mrs. W. says :—

“ July 1st, 1885.

“ I quite remember my husband telling me, on my going to my room on the evening of the 26th October, of a remarkable dream he had just had, and also his making an entry in the pocket-book on the following morning.

“ F. W.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that Jane W. died at the age of 72, on Oct. 26, 1870 [see below], at Brixton, Isle of Wight.

Mr. Podmore says :—

“ I called on Mr. J. H. W. to-day (July 4th, 1884), and heard the account from him *vis à voce*. His cousin's corroboration, for a reason which he explained to me, cannot be obtained. But he explained to me that he went to see his cousin within three months of the death, and received full particulars of the death-scene from her then. I asked him if he stood by the phrase ‘ at least 20 minutes,’ pointing out that it was difficult to attach any precise meaning to these words ; if they were a correct description of his impressions, a grotesque incident must have been interpolated in the midst of an otherwise realistic dream. He maintains that the words are correct ; it seemed to him that he and the old lady sat staring at each other across the table for a very long time. Mr. W. told me that he dreams very little ; and that he has never had another dream which he thought worth noting. He has never dreamt of death.”

After a second call, Mr. Podmore writes :—

“ I received an account from Mrs. W. of her husband's dream, as she remembered to have heard it within an hour of its occurrence and subsequently, which tallied precisely with the account here given. I saw also the note made on the following morning. It occurs at the head of the first page of a small pocket sketch-book, the rest of the page being occupied with pen or pencil memoranda of accounts, &c. The entry is ‘ Odd dream, night of October 26th, 1870.’ The last numeral, which is very indistinct, is apparently 0. Mr. W., in writing his original account in March, 1883, had referred to this note and read the final numeral as 2. Hence the discrepancy. He has no other memorandum of the death.

“ I pressed him as far as I could, but he still declines to give his name, fearing that he might acquire the reputation of being ‘ ghostly ’ and fanciful, and thus injure his professional prospects.”

Clearly the *dream* here is far less likely to have been accidental than Mr. Newnham's. But the inference from the dying woman's words, that she may have been in some way affected with a sense of her grandson's presence, is, of course, not one that can be pressed. And the same remark applies to several cases where A, who is in the crisis of illness, professes actually to have seen, as though by some clairvoyant flash, an absent relative, B, who turns out to have had at the same time a telepathic impression of A ; for unless special details of B's aspect or surroundings are described, A's alleged perception of him may always be supposed to have been a mere subjective dream or vision, and the percipience is not demonstrably reciprocal.

The next example—from Mr. J. T. Milward Pierce, of Bow Rancho, Knox County, Nebraska, U.S.A.—stands somewhat apart.

“ Frettons, Danbury, Chelmsford.

“ January 5th, 1885.

(304) “ I live in Nebraska, U.S., where I have a cattle rancho, &c. I am engaged to be married to a young lady living in Yankton, Dakota, 25 miles north.

“ About the end of October, 1884, while trying to catch a horse, I was kicked in the face, and only escaped being brained by an inch or two ; as it was I had two teeth split and a severe rap on the chest. There were several men standing near. I did not faint, nor was I insensible for a moment, as I had to get out of the way of the next kick. There was a moment's pause before anyone spoke. I was standing leaning against the stable wall, when I saw on my left, apparently quite close, the young lady I have mentioned. She looked pale. I did not notice what she wore ; but I distinctly noticed her eyes, which appeared troubled and anxious. There was not merely a face, but the whole form, looking perfectly material and natural. At that moment my bailiff asked me if I was hurt. I turned my head to answer him, and when I looked again she had gone. I was not much hurt by the horse ; my mind was perfectly clear, for directly afterwards I went to my office and drew the plans and prepared specifications for a new house, a work which requires a clear and concentrated mind.

“ I was so haunted by the appearance that next morning I started for Yankton. The first words the young lady said when I met her were, ‘ Why, I expected you all yesterday afternoon. I thought I saw you looking so pale, and your face all bleeding.’ (I may say the injuries had made no visible scars.) I was very much struck by this and asked her when this was. She said, ‘ Immediately after lunch.’ It was just after my lunch that the accident occurred. I took the particulars down at the time. I may say that before I went into Yankton, I was afraid that something had happened to the young lady. I shall be happy to send you any further particulars you may desire.

“ JNO. T. MILWARD PIERCE.”

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Pierce says :—

“ I think the vision lasted as long as a quarter of a minute.” He has had no other visual hallucination, except that once, when lying shot through the jaw by an Indian, he thought he saw an Indian standing over him, and infers that it was not a real one, or he would have been scalped.

Mr. Pierce wrote on May 27th, 1885 :—

“ I sent your letter to the lady, but did not get an answer before leaving England, and upon arriving here found her very ill, and it is only recently I have been able to get the information you wished for. She now wishes me to say that she recollects the afternoon in question, and remembers expecting me, and being afraid something had happened, though it was not my usual day for coming ; but although at the time she told me that she saw me with a face bleeding, she does not now appear to recollect this, and I have not suggested it, not wishing to prompt her in any way.”

In another letter of July 13th, 1885, Mr. Pierce says :—

“ I am sorry I can do no better for you than the enclosed letter. The fact seems to be that events of absorbing interest, and illness, appear to

have driven nearly all remembrance of the incident from Miss MacGregor's mind, attaching no particular importance to it at first. I have prompted her memory, but she only says, no doubt I am right, but that she can't now recollect it."

The letter enclosed from Miss Macgregor is as follows :—

" Yankton, D.T.

" July 13th, 1885.

" I have read the letter you sent to Mr. Pierce. I am afraid I cannot now recall the time you mention clearly enough to give you any distinct recollection.

" I remember feeling sure some accident had happened, but I told Mr. Pierce at the time everything unusual I felt, and events that have since occurred have, I am afraid, completely effaced all clear recollections of the facts.

" ANNIE MACGREGOR."

Knowing Mr. Pierce, I have no doubt that his recollection of what Miss MacGregor told him at the time is substantially accurate, and if so, it would be natural to interpret *her* experience as telepathic. But *his* vision may have been purely subjective. I am not aware, it is true, of any precisely parallel case, unless indeed it be Mr. Pierce's other experience, with the Indian. In my collection of purely subjective cases, I have one from a lady who was troubled by hallucinations for some time after a concussion of the brain ; but the blow which Mr. Pierce received was a comparatively slight one. Still, seeing that on the one hand his faculties may have been momentarily disordered by it, and that on the other the person whose form he saw was in a completely normal state at the time, it is safer not to lay stress on the reciprocal aspect of the case.

§ 2. The remaining cases are, I think, less doubtful. The following account is extracted from the evidence given by the late Mr. Cromwell F. Varley, F.R.S., before a Committee of the Dialectical Society, on May 25th, 1869 (*Report*, p. 161). [Another case of his has been omitted.]

(305) " In a second case my sister-in-law had heart disease. Mrs. Varley and I went into the country to see her, as we feared, for the last time. I had a nightmare and could not move a muscle. While in this state, I saw the spirit¹ of my sister-in-law in the room. I knew that she was confined to her bedroom. She said, ' If you do not move you will die ' ; but I could not move, and she said, ' If you submit yourself to me, I will frighten you, and you will then be able to move.' At first I objected, wishing to ascertain more about her spirit-presence. When at last I consented, my heart had ceased beating. I think at first her efforts to terrify me did not succeed, but when she suddenly exclaimed, ' Oh, Cromwell ! I am dying,' that frightened me exceedingly, and threw me out of the torpid state, and I awoke in the ordinary way. My shouting had aroused Mrs. Varley ; we examined the door, and it was still locked and bolted, and I told my wife what had happened, having noted the hour, 3.45 a.m. and cautioned her not to mention the matter to anybody, but to hear what was her sister's version, if she alluded to the subject. In the morning she told us that she had passed a dreadful night ; that she had been in our room, and greatly troubled on my account, and that I had been nearly dying. It was between 3.30 and 4 a.m. when she saw I was in danger.

¹ See p. 176, note 2.

She only succeeded in arousing me by exclaiming, 'Oh, Cromwell! I am dying.' I appeared to her to be in a state which otherwise would have ended fatally."

Even this incident might possibly be explained (like case 94) as an instance of simultaneous dreams¹—an independent and original nightmare of one of the two parties concerned inducing that of the other, without being reciprocally influenced by it. The next case, if correctly recorded, could not be so regarded. The account is contained in a letter from Mr. T. W. Smith, late of Leslie Lodge, Ealing, to the Psychological Society, dated February 26th, 1876, and kindly lent to us by Mr. F. K. Munton, who was secretary of that Society. Mr. Smith, who was known to Professor Barrett, left Ealing early in 1877, and his present address cannot be ascertained.

(306) "I found the lady who is now my wife at a large public institution to which I was appointed headmaster, in 1872. On leaving her situation, I induced her, for certain reasons, to conceal the fact of our intended marriage from those of her friends whom she had left behind at the school, and the only way to do this was not to write to any of them.

"Some six months after our marriage, I was reading in bed, according to a habit of mine, my wife asleep at my side, when she awoke suddenly, sat up, and exclaimed, in very earnest tones, 'Oh, I have been to ——.' I, of course, treated what she forthwith began to relate to me as a more than usually vivid dream, and the next day ceased to think of it. She, however, recurred to her dream from time to time, and I remember the circumstantial way in which she dwelt upon each point of it, especially a peculiar expression which I did not forget, though I made no written note of it at the time. Three months later my wife went to visit her mother, and found there a letter from one of her friends, urgently entreating some one to write and say whether Miss —— (my wife) was alive or dead. I was induced to go and see the writer, and then ascertained the cause of her hastily written and strangely worded epistle. The two occurrences on the same day—as well as I could fix the date, for neither of us were quite certain as to that essential particular—present a coincidence which I have never been able satisfactorily to explain on any hypothesis consistent with what is at present known of nature's laws.

"My wife dreamt that she was in a well-remembered room, at the base of the building, in company with four females—two of whom were old friends and two strangers to her. They were talking and laughing and preparing to retire to their several sleeping apartments. She saw one of them turn off the gas. She followed them upstairs, entered with two of them into a bedroom, saw 'Bessie' place some things in a box, undress, and get into bed; then she went to her, took her by the hand, and said, 'Bessie, let us be friends.' So much for the dream.

"The writer of the letter gave me this account of what had occasioned her writing; and I need scarcely say that I did not first mention what my wife had dreamt, for in that case it might be supposed that I had myself assisted in suggesting the remarkable expression, which, in my opinion, removes the occurrence from the category of 'remarkable coincidences.' She and her friend, 'Bessie,' had gone to bed one Sunday night, when an alarming cry from the latter brought the other to her bedside: 'I have just seen ——' (my wife); 'she touched me and said, "Let us be friends."'

¹ See pp. 217-21.

"The next day, on discussing the matter, though some of them thought that Bessie had been dreaming, and imagined what she declared she saw, others thought it a 'sign' that my wife was dead. And the one who was the best scribe amongst them undertook to write to the only address they possessed, in order to ascertain the truth. The letter had not been forwarded to us because my wife had, it seems, told her mother my wish that no communication with her former friends should take place.

"The odd thing about the dream is that my wife had always been on good terms with 'Bessie,' and was so on parting with her.

"In the foregoing account of the dream, and what I may call its complement, I omit many minor points, such as the fact that two new comers *had* taken the place of two former friends of my wife; that the effect on both my wife and Bessie was beyond what any ordinary dream would have produced; and that the two females, whom my wife in her dream saw enter the bedroom, did really occupy the same room."

[It is much to be regretted that we have had no opportunity of examining the letter; but the correspondence of the two experiences would hardly have impressed Mr. Smith as it did, if it had not included a very striking detail.]

The evidential weakness of this narrative is, of course, the doubt as to the exactitude of the coincidence. Supposing the two experiences to have fallen on the same night, we can hardly help connecting "Bessie's" impression (which seems to have been a hallucination and not a dream) with Mrs. Smith's remarkable vision; which latter is again, apparently, an instance of thought-transference of that extreme form which I have described as telepathic clairvoyance.

That this last word is the appropriate one for describing (it is far enough of course from explaining) the process appears from other examples; and a glance at the condition of these reciprocal cases will show that it would naturally be so. There is, as a rule, no difficulty in deciding to which of the two persons concerned the origin of the complex phenomenon should be traced; since one of the two is in a more or less abnormal condition, as compared to the other. In Mrs. Smith's case, the abnormality (outwardly at any rate) was nothing beyond sleep; but in other examples it is far more pronounced. If, then, it is A who is in the abnormal state—dying, or whatever it may be—we attribute B's vision of him to that state. But we cannot inversely attribute A's vision of B to B's state, if B's state is completely normal. It may, no doubt, be said that B's state ceases to be normal at the moment when A affects him; and that possibly the power to react telepathically on the impression is started by the mere fact of receiving it. But the more natural account of the matter would surely trace A's impression, no less than B's, to the peculiarity of A's state—by supposing either that A's power to act abnormally in a certain direction has involved an abnormal extension of *his own susceptibility* in the same direction; or else that some independently caused extension of his own susceptibility has involved the power to act abnormally.¹ In either case, his reception of the impression would be

¹ This latter hypothesis seems specially applicable to cases where A's condition has been one of mere sleep or trance, and not abnormal in any more serious way. For, considering that nearly all the evidence that exists for the reality of clairvoyance goes further to show that sleep and trance are the conditions most favourable to it,

active rather than passive; of the sort that partly seems (as I tried to express it before) like the momentary using of B's faculties—although B's state is not now, as in the former clairvoyant pictures and dreams,¹ supplying any exceptional telepathic stimulus. Still, though A's perception may not be conditioned by B's state, it must, I conceive, be conditioned by B's *existence* and *relation to A*; and the distinction again stands clear between *telepathic* clairvoyance, and that alleged *independent* clairvoyance where what is discerned cannot be traced in any natural way to the contents of any other human mind.

The next example is from the Hon. Mrs. Parker, of 60, Elm Park Gardens, S.W., who wrote to us on May 24th, 1883:—

(307) "The following experience happened in the month of November, 1877, in Regency Square, Brighton. My husband [since deceased] was undergoing a course of magnetism from Mr. L., an American. The treatment consisted of rubbing by mesmeric passes down the back, and arms and legs, but in all this there was no intention of putting my husband to sleep. The passes were intended to give strength. Mr. L. called himself, I believe, a professional mesmerist, but at the time we employed him he was not practising as such. He had come to Brighton for rest.

"After the treatment my husband was in the habit of sitting, for some hours, in his wheel-chair, at the top of the Square garden, and on the day of which I am writing he had expressed a wish to stay out rather later than usual. I went into the house for luncheon, leaving him alone, but on looking out of the window a little later, at 2 o'clock, I saw a man standing in front of his chair, and apparently talking to him. I wondered who it was, and concluded it must be a stranger, as I did not recognise the figure, or the wide-awake hat and rather oddly cut Inverness cape which he wore. However, as it very often happened that strangers did stop and speak to him, I was not surprised. I turned away my eyes for a moment, and when I again looked up the garden, the man had disappeared. I could not see him leaving the garden by any of the numerous gates, and remarked to myself how very quickly he must have walked to be so soon out of sight. Regency Square does not possess a tree and scarcely a shrub, so that there was nothing to impede my view.

"When my husband came in a little later, I said to him, carelessly, 'Oh, who was that talking to you in the square just now?'

"He replied, 'No one has spoken to me since you left. No one has even passed near me.'

"'But I saw a man standing in front of you and—as I thought—talking to you about a quarter of an hour ago. His dress was so odd, I couldn't at all tell who it could be.'

"At this my husband laughed, saying, 'I should think not, for there was no one to recognise. I assure you not a soul has been near me since you left.'

"'Have you been asleep?' I asked, though I did not think it very

we should certainly rather conceive that what enables A to affect B is the clairvoyant perception itself of B or B's surroundings, than that this perception is a secondary result, dependent on the fact that A has impressed B by dint merely of being asleep or entranced. We should naturally expect that where the conditions are much the same on *both* sides, A's and B's parts in the phenomenon might be exactly equal and parallel—each being perceived by the other in the other's own environment.

I may note here that the evidence for a heightening of telepathic susceptibility at the time of death, and in seasons of illness, is not confined to the class of cases now in question. See for instance cases 126, 303, 308, 311.

¹ Pp. 185-9, 231-2, and 242-50.

likely. He assured me he had not. So the subject dropped ; still in my own mind I knew I had seen the mysterious figure.

"Two days afterwards, Mr. L., after giving my husband his treatment, came, as was his usual habit, to speak to me before leaving the house. After a few words and directions, he said, 'It is a very odd thing, but the same experience has happened to me twice since I have attended your husband, that, when in quite another place, I have suddenly felt as if I were standing by his side, either in your drawing-room or out there in the garden.'

"I looked at him, and for the first time noticed his overcoat which he had put on before coming into the room, and the wide-awake in his hand. It struck me that these articles were very similar to those worn by the figure I had seen, and that in every way Mr. L. resembled this same figure. I asked him when, and at what time, he had had the last experience spoken of? 'The day before yesterday,' was the reply. 'I had just finished an early dinner, and was sitting in front of the fire with a newspaper. It was about 2 o'clock ; I remember the time perfectly. Suddenly I felt I was no longer there, but standing near your husband in the Square garden.'

"I then told him of the figure I had seen at the same time and place, and how I now recognised it to be his. Afterwards I asked my husband if he had mentioned the circumstance to Mr. L., but he had not done so, and had indeed forgotten all about it. My husband was the *only* person to whom I had mentioned the fact of my vision. It could not by any possibility have got round to Mr. L.

"AUGUSTA PARKER."

[In answer to the inquiry whether she had ever had any other hallucination of the senses, Mrs. Parker replied that she had had one other. It seems likely, however, that this was merely a case of mistaken identity, the figure being seen at the end of a long hotel-passage ; and this was her own impression at the time.]

This case again seems difficult to explain except on the reciprocal theory. It is true that there is not the same proof in the case of Mr. L. as in that of Mrs. Smith above, that the scene which he saw was transferred, and not spontaneously pictured ; for the place was familiar to him, and no unusual details are mentioned. But, on the other hand, his experience seems to have been quite unlike an ordinary dream ; its very unusualness is what allows us to connect it with Mrs. Parker's simultaneous and unique vision ; and if we may regard it as having been conditioned by the presence in the perceived scene of his patient, Mr. Parker—who forms, so to speak, the pivot of the case—the fact that Mr. Parker himself was not consciously affected can still be accounted for on the analogy of such instances as Nos. 242 and 355.¹

The next case was one of *collective* percipience ; but its best place is in the present chapter. The full names of the persons concerned may be mentioned, but not printed. Mrs. S., one of the percipients, writes :—

"April, 1883.

(308) "A and B² are two villages in Norfolk, distant about five miles

¹ I should further conjecture one of the conditions of Mrs. Parker's percipience to have been the fact that she was actually contemplating the scene in which Mr. S. seemed to find himself (see pp. 514-16).

² These letters are substituted for those actually given for the sake of clearness. The names of the villages were not suppressed in the accounts that follow ; but as they were suppressed in this first one, it has been thought right to suppress them throughout.

from each other. At the time of the occurrence about to be related, the clergymen of these parishes both bore the same name, though there was no relationship between them; at the same time there was a great friendship between the two families. On the 20th February, 1870, a daughter, Constance, about 14 years old, of the clergyman of A, was staying with the other family—a daughter, Margaret, in that family, being her great friend. Edward W., the eldest son of the Rector of A, was at that time lying dangerously ill at home with inflammation of the lungs, and was frequently delirious. On the day mentioned, at about noon, Margaret and Constance were in the garden of B Rectory, running down a path which was separated by a hedge from an orchard adjoining; they distinctly heard themselves called twice, apparently from the orchard, thus: ‘Connie, Margaret—Connie, Margaret.’ They stopped, but could see no one, and so went to the house, a distance of about 40 yards, concluding that one of Margaret’s brothers had called them from there. But to their surprise they found that this was not the case; and Mrs. W., Margaret’s mother, assured the girls no one had called them from the house, and they therefore concluded they must have been mistaken in supposing they had heard their names repeated. This appeared to be the only explanation of the matter, and nothing more was thought of it.

“That evening Constance returned to her home at A. On the following day, Mrs. W. drove over to inquire for the sick boy Edward. In the course of conversation, his mother said that the day before he had been delirious, and had spoken of Constance and Margaret, that he had called to them in his delirium, and had then said, ‘Now I see them running along the hedge, but directly I call them they run towards the house.’ Mrs. W., of B, at once called to mind the mystery of the previous day, and asked, ‘Do you know at what time that happened?’ Edward’s mother replied that it was at a few minutes past 12, for she had just given the invalid his medicine, 12 being his hour for taking it. So these words were spoken by Edward at the same time at which the two girls had heard themselves called, and thus only could the voice from the orchard be accounted for.

“M. K. S.”

(The “Margaret” of the narrative.)

The following statement is from Mrs. R., the “Constance” of the narrative.

“Sept. 1884.

“Margaret and I were walking in some fields at B, away from the road, but not very far from the house. Here I heard a voice call ‘Connie and Margaret’ clearly and distinctly. I should not have identified it with Ted’s voice [*i.e.*, her brother’s at A], for we thought it was one of the B brothers at the time, till we found no one had called us. I remember that it was before early dinner, and that I was expecting to be fetched home that same morning, because of Ted’s illness; and that Mrs. W. thought of asking mother if Ted had mentioned our names in any way, *before* she told her of what had passed at B. I ought to add that an explanation of the story might be found in the conduct of some B plough-boy, playing a trick upon us. The situation was such that he might easily have kept out of sight behind a hedge.

“C. E. R.”

Mr. Podmore says:—

“November 26th, 1883.

“I saw Mrs. R. yesterday. She told me that they recognised the voice vaguely as a well-known one at the time. She thinks that the

coincidence in time was quite exact, because Mrs. W. of B made a note of the circumstance immediately. Her brother—an old school-fellow of mine—cannot recollect the incident at all.”

[If a written note was made, the girls’ experience must have seemed odder than the “nothing more was thought of it” in Mrs. S.’s account would imply.]

Mrs. W. of A says :—

“My son was about 17 years old. He had had fever and inflammation, and was weakened by illness. It was about 12 o’clock. I was sitting with him, after his washing and dressing, and he seemed quiet and sleepy, but not asleep. He suddenly sprang forward, pointed his finger, with arms outstretched, and called out in a voice the loudness of which astonished me, ‘Connie and Margaret!’ with a stress on each name, ‘near the hedge,’ looked wildly at them, and then sank down, tired. I thought it odd at the time, but, considering it a sort of dream, did not allude to it. The next day, Mrs. W. called with Connie and Margaret, and said the girls had heard their names called; had run home; were walking by a hedge in their field, had found no one had called them from B Rectory. The voice sounded familiar, but as far as I can remember—my daughter will say—it was not distinctly thought to be Edward’s. I at once told my story, as it was too striking not to be named. They said it was about 12 o’clock. Though he was constantly delirious in the evening, when the pulse rose, he was never so in the middle of the day, and there was no appearance of his being so at the time this occurred.

“M. A. W.”

Mrs. W. of B says :—

“August, 1884.

“Connie was staying with us on account of the illness of her brother Edward, and had—with Margaret—been reading with me one morning. At about 11.30 they went into the garden to play (they were girls of about 13 and 14), and in half an hour came up to the window to know what I wanted. I said ‘Nothing,’ and that I had not called them, though they had heard both their names called repeatedly. I asked them where they were when they heard it, and they said in the next walk—which, you will remember, is formed on one side by the orchard hedge. Margaret said directly, ‘There, Connie; I said it was not mother’s, but a boy’s voice.’ Then I turned to look at the clock—for we had some boys as pupils then—and I said, ‘It would not be one of the boys, for they are not out of the study; it is now 12 o’clock, and I hear them coming out.’

“I was to take Connie home that afternoon,¹ and, on arriving, of course my first question was, ‘How was Edward?’ Mrs. W. told me that he had not been so well, and had been very delirious. She said that morning he had been calling, ‘*Margaret! Connie! Margaret! Connie! Oh, they are running by a hedge, and won’t listen to me.*’ I did not say what had happened at home, but asked if she knew at what time this had so distressed him. She said ‘Yes’; for she had looked at the clock, hoping it was nearly time to give him his medicine, which always quieted him, and was thankful to find it was just 12 o’clock.”

Here we seem to have, on the part of the two girls, a telepathic hallucination, reproducing the exact words that were in the mouth and ear of

¹ The other accounts make it probable that it was not till next day that Mrs. W. of B went to A.

the sick boy ; and, on his part, a vision reflected from their minds, and once more illustrating how what might be described as clairvoyance may be a true variety of thought-transference. The suggestion at the end of Mrs. R.'s account must not be overlooked ; but I should be glad to know of precedents for hidden plough-boys calling out the Christian names of clergymen's daughters and their friends. Nor do I quite see how such a freak could merit the designation of a " trick " ; it would surely be a mere piece of aimless and pointless rudeness—unless, indeed, the plough-boy was enjoying a telepathic chuckle at the idea that his cry might be confounded with another, which was being simultaneously uttered five miles off.

It will be seen that the number of these reciprocal cases (even with the addition of those in the Supplement) is small—so small that the genuineness of the type might fairly enough be called in question. There is some danger that our view of the rarer telepathic phenomena may be unduly affected by the sense of certainty that gradually and reasonably forms with regard to the broad fact of telepathy itself. The argument for the reality of telepathy, we must remember, depends on a mass of narratives so large as to make a universal error in the essential point of all or nearly all of them exceedingly improbable ; and is not available in respect of peculiar features, which are present in only a very small proportion of the alleged cases. For these, the various possibilities of error so fully discussed in the general sketch of the evidence (Chapter IV) may seem quite sufficient to account ; and the greater the theoretic interest of the peculiarities, the more jealously must their individual claims be scrutinised. As to reciprocity, the reader will form his own opinion. That the examples should be few, as compared with those of the simpler telepathic types, cannot at this stage of our inquiry seem unnatural. For if, amid all the apparent opportunities that human lives present, the unknown and probably transient conditions of telepathic percipience and of telepathic agency only occasionally chance to coincide, so as to produce a telepathic phenomenon at all (pp. 419-20) ; and if, of the two, the conditions of percipience are the rarer, as experimental thought-transference would lead us to suppose ; then the complete conditions of a reciprocal case must be rare among the rare. Still, if they have occurred, they will occur again. If my colleagues and I are right in supposing the type to be a genuine one, we ought to obtain, as time goes on, some more well-attested specimens of it ; and to this we look forward with considerable confidence.

CHAPTER XVIII

COLLECTIVE CASES

§ 1. THE telepathic cases quoted in the foregoing chapters have almost all affected a single percipient only; and the fact that sometimes the percipient was in company at the time, and that his sensory experience was unshared by any one present, has confirmed the view (to which all other considerations seemed to converge) that telepathic affections of the senses are in the most literal sense *hallucinations*. But we have already encountered a few cases where the senses of more than one percipient have been affected;¹ and what awaits us in the present chapter is the discussion and complete illustration of this perplexing feature.

Of course the first view which is suggested by the fact that two or more people have seen or heard the same thing at the same time is that the sight or sound, however abnormal and unaccountable, was due to some objective reality within the range of their sense-organs—in other words, that it was not a hallucination at all.² Hence those apparently telepathic instances where a sensory experience, representative of some absent person, has been shared by more than one percipient, would imply the immediate presence of some sort of physical wraith, or at any rate of an objective human presence.

I scarcely know how far the idea of a literal wraith is seriously entertained by any educated person in the present day. Gaseous and vaporous ghosts are, I imagine, quite at a discount; but the word "ether" seems sometimes to be used as a way out of the difficulty. For many ears the word has, no doubt, a convenient vagueness; but, in fact, we know of no mode by which ether can affect the retina, except through waves started by luminous substances of known type. And even if etherial ghosts could be *seen*, the *auditory* phenomena would remain a hopeless obstacle to a satisfactory physical explanation of them. For even the assumption of some tenuous and elusive form of matter, which somehow hangs about in relation to the mysterious ether, seems less desperate than the assumption that such a tenuous presence could move the air in the infinitely complex vibration-patterns which correspond to speech or music—that is to say, could produce at will an effect of inconceivable difficulty and complexity on certain gross elements of the known material world.

As to the notion of an objective presence which may affect the per-

¹ Nos. 14, 36, 254 (first incident), 308. See also the dream-case 127.

² It was in this occasional feature of *collective* percipience that Falek, in 1692, found the strongest argument for the production of hallucinations by an external and dæmonic power. See p. 72 of his able and elaborate dissertation against Hobbes and Spinoza, in *De Demonologiâ recentiorum Autorum*.

ceptive faculty of several persons without producing changes in the external world, one sort of case is conceivable which would no doubt favour it—e.g., if two persons, situated at some distance from one another, saw the appearance in the respective relations of distance and posture which a real object of the same kind would bear to them—one of them, it might be, seeing a full face, and the other a profile. But I know of no examples of this sort. And as a mere theory, the notion in question may be left with a single general comment; for though our path skirts, it had better not enter, the metaphysical labyrinth suggested by the words "objective reality." Let it be conceded then that, where there is a consensus of perception, it becomes a nice question for Idealism to determine how far, or in what sense, the percept lacks an objective basis. To put an extreme case—suppose all the seeing world, save one individual, had a visual percept, the object of which nevertheless eluded all physical tests: would the solitary individual be justified in saying that all the others were victims of a subjective delusion? and if he said so, would they agree with him? But then in this case, or in a less extreme one of the same kind, we might at any rate ask one of the perceivers to tell us what meaning he can attach to the *objectivity* of his percept, beyond that it has its existence in other minds besides his own. If he fails to supply us with any further meaning, on him surely lies the *onus* of proving that the conditions of the percept lie outside the perceiving minds; and if no proof be forthcoming, I see no definite way of distinguishing this "objective" view of "collective hallucinations" from the view to be considered immediately, which regards the community of percipience as a form of thought-transference.¹

"But"—some objectors may say—"the question has been begged by assuming that the collective percept eludes physical tests. True, apparitions have not yet been subjected to spectroscopic analysis, nor have phantasmal remarks been recorded by the phonograph; but suppose that the form of a dying person not only appears, but opens the door or the window, and the door or the window *remains open*, thus affording to the muscles of the servant who closes it a test of a physical change in the external world—what account is to be given of this?" Now clearly such phenomena, even if established, would afford no convincing analogy by which to judge of cases where no similar physical tests are included. But, as a matter of fact, no records of the sort that we have met with have reached the evidential standard which would entitle them to a place in this book (see pp. 125-6); and until they are established by irrefragable evidence, there is another analogy which has in every way a prior claim—namely, the facts of telepathy as so far set forth. Cannot our further facts be explained without going beyond the purely psychical transference for which we believe that we have ample evidence?

Let us see in what ways a theory of purely psychical impressions could cover the phenomena of collective hallucinations. Two possible views of

¹ A *psychical* condition outside the perceiving minds might, no doubt, be found in "disembodied intelligence." For the present, it is enough to remark that this change of "agency" to some further mind would leave the nature of the phenomenon unchanged. Experience thus caused may be called objective, if we will, but it is still thought-transference; just as in Berkeley's view the whole objective universe was only thought-transference *in excelsis*,

what may happen present themselves. The *first* of these would apply only to veridical cases—cases which are “telepathic” in the literal sense. On this view the simultaneous experiences would be traced to a cause external to the percipients; but this cause would not be a real object within the range of the percipient’s senses, but a real condition of an absent person. A, who is passing through some crisis at a distance, produces a simultaneous telepathic impression on the minds of B and of C, who happen to be together; both B and C project this impression as a hallucination of the senses, in the way that has been so fully considered; and the hallucinations more or less nearly resemble each other.

The *second* view would apply equally to the cases which are, and to those which are not, telepathic, in this literal sense of relating to a *distant* agent. The view is that the hallucination of one percipient, however caused, begets that of the other, by a process of thought-transference; the hallucination is in itself, so to speak, infectious. B and C are together, and B has a hallucination—it may be veridical and due to a telepathic impression from the distant A, or it may be non-veridical and due to a spontaneous pathological disturbance of B’s own brain; and this experience of B’s is then communicated to C, whose brain follows suit and projects a kindred image. The process in fact would strongly recall those cases of simultaneous dreaming where one dream may be regarded as the cause of the other (see pp. 217–9). It would be a fresh example of the psychological identity between the sleeping and the waking hallucinations on which so much stress has already been laid.

Such are the two possible views; and we have now to decide how far either, or both, may be reasonably entertained. I may state at once that in my opinion the best solution that the problem at present admits of involves a certain combination of the two (see § 7 below); but I shall consult clearness by first considering each of them separately.

§ 2. First, then, as regards the theory of the simultaneous origination of two or more hallucinations by a distinct agent—we certainly know of no reason why a state of the agent which is telepathically effective at all, should be bound to confine its effects to a single percipient. That it generally does so confine them, may be easily explained by supposing a special susceptibility on the percipient’s part, or a special *rapprochement* between him and the agent; but that occasionally the impression should extend to others, who have also been sympathetically related to the agent, may seem no very astounding fact. Now if the impression were a merely inward experience, an impression of a merely ideal or emotional kind, and did not give rise to actual hallucination, this account of the matter might be plausible enough: it would apply for instance to Mr. H. S. Thompson’s case, p. 78. But it will be remembered that we have seen reason to regard the *hallucination* as distinctively the *percipient’s* work—as something projected by him under a telepathic stimulus; and we have found these sensory projections to take various forms according to the projector’s idiosyncrasies. We have found, moreover, that the time during which such hallucinations may take place extends over several hours—that we cannot name an exact moment at which the telepathic message will reach consciousness, or externalise itself to the sense. It becomes, then, ex-

tremely improbable that two or more persons should independently invest their respective telepathic impressions, at the *same* moment, with the *same* sensory form ; that they should all at once see the same figure, or hear the same sound, in apparently the same place. We should expect to find one of them embodying it in sound, and another, perhaps half an hour later, in visible shape ; or one of them embodying it in sound or shape, and another only conscious of it as an inward idea ; and so on. And for divergences of this sort, the evidence, though it exists, is small in amount.

But this is not all. On the theory that joint telepathic hallucinations are all exclusively and directly due to a distant agent, there is one thing that we should *not* expect to happen, and one thing that we *should* expect to happen. (1) We should *not* expect the group of percipients to include anyone who was a stranger to the agent ; or who was not personally in such relations with the agent as would have rendered it natural for him, had he chanced to be alone at the time, to suffer the same telepathic experience. Nevertheless, cases exist where such an outside person has shared in the perception. And (2) we *should* expect that in a fair proportion of cases two or more percipients would share the perception, though they were not in each other's company at the time. For on the theory that is being considered, there would be no virtue in the mere local proximity of the percipients to one another ; the agent is supposed to affect them by dint of his respective relations to each of them, which have nothing to do with their being together or apart. Now, in point of fact, we have a group of cases where the persons jointly affected have been apart, but they are disproportionately rare in comparison with the experiences shared by percipients who have been together ; and in several of them, moreover, B and C, the two percipients, were near each other, and had been to some extent sharing the same life—conditions which may have had their share in the effect (see pp. 514-5). However, the existence of this type might no doubt be regarded as an argument for the occasional production *ab extra* of several similar and simultaneous hallucinations ; and our few specimens may conveniently be cited at once.

I have already given a case (No. 127) where two vivid dreams of a quite unexpected death were dreamt by persons who were in the same house, but not in the same room. The following is a somewhat similar instance, but only one of the experiences was a dream. Mrs. Bettany, of 2, Eckington Villas, Ashbourne Grove, Dulwich (the narrator of case 20), writes :—

“ June, 1885.

(309) “ On the evening of, I think, March 23rd, 1883, I was seized with an unaccountable anxiety about a neighbour, whose name I just knew, but with whom I was not on visiting terms. She was a lady who appeared to be in very good health. I tried to shake off the feeling, but I could not, and after a sleepless night, in which I constantly thought of her as dying, I decided to send a servant to the house to ask if all were well. The answer I received was, ‘ Mrs. J. died last night.’

“ Her daughter afterwards told me that the mother had startled her by saying, ‘ Mrs. Bettany knows I shall die.’

“ I had never felt an interest in the lady before that memorable night. After the death, the family left the neighbourhood, and I have not seen any of them since.

“ JEANIE GWYNNE BETTANY.”

We find from the Register of Deaths that Mrs. J. died on March 23, 1883.

The following is the evidence of the servant who was sent to inquire :—

“ January, 1886.

“ I remember Mrs. Bettany sending me to inquire if all were well at Mrs. J.’s. The answer they gave me was that Mrs. J. was dead. Mrs. Bettany sent me to inquire, because she had a presentiment that Mrs. J. was dead or dying.”

Mrs. Bettany adds :—

“ My cook, to whom I had not mentioned my presentiment, remarked to me on the same morning : ‘ I have had such a horrible dream about Mrs. J., I think she must be going to die.’ She distinctly remembers that some one (she does not know *who*, and I think never did) told her in her dream that Mrs. J. was dead.”

The following is the first-hand evidence to the dream :—

“ January 11th, 1886.

“ I remember that some one in my dream said ‘ Mrs. J. is dead.’ I do not remember the rest of the dream, but I know it was horrible. I told Mrs. Bettany at the time, and she then told me about her presentiment about Mrs. J.

“ M. WENT.”

[M. Went has occasionally dreamt of the deaths of people she knows, without any correspondence.]

This case would seem to have been in some way “ reciprocal ” ; and it is unfortunate that we cannot obtain further details of the dying woman’s impression.

[No. 310, a case of a name being heard by two percipients in different rooms at the time of a death at a distant place, is omitted.—ED.]

The following case is part of a record of some singular hypnotic experiences. Mrs. John Evens, of Oldbank, Enniskillen, narrates as follows :—

“ December 4th, 1885.

(311) “ With regard to the apparition or optical illusion, I have a perfect and clear remembrance. It occurred after the experience related [*i.e.*, after a cataleptic fit produced under hypnotic influence]. The operator had left me with an earnest request to my husband to send for, or fetch him, should anything seem to require it.

“ I was wide awake, and enjoying the freedom from pain ; my room being carefully darkened. The operator had, while with me, been seated on a chair midway between my bed and a chest of drawers—about three feet from each. I was thinking very gratefully of the relief I had experienced, when I noticed a bluish white light round the chair. It seemed to be flickering and darting in a large oval, but gradually concentrated on a figure seated on the chair.¹ The appearance did not startle me in the least ; my first thought was, ‘ It is Mr. T.,’ a young officer with whom we were very intimate, and who had been in the house that evening. But the expression of the mouth struck me then, and I thought ‘ Can it be Mr.

¹ As to the oval, see the remarks on case 220 ; as to the gradual appearance and gradual disappearance, see Chap. xii., §§ 2 and 3, also p. 47, note, and p. 432.

D. ?'—a dear friend who had died some little time before. All this time the face seemed to be changing, and, as it were, *settling*. Suddenly it flashed into my mind 'It is Mr. B.' (the father of the operator). I did not know this gentleman at all, except from having seen his photograph, but had no doubt on the subject. (Curiously enough his mouth and that of Mr. D.'s were singularly alike in expression.) The figure sat in a kind of dim halo. I felt no surprise; nor did I speak to it, but thought, 'Oh, you have come to find P. (the son); he has been here all the evening, but has gone home now.' As I thought this the halo gradually diffused itself, as it had before become concentrated, and the figure vanished. Besides the distinctness of feature, a movement, of crossing and uncrossing the knees two or three times, struck me.

"That same night, and it must have been nearly at the same time, the friend who had magnetised me was awoke by hearing his name called twice. His impression was that I needed his aid, and he was prepared to come (he was living a mile off), if he heard the call repeated. But it was not. The next day, when I saw him, without telling him any of this, I asked, 'Has your father any noticeable habit or trick of movement?' At first he said 'No,' and then, 'unless you would describe as such a way he has of frequently crossing and uncrossing his knees. He has varicose veins, and is restless at times!'

"This was the whole matter. The father, who dislikes such subjects, would never say whether he had dreamed or been thinking intently of his son; but probably it was so.

"AGNES EVENS."

In a letter dated 18th December, 1885, Mrs. Evens writes that she thinks the occurrence took place in September or October, 1881. She has never experienced any other visual hallucination.

In answer to inquiries, she adds:—

(1) "I cannot be sure as to the time at which I saw the appearance, but, putting circumstances together, I should think between 12 and 1 o'clock—nearer the latter hour.

(2) "I am perfectly certain that I uttered no sound; the phantom's disappearance seemed to answer to the thought that passed through my mind, 'You want Preston; he has been here all the evening, but went back to Fort Tourgis some time since.'

(3) "I had not any wish for his presence. I was lying in quiet enjoyment of the relief from agonising pain and quivering nerves, in which condition one has no active line of thought. I very likely thought about him, with a lazy kind of gratitude to him as the author of the relief I was experiencing."

Captain Battersby, R.A., F.R.A.S., of Ordnance House, Enniskillen, son-in-law of Mrs. Evens, writes:—

"December 21st, 1885.

"I had mesmerised Mrs. E. for several months, for severe neuralgia, with the view of affording her natural sleep. One night she had been in the mesmeric trance, and had been awoke by me, and I had returned to barracks—situated about half a mile from her house—leaving her in her room. I went to bed, and to sleep, and was awakened with a start by hearing my name called very distinctly. I sat up in bed, and looked for the caller, but saw no one. It was too dark to look at my watch, so that I cannot say what the time may have been. It occurred to me at the time that Mrs. E. might want me for something. I did not recognise the voice, and indeed had no chance of doing so, as

it did not call again. In the morning I went to see Mrs. E., in order to find out whether she had had any unusual experience. She asked me if anything had happened to me the night before. I said 'Yes,' and asked her why she put the question. She said, 'Has your father a habit of moving one leg over the other, now and then, in a restless way?' This was the case. She then said, about 1 a.m. she had been roused from sleep, and saw a phosphorescent appearance on the chair near her bed, which resolved itself into a human figure, recognised by her as my father from a photograph in my possession. It did not speak, but seemed to ask her mentally, 'Where is Preston?' To which she responded, also mentally, 'He was here, but is gone home'; whereon the figure disappeared. I was somewhat alarmed at the occurrence, and wrote to ask if my father was well. He was so; and did not remember having any dream of me on that night. Mrs. E. particularly remarked his habit of crossing first one leg and then the other, of which I had not previously told her.

"T. PRESTON BATTERSBY."

In answer to inquiries, Captain Battersby says:—

"I beg to say that at no time, except on the occasion referred to by me in my previous letter, have I woken from sleep with the impression of having been called. In fact this was the only occasion in my life in which I heard or saw anything unusual."

The "collective" character of these two experiences is clearly very doubtful; they may not have been due to any agency on the part of Captain Battersby's father, or connected with each other. But considering that the accidental coincidence of the two unique experiences would be most improbable, and that a hypnotic *rapport* probably existed between Captain Battersby and his patient, it is a reasonable supposition that his mind was either the source or the channel of a telepathic communication to hers.

[The next two cases, 312 and 313, are omitted as remote. In No. 312 an apparition of a friend who had lately stayed in the house was, on the night of her unexpected death, seen on the staircase by one percipient, while a similar figure was seen independently about the same time by a young maid-servant in another room. In No. 313 a mother and son in different rooms of the same house had, on the same night, one an impression of horror and the other a hallucination both connected with a dying woman who had recently lived in the house.—Ed.]

In the remaining cases the percipients were much more widely separated; but unfortunately the evidence as to identity of time is very far from complete. The following account is from Mrs. Coote, of 28, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

"July 29th, 1885.

(314) "On Easter Wednesday, 1872, my sister-in-law, Mrs. W., sailed with her husband and three young children from Liverpool in the steamer 'Sarmatian' for Boston, U.S., where they arrived in due course and settled. In the following November she was seized with, and died from, suppressed small-pox, at that time raging in Boston. About the end of November, or the beginning of December in the same year, I was disturbed one morning before it was light, as near as may be between 5 and 6 a.m., by the appearance of a tall figure, in a long night-dress, bending

over the bed. I distinctly recognised this figure to be no other than my sister-in-law, Mrs. W., who, as I felt, distinctly touched me. My husband, who was beside me asleep at the time, neither saw nor felt anything.

"This appearance was also made to an aged aunt, residing at this time at Theydon Bois, near Epping, Essex. She is now alive, aged over 80 years, and residing at Hextable, near Dartford, in Kent. She is still in full possession of all her faculties. She told my husband as recently as the 4th inst., that the appearance came to her in the form of a bright light from a dark corner of her bedroom in the early morning. It was so distinct that she not only recognised her niece, Mrs. W., but she actually noticed the needlework on her long night-dress! This appearance was also made to my husband's half-sister, at that time unmarried, and residing at Stanhope Gardens. The last named was the first to receive the announcement of the death of Mrs. W., in a letter from the widower dated December (day omitted), 1872, from 156, Eighth Street, South Boston, still preserved. The death was announced, among other papers (as my husband has recently learned), in the *Boston Herald*. A comparison of dates, as far as they could be made in two of the cases, served to show the appearance occurred after the same manner, and about the same time, *i.e.*, at the time of, or shortly after, the death of the deceased. Neither myself nor the aged Mrs. B., nor my husband's half-sister, have experienced any appearance of the kind before or since. It is only recently, when my husband applied to his half-sister to hunt up the Boston letter, that we learnt for the first time of this *third* appearance."

Mr. Coote writes to us as follows :—

"That Mrs. Coote's 'vision' occurred within a week of the death of Mrs. W., in Boston, U.S., is undoubted; and without any effort to make our memories more precise, I may add, that from the first I have always thought that the most marked feature in the case was (judging, of course, from an opinion formed at the time when the circumstances were fresh in my memory) that it occurred within the 24 hours after death. I am afraid after this lapse of time that nothing conclusive can be arrived at as to 'times' in the other two cases, beyond the general idea that still obtains in the minds of both the aged Mrs. B. and Mrs. —, that the visions occurred about the same time as that of Mrs. Coote, and after the same manner. Mrs. Coote desires me to add that to this hour she has never exchanged ideas upon this vision, even with the aged Mrs. B., which precludes all possibility of collusion in the matter.

"C. H. COOTE."

[It is not possible to obtain a first-hand account of the vision from Mr. Coote's half-sister at present.]

[The final example of this type, No. 315, is again omitted as remote. In it a brother and sister widely separated have one a vision and the other a vision or dream of a sister, both, it is believed, on the night of her death. —ED.]

§ 3. I turn now to the second of the two theories above propounded—the theory that one percipient catches the hallucination from another by a process of thought-transference. This is certainly the explanation that would suggest itself in telepathic cases where one of the percipients has previously had no relations, or only slight relations, with the distant agent. But clearly the most conclusive evidence for the theory of infection would

be derived from cases involving no distant "agent" at all; cases which in their inception are pathologic, not telepathic—purely subjective delusions on the part of some one present—but which proceed to communicate themselves to some other person or persons. If it can be shown that this self-propagation is an occasional property of hallucinations as such, there will be no difficulty in extending the same explanation to cases where the hallucination is in its inception due to a distant agent. If B's *purely subjective* hallucination may affect C, it is only what we should *a priori* expect that B's *telepathic* hallucination might affect C: such communicability would merely be one more of those points of resemblance, which we have already seen to be so numerous, between the purely subjective and telepathic classes. And as collective hallucinations even of subjective or non-veridical origin (*i.e.*, not due to the critical situation of some distant agent) would constitute in themselves a form of thought-transference, no excuse is needed for examining them here at some length.

What evidence, then, do we find that hallucinations of the senses, as such, may be infectious? It must be allowed at starting that no property of the sort has ever been attributed to them by psychologists of repute:¹ the doctrine would be as new to science as every other variety of telepathic affection. This, however, is easily accounted for. We have already seen that psychologists have never made hallucinations, or at any rate transient hallucinations of the sane, the subject of careful collection and tabulation; and it is among the sane rather than the insane² that we should expect any phenomenon of thought-transference to present itself. It is therefore not surprising that the rare and sporadic evidence for collective hallucinations should have escaped notice. But if, on the one hand, collective hallucinations have not been recognised by science, on the other hand phenomena have sometimes been described by that title which have no sort of claim to it. It is here that the real importance of distinguishing *illusions* from *hallucinations* lies; and I cannot well proceed without first making this distinction plain.

Illusion consists either in perceiving a totally wrong object in place of the right one, as when Don Quixote's imagination transformed the wind-mills into giants; or in investing the right object with wrong attributes, as when the stone lion on Northumberland House was seen to wag its tail.³ Either sort of illusion may easily be collective. The error is not in the actual sensory impression, which is given by the real object and is common to all present, but in the subsequent act of judgment by which the nature of the object is determined; and in this act of judgment one person has every opportunity of being influenced by another. In the attitude of trying to imagine what further attributes will fit in naturally with those which the senses perceive, and will with them compose some known object,

¹ This was written before the appearance of Dr. E. von Hartmann's tract on *Spiritism* (lately translated by Mr. C. C. Massey), in which he treats the apparitions seen at séances as collective hallucinations; but he regards the influence exercised on the sitters by the medium as to some extent exceptional in kind.

² As an instance of the insusceptibility of the insane to abnormal influences, it is worth noting that they are peculiarly difficult to hypnotise.

³ I have never discovered on what authority this anecdote rests; but such an illusion is, I believe, quite possible.

the mind is almost at the mercy of external suggestion. We see this constantly exemplified in cases where a group of people are puzzling as to the nature of some barely visible object, or of some imperfectly heard sound : as soon as someone expresses an opinion, someone else is pretty sure to endorse it, and to see or hear the thing in the suggested sense, though on nearer approach this may prove to have been incorrect. Even in cases where we feel as if we were right beyond the possibility of mistake, it often needs an effort to realise how little is given us, and how much we ourselves supply. A few slight sensory signs will introduce to the mind a whole array of attributes that have been associated with them on other occasions ; the whole is then taken to be a single and immediate perception of the object ; and since the actual sensory signs may be common to several different groups of attributes—i.e., to several different objects—it may easily happen that they suggest some group which is not the object actually present. For instance, the slight sensory signs which Scott would normally have interpreted as the folds of coats and plaids hanging in a dimly lit hall, were interpreted by him, at a moment when the idea of Byron was running strongly in his head, as the figure of the deceased poet.¹ Here the idea which happened to be dominant at the moment was what determined the false judgment ; and such a dominant idea may, of course, often operate upon many minds at once ; as when, in a conflagration at the Crystal Palace, a sympathetic crowd watched the struggles of an agonised chimpanzee—*alias* a piece of tattered blind—in the roof ; or when a horrified crew recognised in a piece of old wreck, which was floating on the waves, the form and peculiar limping gait of a drowned comrade.² The case of the proverbial crowd and the stone lion's tail is somewhat different ; for there the object was clearly seen, and recognised for what it was. But we are all of us well exercised in imagining familiar objects as moving in position and changing in contour ; and the power of evoking mental pictures is often, I think, strong enough to enable us slightly to modify our visual impressions ; while such devices as half-closing our eyes, or shutting them alternately in quick succession, or moving or inclining the

¹ An interesting case was given by Mr. W. H. Pollock, in the Christmas number, for 1884, of the *Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News*, under the title "The Ghost at the Lyceum." Mr. Pollock has assured me that the description is "an absolute record of fact, without a word of garnish" ; and his recollection of the incident, and of the bewilderment that it caused, was quite confirmed by his companion's account, as reported to me independently by a common friend. Seated in a box at the theatre, Mr. Pollock and a friend saw, during several hours (with intermissions when the lights were turned up), the vivid appearance of a decapitated head, with a fine profile and a grey Vandyke beard, resting on the lap of a lady in the stalls. At the time, they rejected the idea that this could have been an optical effect due to the folds of the lady's garments—as they noticed that she moved more than once in the course of the evening, while the face remained the same. Mr. Pollock seems to have been unaware that, as a possible example of *collective hallucination*, the vision had a very high scientific interest ; or he would scarcely, even for "sporting and dramatic" purposes, have taken refuge in so meaningless a designation as "ghost." It may be, however, that the case was after all one not of hallucination, but only of illusion. It is at any rate impossible, from the record, to be quite sure that adequate means were taken to exclude this hypothesis, which, as Mr. Pollock has recently informed me, is the one that he is now inclined to adopt.

² Dr. Hack Tuke, *Influence of the Mind upon the Body*, 2nd edition, p. 59 ; Wandt, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 358.

head, will increase the illusion. It is not surprising, then, that a strong effort to see a thing in a way in which others are professing to see it, should, for a brief period, introduce illusory elements into what seems to be a clear and complete view of the object.

These considerations will certainly suffice to explain the majority of the collective apparitions on record. The visions seen during battles, such as are especially frequent in the history of the Crusades—either signs in the heavens or phantom champions—may easily have had some objective basis. The streak of cloud, which at one moment may be "very like a whale," might at another be equally like a fiery sword; real horsemen might be unrecognised, and the first breath of rumour that they were supernatural assistants would be caught up with avidity.¹ More deceptive cases, however, occur, which are not illusions, but yet have as little claim as the preceding to be called collective *hallucinations*, if that word be (as throughout this treatise it is) confined to the strict sensory meaning. Nothing, for instance, could better illustrate what collective hallucinations are *not*, than two cases which Dr. Briere de Boismont² has adduced to illustrate what they are. A battalion of infantry, after a 40 miles' march under a June sun, was quartered for the night in a dismal building which had the reputation of being haunted. The surgeon of the regiment describes how, about midnight, these soldiers rushed out of their quarters with wild cries, and declared that the devil had entered their chamber "in the form of a large black dog with curly hair, who had bounded upon them, ran over their chests with the rapidity of lightning, and disappeared on the side opposite to the one at which he had entered." Now—on the supposition that no real dog or cat had a share in shaping the idea—what can be more likely than that the general nervousness took sudden form from one man's sudden cry, on waking from a nightmare? There is not the slightest proof that all present simultaneously saw the dog, and followed his movements. I have already drawn attention to the ease with which uneducated persons may slip into believing that they have seen

¹ The reader will recall the phantom battle in the sky, described by Motley (*The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, pp. 559–60), as to which the depositions of five witnesses were taken on oath. The collective vision of an army marching on *terra firma*, described by the Duke of Argyll in *Good Words* for Jan., 1875, would be less easy to account for as an illusion: but the record is second-hand, and was not written down till more than 50 years after the incident is alleged to have occurred. Phantom champions are not yet extinct. Mr. J. T. Milward Pierce, of Bow Ranch, Nebraska, U.S.A., has told me of a quite recent case, narrated to him by one of the witnesses—where the form of a defunct Indian Chief, "Brown Bear," led his tribe in a battle against the Dacotahs. Mr. Pierce has since sent me a first-hand account of the incident from another professed witness. [For instances stated to have occurred in the present war see *S.P.R. Journal* for Dec., 1915, especially pp. 115, 116.—ED.]

A recent case of a more ordinary type is the following, from Mrs. Lanc, of 49, Redcliffe Square, S.W. When at school, she was sleeping in the bed of a Miss Winch, who had been sent home ill; and, waking up, she was much alarmed to see this girl standing at the foot of the bed. She addressed the figure, which nodded slowly. She then roused her companions, "and they all said they saw Miss Winch, too." The girls did not know, what was learnt next day, that Miss Winch was dying; but even supposing the first percipient's vision to have been telepathic, her terrified words, and the dim light, would probably be quite sufficient to convert a bed-hanging or a curtain into the suggested form for her companions' eyes.

² *Des Hallucinations* (Paris, 1862), pp. 280, 296.

what they have only heard of ; and under excitement this is, of course, doubly easy. One man may have believed that he *saw* ; the rest may merely have believed they *had seen*. De Boismont's second case is that of Dr. Pordage's disciples in the middle of the seventeenth century, who saw " the powers of hell pass in review before them, seated in chariots, surrounded by dark clouds, and drawn by lions, bears, dragons, and tigers. These were followed by inferior spirits, who were provided with the ears of a cat or a griffin, and with deformed and distorted limbs." But here the fact that " it made no difference whether their eyes were open or shut " renders it doubtful how far the impression was really more than a vivid inward picture ; and there is nothing to contradict, and everything to suggest, the notion that one person described his impressions in language which would easily conjure up the general scene in kindred and excited minds.

But apart from such spurious types, cases undoubtedly remain of really externalised collective hallucination, which are still perfectly explicable without resorting to thought-transference. The history of religious epidemics supplies instances where a whole group of persons have professed to behold some exciting or adorable object, and probably actually projected its image into space as part of the surrounding world ; but where, without proof (which has never been presented) that what was seen was independently observed and described, it would be rash to suppose any other cause for the similarity of the individual experiences than a previous common idea and common expectancy.¹ Nor is even expectancy a necessary condition ; there are cases where the suggestion of the moment seems sufficient. The most marked of these are *hypnotic* hallucinations : it is as easy for a mesmerist to persuade a group of good " subjects " that they all see a particular phantasmal object, as to persuade one of them that he sees it. And I think it must be admitted as possible that mere verbal suggestion may act similarly on certain minds at certain times, without the preliminary of any definite hypnotic process. I say at *certain times* advisedly ; for all clear evidence of the sort seems to connect the phenomenon with circumstances of rather special absorption or excitement, sometimes even with a state of semi-trance.² I do not know of

¹ A probable example is the recent remarkable delusion at Corano—starting from a peasant girl's alleged vision of the Virgin—in which a crowd of children and many adults shared. It is described in the *Times* for July 31, 1885.

² If (as intelligent English eye-witnesses believe) a semi-hypnotic condition, due to abnormally concentrated attention, is in great part answerable for the extraordinary illusions of Indian jugglery, the same condition might naturally be looked for in cases of collective hallucination. Very suggestive in this respect is the following record, by Professor Sidgwick, of a scene described to him by Mazzini :—

" In or near some Italian town, Mazzini saw a group of people standing, apparently gazing upwards into the sky. Going up to it, he asked one of the gazers what he was looking at. ' The cross—do you not see ? ' was the answer ; and the man pointed to the place where the cross was supposed to be. Mazzini, however, could discern no vestige of anything cruciform in the sky ; and, much wondering, went up to another gazer, put a similar question, and received a similar answer. It was evident that the whole crowd had persuaded itself that it was contemplating a marvellous cross. ' So,' said Mazzini, ' I was turning away, when my eye caught the countenance of a gazer who looked somewhat more intelligent than the rest, and also, I thought, had a faint air of perplexity and doubt in his gaze. I went up to him, and asked

any instance where the sane and healthy A, simply by saying at a casual moment to the sane and healthy B, "There is such and such an object" (not really present, and not capable of being imposed as an illusion on some object really present) has at once caused the object to be conjured up in space before B's eyes. In the most extreme case that has come to my knowledge, where something like this has proved possible, very strong insistence and repetition on A's part, of the sort that a mesmerist employs when seeking to dominate a "subject's" mind, are needed before the impression develops into sensory form. In cases, therefore, where A has himself had a hallucination of which he has spoken at the moment, and B has shared it, it is too much to assume at once that B's experience *must* have been exclusively due to the verbal suggestion; for if A's mere suggestion can produce such an effect on B at that particular moment, why not at other moments when he suggests the imaginary object without having himself seen it? None the less, of course, ought the hypothesis of verbal suggestion to be most carefully considered, in relation to the special circumstances of each case, before any other hypothesis is even provisionally admitted.

I have, perhaps, said enough to define the phenomena which are really of interest for us here. Fairly to allow of explanation by thought-transference, a collective case must present evident marks (1) of being a hallucination and not a mere illusion; (2) of having occurred, so to speak, in an isolated way, and not under the dominance of any special prepossession; and (3) of having been independently projected by the several percipients, and not merely conjured up by one on the suggestion of another. It is naturally not always easy to ascertain how far these conditions are met. In judging of the auditory cases, especially, great caution is necessary; for, as we have seen above (pp. 443-4), there is scarcely any sort of mere noise which may not have some undiscoverable external origin in the house or the neighbourhood. Intelligent speech, on the other hand, and certain musical sounds, such as bell-sounds or distinct melodic sequences, if externally caused, imply conditions the presence or absence of which it is usually possible to ascertain. So again in the visual cases, the fact of dim or uncertain light may favour the hypothesis of illusion; but where the light is good, the presence or absence of an adequate external cause in the vicinity can often be determined with all but complete certainty.¹ One

what he was looking at. "The cross," he said, "there." I took hold of his arm, gave him a slight shake, and said, "There is not any cross at all." A sort of change came over his countenance, as though he was waking up from a kind of dream; and he responded, "No, as you say, there is no cross at all." So we two walked away, and left the crowd to their cross. It is nearly 20 years since I heard this story; but it made a considerable impression on me, both from the manner in which Mazzini told it, and from its importance in relation to the evidence for 'spiritualistic' phenomena."

¹ I am including only cases of hallucinations which have occurred to more than one percipient *simultaneously*, or very nearly so. The extremely perplexing cases, few, but well attested, where the same phantasm has been independently described by different persons who have at different times encountered it in the same locality, may possibly be also connected with the infectious character of hallucinations: for we cannot pronounce it to be indispensable that the infectious influence should act at the moment. A certain amount of evidence for this explanation is afforded by cases where the experience (not apparently due to suggestion or illusion) has some-

point of uncertainty often remains, owing to the way in which the evidence reaches us : we cannot be sure how far the mere verbal description of one percipient, after the occurrence, may not have caused another to fill in or modify his own recollection with details which he did not himself observe. But if both clearly shared in the experience, it is not important that their percepts may not have been so precisely similar as is sometimes alleged. So far, indeed, from telling against the theory of mental transfer, such want of identity is rather what we might have expected, both from the numerous *approximate* successes in experimental thought-transference—*e.g.*, in reproducing drawings—and from the evidence that a telepathic impression is liable to be reacted on in various ways by the person whom it affects.

§ 4. I fear to weary the reader by yet further explanations and distinctions before examples are given. But difficulty of exposition and risk of misapprehension alike culminate in this final chapter ; and the patience which has been able to accompany me thus far must be so considerable that I venture to make one more demand on it.

I have propounded the question, what evidence do we find that purely subjective hallucinations of the senses may be infectious ? and I have implied that I am able to produce some evidence of the sort. And, in fact, I am about to cite examples which I think that the majority of my readers—or of such of them at any rate as accept the substantial accuracy of the facts—will regard as going some way to establish the point. But there are those, I am aware, in whose minds some of my instances will produce a doubt whether the experiences were really subjective—

times occurred to one person alone, and at other times to several together. But the hypothesis, as thus extended, becomes doubtful and difficult, and is, moreover, only one out of several hypotheses, all about equally doubtful and difficult, that may be suggested. (See Mrs. H. Sidgwick's paper "On the Evidence, collected by the Society, for Phantasms of the Dead," in the *Proceedings of the S.P.R.*, vol. iii., especially pp. 146-8.)

Clearly no such explanation is needed for the general run of *traditional* appearances—the white ladies, headless horses, and phantom dogs, which are the most widely spread forms ; or the phantasms which are more or less indigenous to a particular district, like the "corpse-candles" of some Welsh counties, and the figures in shrouds of the Western Scottish islands. To account for these, we need not go beyond the latent idea in the percipient's own mind. But it seems occasionally to happen that the percipient of a traditional phantasm is a person not previously acquainted with the tradition. Thus Mr. Lowell tells me that he once saw the appearance of the "Witch-farm," on the Massachusetts coast, though unaware of the local legend concerning it, at the very place to which he found afterwards that the legend assigned it ; and in Dyer's *English Folk-lore*, p. 208, a case is reported where a phantasm, coinciding with and possibly originating in a death, took a form that exactly accorded with the ideas of death-apparitions current in the place, though the percipient was a transient sojourner whom no rumour of those ideas had reached.

Another type (recorded by Aubrey, Martin, Dalyell, Napier, Gregor, and other writers on "second-sight," and possibly genuine), which seems to strain the hypothesis of infection somewhat less, is that where *physical contact* with the percipient of an abnormal sight or sound has enabled a second person to share it. Our own collection contains a couple of modern instances—one first-hand from Mrs. Taunton, of Brook Vale, Witton, near Birmingham, the other from two daughters and a son-in-law of the late Mr. and Mrs. George Whittaker, of the Bowdlands, Clitheroe, the first-hand witnesses. Such a phenomenon might at least be compared with the favouring effect of contact in certain "thought-reading" results, which (by rare exception among results where contact is a condition) seem not to be explicable as "muscle-reading."

whether they may not have had some unknown origin external to any of the perceiving minds ; and I admit, though the doubt weakens my argument, that it is one which I in some measure share. To explain this, I must recur to a point that was very briefly touched on in Chapter XI (p. 331, note). It may be remembered that the question there arose whether *post-mortem* appearances of persons some time deceased were necessarily subjective hallucinations, or whether they might not be amenable to a telepathic explanation ; and I observed that, while telepathy—being a psychical and not a physical conception—was quite able to embrace these phenomena as possibly due to the action of human minds continuing after bodily death, yet the *evidence* for them (of a sort that would preclude their being regarded as purely subjective experiences) was scanty and inconclusive ; and I dismissed the topic as not germane to an inquiry concerning telepathic transferences between the minds of living persons. But the topic which was rightly thus dismissed when we were considering affections of a *single* percipient, forces itself on us again when we encounter cases of *joint* percipience. For suppose that the object which B and C both simultaneously behold is the form of the deceased A. Then, if (1) the idea of B's and C's affection by the still continuing mind of A be rejected—as it would be by disbelievers in survival after physical death—yet B's and C's *simultaneous affection* remains a fact which demands recognition in this book ; because, if A does not affect them, then one of them must affect the other, *i.e.*, the case is one of transference between the minds of living persons. And if (2) the idea of A's continuing power to affect B or C be admitted as tenable, but the *joint* affection of B and C by A be regarded as improbable (owing to the difficulties already pointed out of conceiving the projection, under a telepathic impulse, of exactly simultaneous and corresponding hallucinations), yet again a fact remains which demands recognition in this book ; because, if A affects B and not C, then C's vision of A must be obtained from B, and the case is again one of transference between the minds of living persons.

The reader will now, perhaps, divine why I hesitate to apply the words " purely subjective " to some, at any rate, of the cases in the group that awaits us. Though no absent living person was concerned in them as agent, I think it would be rash and unscientific to prejudge the question (deliberately left open in Chapter XI) whether they had an origin in psychical conditions which have survived the change of death. I have shown that alike on either of the above hypotheses—alike, whether the dead (1) have not, or (2) have, minds which can influence the living—cases of collective percipience suggestive of the dead fall within the legitimate scope of the present inquiry ; but I am anxious to avoid any appearance of dogmatic decision between (1) and (2). I am about equally dissatisfied with the arguments adduced for the former, and with the evidence adduced for the latter. But in my view the cases, *whatever else* they involve, at any rate involve an element of quite mundane thought-transference between the minds of the living persons concerned ; and I must beg the reader to bear in mind that it is simply as probable or possible cases of thought-transference, and not as manifestations from the dead, that those of them which may seem to have reference to the dead are

here adduced. If the senses of B and C are similarly and simultaneously affected without the presence of any material cause, then alike whether there *is* or is *not* a real immaterial cause outside their two selves, I believe that the joint phenomenon still depends (partly, if there is such a cause, wholly, if there is not) on psychical communication between their two minds. As to the point that is left in abeyance—the existence or non-existence of the said cause—all varieties of opinion will be allowed for by defining the group, not positively, as cases of “purely subjective” origin, but negatively, as cases which do not apparently originate in the condition of any absent living person.

§ 5. I will begin with visual examples, and first of a rudimentary type. [Case 316—here omitted as remote—describes two flickering flames which slowly moved onto the bed of the two percipients and there broke up into small grains which ran over the bed-covering like quicksilver.—ED.]

We have several other examples of collective hallucinations of light. In one (described to us by Mrs. G. T. Haly, of 122, Coningham Road, Shepherd’s Bush, W., as having occurred a few days after her husband’s death, and assumed by her to be connected with him), a flame as of a candle, but bluer, passed and repassed the bed on which the two percipients were lying, at about 18 inches height from the floor. In another, a luminous ball was seen in a corner of the room. A fourth very remarkable instance, of the brilliant illuminations and then sudden darkening of an empty room, is described to us by the Rev. Edward Ram, of Norwich, as a personal experience of himself and his wife—but this was in a house where other unaccountable phenomena have been observed; as was also the case in a fifth instance, where a light is described by one percipient, Mrs. W. B. Richmond, as a glow over the whole room, out of which (according to her recollection) two bright little balls of light seemed to flash out; and by the other (her mother) as “flickering about” specially in a particular part of the room. In none of these cases does it seem possible that the light was in any way cast or reflected into the room from outside.

Coming to instances of a more developed type, we have a considerable group of cases as to which it might be a possible—though I think a rather desperate—assumption that what was seen was a real object, most strangely misinterpreted, or else appearing in most improbable circumstances; and which I do not therefore number as evidential items. Specially baffling are some of the cases where a carriage, as well as human beings, has appeared. For instance, Major W., resident near Conon Bridge, Ross-shire, writes:—

“February 9th, 1882.

“It was the month of August; rather a dark night and very still; the hour, midnight; when before retiring for the night I went, as is often my custom, to the front door to look at the weather. When standing for a moment on the step, I saw, coming round a turn in the drive, a large close carriage and pair of horses, with two men on the box. It passed the front of the house, and was going at a rapid rate towards a path which leads to a stream, running, at that point, between rather steep banks. There is no carriage-road on that side of the house, and I shouted to the driver to stop, as, if he went on, he must undoubtedly come to grief. The carriage stopped abruptly when it came to the running water, turned, and, in doing

so, drove over the lawn. I got up to it; and by this time my son had joined me with a lantern. Neither of the men on the box had spoken, and there was no sound from the inside of the carriage. My son looked in, and all he could discern was a stiff-looking figure sitting up in a corner, and draped, apparently, from head to foot in white. The absolute silence of the men outside was mysterious, and the white figure inside, apparently of a female, not being alarmed or showing any signs of life, was strange. Men, carriage, and horses were unknown to me, although I know the country so well. The carriage continued its way across the lawn, turning up a road which led past the stables, and so into the drive again and away. We could see no traces of it the next morning—no marks of wheels or horses' feet on the soft grass or gravel road; and we never again heard of the carriage or its occupant, though I caused careful inquiries to be made the following day. I may mention that my wife and daughter also saw the carriage, being attracted to the window by my shout. This happened on the 23rd of August, 1878."

After a visit to the house in September, 1884, Mr. Podmore wrote:—

"Major W., on whom I called to-day, is practically satisfied that what he and his family saw was not a real carriage. He showed me the whole scene of its appearance. The spot where the carriage appeared to turn barely leaves sufficient room for the passage of an ordinary carriage, and that a carriage should turn round there seems almost impossible. The carriage went for some distance across the lawn—a mossy and rather damp piece of grass—and stopped in front of the house for more than a minute, the while Major W. spoke to the man, but without receiving any reply. His wife, whom I also saw, was attracted to the window by the sound of the wheels, in the first instance, on the gravel. Major W. made many inquiries among his neighbours, but could not find that anyone had seen the carriage at all. The house is situated on a peninsula stretching between the Cromarty and Moray Firths, and some 3 miles from the neck of the peninsula. The locality is very lonely, there being no villages or hamlets, and but few private residences of any kind; and it is difficult to imagine the errand which could bring a strange carriage into such a country at the dead of night. Major W. has had one other purely subjective hallucination."

In another of the carriage-cases, the hallucination was of a more bizarre sort, the coachman and footman on the box having black faces, and the four ladies inside being dressed completely in black. The vehicle passed the window without producing any sound on the gravel. In a third case one of the percipients was altogether apart from the three others—they seeing the phantasmal carriage pass the window, and she meeting it some way down the road. In a fourth case, our informant—Mr. Paul Bird, of 39, Strand, Calcutta—followed a phantom gharrie for 100 yards, into the very portico of Hastings House at Alipore, while the same vehicle was watched in its approach by his wife from a window. But more of a puzzle even than the carriage-cases is a narrative received from two daughters of a well-known clergyman—neither romantic nor superstitious witnesses—who describe a vast swarm of soundless phantasmal shapes, dressed in old-fashioned garments, most of them dwarfish, and two with sparks round their faces, by which they and a maid were once accompanied for about 200 yards in a lane near Oxford. "One might imagine it to be a kind of mirage; only the whole appearance [owing to the dresses]

was so unlike what one would have seen in any town at the time we saw it.”¹ If this must be regarded as illusion, because it occurred in misty moonlight, yet an identity of impression is described which still suggests mental infection :—“ If one saw a man, all saw a man ; if one saw a woman, all saw a woman ; and so on.”

I pass by, however, as necessarily inconclusive, the greater number of our instances of collective impression where the appearance was seen out of doors in imperfect light—though there is not one of them which would not be decidedly more remarkable, as a specimen of joint illusion, than any that I have found recorded in print. The following daylight example is from the Misses Montgomery, of Beaulieu, Drogheda.

“ March 2nd, 1884.

(317) “ About the year 1875, I and my sister (we were about 13 years old then) were driving home in the tax-cart one summer afternoon about 4 o’clock, when there suddenly appeared, floating over the hedge, a female figure moving noiselessly across the road ; the figure was in white, and the body in a slanting position, some 10 feet above the ground. The horse suddenly stopped and shook with fright, so much so that we could not get it on. I called out to my sister : ‘ Did you see that ? ’ and she said she had, and so did the boy Caffrey, who was in the cart. The figure went over the hedge, on the other side of the road, and passed over a field, till we lost sight of it in a plantation beyond. Altogether, I suppose, we watched it for a couple of minutes. It never touched the ground at all, but floated calmly along. On reaching home we told our mother of what we had seen, and we were perfectly certain it was not a mere delusion or illusion, nor an owl, or anything of the kind.

“ I have never seen anything like this nor any apparition before or since. We were all in good health at the time, and no one had suggested any grounds for the apparition beforehand ; but we afterwards heard that the road was supposed to be haunted, and a figure had been seen by some of the country folks.

“ VIOLET MONTGOMERY.

“ SIDNEY MONTGOMERY.”

Professor Barrett, who knows the witnesses, adds that Mrs. Montgomery remembers the incident well, and the terror her children were in. They both agreed as to the reality of the figure. Caffrey has gone to America, and been lost sight of.

No one probably will suppose that the witnesses here have agreed to repeat, for our benefit, a romance which they fabricated for their mother’s at the time ; and however much allowance be made for childish terror or exaggeration, the community of experience in broad daylight seems to exceed what can be attributed to verbal suggestions, passed from one to another, *à propos* of a fleece of cloud or an owl. We have a very similar instance from Mr. W. S. Soutar, solicitor, of Blairgowrie, N.B.—who records that he and his brother, as young boys, at play behind their father’s house, in the gloaming of a summer evening, “ both saw an apparition in the shape of a female figure, plainly dressed, with a striped apron over the face, and which *glided*, without any apparent movement of the feet,

¹ This case, which in brief abstract may sound like a frightened girl’s story, will not, I think, produce that impression in the complete account, which may be found in the *Proceedings* of the S.P.R., vol. iii., p. 77.

from the road till about half-way between it and the hedge surrounding a shrubbery near the house, when the figure suddenly disappeared. There was no cover near, behind which the person (if in the body) could hide, the spot where it disappeared being bare and open." This case, however, is remote, and the second witness is dead. A much more striking example (brought to our notice by Mr. A. Farquharson, of North Bradley, Trowbridge, Wilts) is one where the senses of two adults—a gentleman-farmer, described as a hard-headed unromantic business man and his wife—were similarly deluded in an exposed space and in broad daylight; but the timidity of the witnesses precludes me from giving details.

To come, however, to indoor cases, of a less dubious type. As a rule, the figure seen (just as in purely subjective cases occurring to a single percipient) is unrecognised. The following account, though remote, is first-hand, and at any rate deserves quotation. It occurs in *Letters of Philip, 2nd Earl of Chesterfield* (1829), p. 11. The incident was recorded by Lord Chesterfield in an MS. volume containing his letters and "notes for my remembrance of things and accidents, as they yearly happen to me."

(318) "A very odd accident this year [1652] befell mee, for being come about a law sute to London . . . I, waking in the morning about 8 o'clock, . . . plainly saw, within a yard of my bedside, a thing all white like a stand^s sheet, with a knot atop of it, about 4 or 5 foot high, w^h I considered a good while, and did rayse myself up in my bed to view the better. At last I thrust out both my hands to catch hold of it, but, in a moment, like a shadow, it slid to the feet of the bed, out of w^h I, leap^s after it, c^d see it no more. . . . Doubting least something might have happened to my wife, I rid home that day to Petworth in Sussex, where I had left her with her father, the Earl of Northumberland, and as I was going upstairs to her chamber, I met one of my footmen, who told me that he was comming to me with a packet of letters, the w^h I having taken from him went to my wife, who I found in good health, being . . . with Lady Essex, her sister, and another gentlewoman, one Mrs. Ramsey . . . They all asked me what made me to come home so much sooner than I intended. Whereupon I told them what had happened to me that morn^s; which they all wondering at desired me to open and read the letter that I had taken from the footman, which I immediately did, and read my wife's letter to mee aloud, wherein she desired my speedy return^s as fear^s that some ill w^d happen to mee, because that morning shee had seen a thing all in white, with a black face, standing by her bedside. . . . By examining all particulars we found that the same day, the same hour, and (as near as can be computed) the same minute, all that had happened to me had befallen her, being fortie miles asunder. The Lady Essex and Mrs. Ramsey were witnesses to both our relations."

Here, it will be seen, the two percipients were widely separated, which excludes the idea of joint illusion or of verbal suggestion.

In the next example the percipients, though near together, were not actually in one another's company. The case is of special interest, inasmuch as the two percepts were slightly different,—the figure being seen by one observer with a hat on, and by the other without, and the difference corresponding with the associations natural to each in their respective positions. A clergyman writing to us from Lincoln, on April 29th, 1885, describes an afternoon call of the preceding January.

(319) "I was ushered into the drawing-room, and was asked to take a low arm-chair in the middle of the room; but I preferred sitting on a couch drawn up at right angles to the side of the fireplace, where I could command a view, through the window, of the garden. Facing me, with her back to this window, sat one lady; to my left, seated not far from the arm-chair mentioned, was another lady, fronting the hearth. While we sat chatting upon the subject of my visit, an old man, of somewhat sad appearance, dressed in a dark blue overcoat—somewhat shabby—and with a flat-topped felt hat, and remarkable for a white beard, passed the window; and immediately after the front door bell rang. The lady of the house was expecting a visit from some lady friend, and remarked 'This must be ——.' I said, 'No, it's an old man with a white beard.' At which both ladies present expressed surprise, and began wondering who it could be. Just then the door of the room opened, and in walked a well-known local practitioner. As soon as he had shaken hands all round, the lady of the house said, 'But where is the old man with the white beard?' To which the doctor replied, 'Yes; where is he?'

"Our friend, the doctor, had happened to be passing the gate a short time before, and had, without premeditation as he says, suddenly turned in, struck with the idea of paying an afternoon call. He came up the walk towards the hall door, and, in passing the window mentioned, looked into the room where we were sitting, and saw, *seated in the low arm-chair*, an old man exactly answering to the description of the old man I had seen passing the window (doubtless when the doctor passed), with this exception, that the person he saw had, of course, no hat on. The doctor was surprised not to find the old gentleman in the room; hence his strange reply to the lady's question.

"Now observe: I saw the old man exactly at the time the doctor was passing the window. I did *not* see the doctor, whom I know well, who is much shorter than the figure I saw, and who wore a *brown* top-coat, a silk hat, and no beard. And the doctor saw the figure *in* the room, sitting down and without a hat.

"I am not, as far as I know, subject to similar hallucinations, if the affair may be rightly so called."

Dr. Cant writes to us as follows:—

"Silver Street, Lincoln.

"May 7th, 1885.

"I have seen Mr. —— [the clergyman], and quite agree with all he said. The old man was sitting down in the room, and I felt certain of his presence, and was greatly astonished not to find him in the room. The reports we have given are absolutely true, without any doubts in either of our minds.

"W. T. CANT."

Dr. Cant was asked whether he had ever had any other hallucinations; and also whether he would have been certain to see any real person occupying the position where the clergyman saw the figure. He replied:—

"In answer to your questions these phenomena are quite new to me, and I never remember having one of the sort before. It was quite *impossible* for the figure that Mr. —— saw to have been there, as I must have seen it when passing, and he only saw one figure, and did not see me at all."

Both witnesses are positive that the case was not one of mere illusion; though it was dusk, there was enough light for the clergyman to observe that the figure outside was rather badly dressed, besides differing from Dr.

Cant in being considerably stouter and wearing a beard. They discussed the matter the same evening at about 11 p.m. In the interval, something had occurred by which Dr. Cant tells us that he was a good deal impressed. At about 8 p.m. he was called to visit a stranger, who was dying, and who had expressly desired his attendance; and he was startled by the close (though not exact) resemblance of this man to the hallucinatory figure.

The next two cases resemble the last, in the point that the two percipients do not seem to have seen exactly the same thing. Surgeon-Major Samuel Smith, of Wyndham House, Kingsdown Parade, Bristol, sent the following account to the *Western Daily Press* (Nov. 30, 1881), and has since confirmed it to us.

(320) "I solemnly vouch for the truth of the statement made. I will add that I have been, although not a professed teetotaler, a total abstainer from stimulants for the past 10 years, and that I am not a believer in Spiritualism as it exists in the present day.

"About 20 minutes past 11 o'clock on the night of the 20th of April last, I was engaged with my wife's mother in playing a selection from 'La Figlia del Reggimento' for the flute and piano. We were seated in the drawing-room, which was brilliantly lighted by three large gaslights burning in globes which hung from the centre of the ceiling, the only other occupants of the room being my wife, who had fallen asleep upon the couch, and the baby asleep in the cradle. My wife's brother, who had been with us, left the room at 11 o'clock, and retired to rest. The room itself is spacious, lofty, and parallelogram-shaped, the piano occupying a position immediately opposite to the only door of entrance in the middle of the corresponding long side, so that in playing we sat with our backs to the door, which was closed.

"I was thoroughly intent upon the music, which was new to me, and difficult to read, so far as the flute was concerned, owing to the small size of the notes; when suddenly, in the midst of the performance, a strange feeling of mingled awe and fear came over me, and I distinctly felt the approach of someone, or rather of something, coming behind me, and this although I was so engrossed with playing; and in my mind I seemed to perceive the shape. As it approached nearer, I turned my head to the right, and distinctly perceived a shade of a greyish colour standing by me upon my right hand, a little in advance of me. I did not see the whole figure, but what I saw was a part of a shadowy face, the outline of the forehead, nose, mouth, chin, and a part of the neck being visible. Strange to say, I do not remember seeing the eye, but the figure appeared to have a top-hat upon its head. As I gazed upon it, it vanished, and with it the feelings, to a great extent, to which it gave rise. Of the mingled feelings which its presence raised in my mind, I should say that awe predominated.

"I did not cease playing, and subsequently played other pieces by the old masters, sang some songs, and finally went to bed, and slept well. Nor did I mention the matter to my wife's mother that night, either at the time of the occurrence, or before retiring to rest. Now, however, comes the most remarkable part of the matter. At or about 11.30 a.m. on the following day, my wife's mother came into the private room, and suddenly said, 'Did you see something when you turned your head last night, when you were playing?' I did not immediately reply, but the strange event of the preceding night flashed across my mind instantly. I was, indeed, too greatly surprised to reply at once, for I did not believe at the time that she had noticed the action upon my part; and, as I have already said, I had not mentioned the matter to her, or even hinted at it.

" ' Why do you ask ? ' I replied.

" ' Because I thought you did.'

" ' Did you see anything ? ' I asked.

" ' Yes, I believed that someone had come into the room, as I felt that someone had come in.'

" ' Did you think it was a man or a woman ? '

" ' I felt that it was a man, and at first believed it to be James' (my wife's brother), ' who had come down, and I wondered how he could come in without my hearing him.'

" ' Did you see anything ? ' I asked.

" ' Yes, I saw the back and shoulders of the form of a man ; it passed across like a shadow behind you, stood to your right hand, and then disappeared. I was not alarmed, but surprised.'

" So ends the narrative. In no way can I explain the cause, or sequence of events. As they occurred, so I present them."

Surgeon-Major Smith (January 15th, 1886), in sending his mother-in-law's confirmation, adds :—

" In speaking of the matter to-day she said she felt the presence of the visitor in her mind before she saw it ; and this is my experience of it. I felt its presence before I saw it."¹

" Wyndham House, Kingsdown, Bristol.

" January 15th, 1886.

" Agreeably to the request of Mr. Gurney, I write, but have nothing to add to the statement of my experience of the strange visitation described in the *Western Daily Press* in November, 1881 ; the facts being as therein stated.

" HANNAH ROBINSON."

Mr. Smith has repeated the account to me on the spot ; and it then became evident that Mrs. Robinson, turning her head the instant after he did the same, would have seen any flesh-and-blood figure rather *more full-face* than he did ; instead of which she saw the *back*. The extremely distinct and startling character of the experience came out more impressively in conversation than in the written account. Neither percipient can recall having had anything like a hallucination on any other occasion.

[Case 321 is omitted.] In the next case the difference is still more marked, the percept being visual to one person and auditory to the other ; while at the same time something of the same idea seems to have been suggested to both. For the purpose in view, the case (in spite of certain discrepancies in the two accounts) is, perhaps, stronger than it looks. For the fact that the visual and the auditory experience were both unshared, is a decided indication that they were neither of them due to a real external cause ; and if they were hallucinations, then (since no words passed till after both had been experienced) it seems at any rate very possible that one of them produced the other by thought-transference. Lady C. writes, on Oct. 13, 1884 :—

(322) " In October, 1879, I was staying at Bishopthorpe, near York, with the Archbishop of York. I was sleeping with Miss Z. T., when I suddenly saw a white figure fly through the room from the door to the window. It was only a shadowy form, and passed in a moment. I felt

¹ See pp. 308-9, and Chap. xii., § 2.

utterly terrified and called out at once, 'Did you see that?' and at the same moment Miss Z. T. exclaimed, 'Did you *hear* that?' Then I said, instantly, 'I saw an angel fly through the room,' and she said, 'I heard an angel singing.'

"We were both very much frightened for a little while, but said nothing about it to any one.

"K. C."

Miss T. writes :—

"December 19th, 1884.

"Late one night, about October 17th, 1879, Lady C. (then Lady K. L.) and I were preparing to go to sleep, after talking some time, when I heard something like very faint music, and seemed to feel what people call 'a presence.' I put out my hand and touched Lady C., saying, 'Did you hear that?' She said, 'Oh, don't! Just now I saw something going across the room!' We were both a good deal frightened, and tried to go to sleep as soon as we could. But I remember asking Lady C. exactly what she had seen, and she said, 'A sort of white shadow, like a spirit.' The above occurred at Bishopthorpe, York.

"Z. J. T."

In the next two examples (in which the figure was unrecognised) no difference seems to have been noted in the impressions of the two percipients. Mr. Bettany, of 2, Eckington Villas, Ashbourne Grove, Dulwich, S.E., writes :—

"November, 1884.

(323) "One night, early this year, I became conscious of a figure in my bedroom. It was a crouching figure of a woman, enveloped in a black cloak and hood. My impression was that the woman was old, but I did not see a face. This figure slowly and stealthily advanced from the bedroom door to a wardrobe on the same side of the room. It then suddenly and entirely disappeared, and, from the sudden shock, I gave a sharp loud cry. I never saw such an appearance before or since. I consider myself unusually unlikely to see apparitions. This figure and circumstance were like no dream, but were to me real and evident, and there appeared to be no transition between waking and sleeping. I was convinced that what I saw was a waking sight. I have no idea whom the figure represented. I had then occupied this house nearly three years, and I know nothing of former occupants.

"No light was carried nor was any light burning in the room. The figure was visible and the wardrobe was visible; but when the figure disappeared darkness was complete.¹ The door was found locked.

"G. T. BETTANY."

Mrs. Bettany (the narrator of cases 20 and 309) writes :—

"On the night referred to, I woke suddenly, I know not from what cause. My husband was leaning on his elbow, looking intently at a strange woman whom I saw crouching by the wardrobe. I believed it to be a real person. It, however, suddenly disappeared. My husband then gave a cry as he describes. He then told me what he had seen. I tried the door and found it locked.

"The thought has occurred to me that I may have seen this by sympathetic transference from my husband; but, against this, I am much more likely to see something of this kind than he.

"Without having mentioned this apparition to my servants, the nurse-

¹ See p 359

maid told me, next day, that Muriel (a child of three years) had woke her in the night, saying, without any fear in her voice, 'Clara, Clara, there is an old woman in the room.' The nurse herself saw nothing. I may add that my cook has on several occasions asked me if I had entered her room during the night, on occasions when I had certainly not done so. She appeared much mystified on learning this.

"JEANIE GWYNNE BETTANY."

[Case 324 is omitted, as also a curious unnumbered case.—ED.]

I now come to cases where the figure was recognised. The following transitional instance, of semi-recognition, is from Captain Cecil Norton, late of the 5th Lancers, who tells us that he has had no other hallucination of the senses.

"5, Queen's Gate, S.W.

"December 20th, 1885.

(325) "About Christmas time 1875 or 1876, being officer on duty, I was seated at the mess table of the 5th Lancers, in the West Cavalry Barracks, at Aldershot. There were 10 or 12 other officers present, and amongst them Mr. John Atkinson (now of Erchfont Manor, near Devizes, Wilts), the Surgeon-Major of the regiment, who sat on my right, but at the end of the table furthest from me and next to Mr. Russell. [Captain Norton was sitting at the end of the table and directly facing the window.] At about 8.45 p.m. Atkinson suddenly glared at the window to his right, thereby attracting the notice of Russell, who, seizing his arm, said, 'Good gracious, Doctor, what's the matter with you?' This caused me to look in the direction in which I saw Atkinson looking, viz., at the window opposite, and I there saw (for the curtains were looped up, although the room was lighted by a powerful central gas light in the roof and by candles on the table) a young woman, in what appeared a soiled or somewhat worn bridal dress, walk or glide slowly past the window from east to west. She was about at the centre of the window when I observed her, and outside the window. No person could have actually been in the position where she appeared, as the window in question is about 30 feet above the ground.

"The nearest buildings to the window referred to are the Infantry Barracks opposite, about 300 yards distant. Behind where I sat is a conservatory, which was examined by me, as well as the front window, immediately after the occurrence. There was no person in the conservatory. [It was unused in the winter.] The nearest buildings to it are the officers' stables, over which are the staff sergeants' quarters, about 50 yards distant.

"The occurrence made little if any impression upon me, though it impressed others who were in the room. All present had been drinking very little wine; and the dinner had been very quiet.

"It has just occurred to me that I may be wrong as to the time of year and that the occurrence may have taken place about 15th October or about 15th March.

"CECIL NORTON."

Mr. Atkinson writes:—

"Erchfont Manor, Devizes.

"August 31st, 1885.

"The appearance of a woman which I saw pass the mess-room window at Aldershot seemed to be outside, and it passed from east to west. The mess-room is on the first floor, so the woman would have been walking in the air. There has been a very nice story made out of it—like most other ghost-stories, founded on an optical illusion."

[Captain Norton's *vivâ voce* account made it tolerably clear, in my opinion, that the case was one of *hallucination*, not illusion. He further mentions that both Mr. Atkinson and he were "satisfied that the face and form of the woman seen were familiar," though they could not at the moment identify the person. Captain Norton afterwards felt sure that the likeness was to a photograph which he was in the habit of seeing in the room of the veterinary surgeon of the regiment, representing the surgeon's deceased wife in bridal dress. Oddly enough, this man was at the time, unknown to his friends, actually dying or within a day or two of death, in the same building. But Mr. Atkinson recalls nothing about the photograph; and the coincidence is not one to which we can attach weight.]

[Cases 326, 327, and 328, all clearly "recognised," are here omitted.]

In the next example, the apparition seems definitely independent of any conscious mental action on the part of the absent person; for it would be hard to attribute a special telepathic influence to some casual image of his usual resort that may have flitted across his mind, at the same time that his form appeared. The two percipients were at the time secretaries to societies of which the offices were in the same building. The narrator is Mr. R. Mouat, of 60, Huntingdon Street, Barnsbury, N. His account, which was written down soon after the occurrence, has been slightly condensed.

(329) "On Thursday, the 5th of September, 1867, about the hour of 10.45 a.m., on entering my office, I found my clerk in conversation with the porter, and the Rev. Mr. H. standing at the clerk's back. I was just on the point of asking Mr. H. what had brought him in so early (he worked in the same room as myself, but was not in the habit of coming till about midday) when my clerk began questioning me about a telegram which had missed me. The conversation lasted some minutes, and in the midst of it the porter gave me a letter which explained by whom the telegram had been sent. During this scene Mr. R., from an office upstairs, came in and listened to what was going on. On opening the letter, I immediately made known its purport, and looked Mr. H. full in the face as I spoke. I was much struck by the melancholy look he had, and observed that he was without his necktie. At this juncture Mr. R. and the porter left the room. I spoke to Mr. H., saying, 'Well, what's the matter with you? You look so sour.' He made no answer, but continued looking fixedly at me. I took up an enclosure which had accompanied the letter and read it through, still seeing Mr. H. standing opposite to me at the corner of the table. As I laid the papers down, my clerk said, 'Here, sir, is a letter come from Mr. H.' No sooner had he pronounced the name than Mr. H. disappeared in a second. I was for a time quite dumbfounded, which astonished my clerk, who (it now turned out) had not seen Mr. H., and absolutely denied that he had been in the office that morning. The purport of the letter from Mr. H., which my clerk gave me, and which had been written on the previous day, was that, feeling unwell, he should not come to the office that Thursday, but requested me to forward his letters to him at his house.

"The next day (Friday), about noon, Mr. H. entered the office; and when I asked him where he was on the Thursday about 10.45, he replied that he had just finished breakfast, was in the company of his wife, and had never left his house during the day. I felt shy of mentioning the subject to Mr. R., but on the Monday following I could not refrain from asking him if he remembered looking in on Thursday morning. 'Perfectly,' he replied; 'you were having a long confab with your clerk about a telegram,

which you subsequently discovered came from Mr. C.' On my asking him if he remembered who were present, he answered, 'The clerk, the porter, you and H.' On my asking him further, he said, 'He was standing at the corner of the table, opposite you. I addressed him, but he made no reply, only took up a book and began reading. I could not help looking at him, as the first thing that struck me was his being at the office so early, and the next his melancholy look, so different from his usual manner; but that I attributed to his being annoyed about the discussion going on. I left him standing in the same position when I went out, followed by the porter.' On my making known to Mr. R. that Mr. H. was 14 miles off the whole of that day he grew quite indignant at my doubting the evidence of his eyesight, and insisted on the porter being called up and interrogated. The porter, however, like the clerk, had not seen the figure."

Mr. R. has supplied independent and precise corroboration of these facts, so far as he was a party to them—the one insignificant difference being that he says he did not *speak* to Mr. H., but "gesticulated in fun to him, pointing to Mr. M. and the clerk, who were having an altercation about a telegram; but my fun did not seem at all catching, Mr. H. apparently not being inclined, as he often was, to make fun out of surrounding circumstances." He adds that he has never experienced any other hallucination of the senses; and Mr. Mouat made a similar statement *vivâ voce* to the present writer.

Cases of this type naturally suggest the question whether they may not be parallel to those cases of *casual agency* (Chapter XIV, § 5), where the same person has on several occasions, unconnected with any crisis, been the source of hallucination, now to one friend, now to another. But even supposing such an impression as the above, of an absent person who is in a normal state, to be telepathic and not purely subjective in its inception, no one on reflection will maintain that by pure accident two percipients were casually affected in this extremely rare way *at the same moment*. And if not, then something took place between them; which—if what one saw was not suggested to the other by verbal or physical signs—must be of the nature of thought-transference. [Case 330 is omitted.]

The next account is from Mr. Charles A. W. Lett, of the Military and Royal Naval Club, Albemarle Street, W.

"December 3rd, 1885.

(331) "On the 5th April, 1873, my wife's father, Captain Towns, died at his residence, Cranbrook, Rose Bay, near Sydney, N. S. Wales. About 6 weeks after his death, my wife had occasion, one evening about 9 o'clock, to go to one of the bedrooms in the house. She was accompanied by a young lady, Miss Berthon, and as they entered the room—the gas was burning all the time—they were amazed to see, reflected as it were on the polished surface of the wardrobe, the image of Captain Towns. It was barely half figure,¹ the head, shoulders, and part of the arms only showing—in fact, it was like an ordinary medallion portrait, but life-size. The face appeared wan and pale, as it did before his death; and he wore a kind of grey flannel jacket, in which he had been accustomed to sleep. Surprised and half alarmed at what they saw, their first idea was that a

¹ See p. 393, note.

portrait had been hung in the room, and that what they saw was its reflection—but there was no picture of the kind.

"Whilst they were looking and wondering, my wife's sister, Miss Towns, came into the room, and before either of the others had time to speak she exclaimed, 'Good gracious! Do you see papa?' One of the housemaids happened to be passing downstairs at the moment, and she was called in, and asked if she saw anything, and her reply was, 'Oh, miss! the master.' Graham—Captain Towns' old body servant—was then sent for, and he also immediately exclaimed, 'Oh, Lord save us! Mrs. Lett, it's the Captain!' The butler was called, and then Mrs. Crane, my wife's nurse, and they both said what they saw. Finally, Mrs. Towns was sent for, and, seeing the apparition, she advanced towards it with her arm extended as if to touch it, and as she passed her hand over the panel of the wardrobe the figure gradually faded away, and never again appeared, though the room was regularly occupied for a long time after.

"These are the simple facts of the case, and they admit of no doubt; no kind of intimation was given to any of the witnesses; the same question was put to each one as they came into the room, and the reply was given without hesitation by each. It was by the merest accident that I did not see the apparition. I was in the house at the time, but did not hear when I was called.

"C. A. W. LETT."

"We, the undersigned, having read the above statement, certify that it is strictly accurate, as we both were witnesses of the apparition.

"SARA LETT.

"SIBBIE SMYTH (*née* Towns)."

Mrs. Lett assures me that neither she nor her sister ever experienced a hallucination of the senses on any other occasion. She is positive that the recognition of the appearance on the part of each of the later witnesses was *independent*, and not due to any suggestion from the persons already in the room.

[We hope in time to receive the corroboration of Miss Berthon, and of Mrs. Crane, Mrs. Lett's nurse.]

These last [330 and 331] are cases where the distinction to which I have called attention (pp. 479-81) must be specially borne in mind. My central object being to prove that ideas may be transferred from mind to mind without words or physical signs, I am presenting certain collective sensory experiences which I think may constitute one type of such transference. Now believers in communications with the departed will probably need so little convincing as to the general theory of the far less startling transferences between living persons, that on them I am not concerned to press the evidence of this particular type. But of the rest of my readers I would ask—supposing the above and similar occurrences to be truly described—on what hypothesis, other than that of the transferability of hallucinations as such, they would explain them.

I pass by some other examples of the same kind; as no insistence on my point of view in quoting them would prevent my seeming to some to be explaining away veritable manifestations as subjective delusions, and to others to be introducing "ghosts" by a side-wind. But I give the following as a further interesting case of impressions which, though probably simultaneous, were not similar. The narrative was originally printed in July, 1883, in an account of the Orphanage where it occurred,

entitled *The Orphanage and Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie, &c.* (pp. 44-5). The narrator throughout is the Rev. C. Jupp, Warden of the Orphanage.

(332) "In 1875, a man died leaving a widow and six orphan children. The 3 eldest were admitted into the Orphanage. Three years afterwards the widow died, and friends succeeded in getting funds to send the rest here, the youngest being about 4 years of age. [Late one evening, about 6 months after the admission of the younger children, some visitors arrived unexpectedly; and] the Warden agreed to take a bed in the little ones' dormitory, which contained 10 beds, 9 occupied.

"In the morning, at breakfast, the Warden made the following statement:—'As near as I can tell I fell asleep about 11 o'clock, and slept very soundly for some time. I suddenly woke without any apparent reason, and felt an impulse to turn round, my face being towards the wall, from the children. Before turning, I looked up and saw a soft light in the room. The gas was burning low in the hall, and the dormitory door being open, I thought it probable that the light came from that source. It was soon evident, however, that such was not the case. I turned round, and then a wonderful vision met my gaze. Over the second bed from mine, and on the same side of the room, there was floating a small cloud of light, forming a halo of the brightness of the moon on an ordinary moonlight night.

"I sat upright in bed, looking at this strange appearance, took up my watch and found the hands pointing to 5 minutes to 1. Everything was quiet, and all the children sleeping soundly. In the bed, over which the light seemed to float, slept the youngest of the 6 children mentioned above.

"I asked myself, 'Am I dreaming?' No! I was wide awake. I was seized with a strong impulse to rise and touch the substance, or whatever it might be (for it was about 5 feet high), and was getting up when something seemed to hold me back. I am certain I heard nothing, yet I felt and perfectly understood the words—'No, lie down, it won't hurt you.' I at once did what I felt I was told to do. I fell asleep shortly afterwards and rose at half-past 5, that being my usual time.

"At 6 o'clock I began dressing the children, beginning at the bed furthest from the one in which I slept. Presently I came to the bed over which I had seen the light hovering. I took the little boy out, placed him on my knee, and put on some of his clothes. The child had been talking with the others; suddenly he was silent. And then, looking me hard in the face with an extraordinary expression, he said, 'Oh, Mr. Jupp, my mother came to me last night. Did you see her?' For a moment I could not answer the child. I then thought it better to pass it off, and said, 'Come, we must make haste, or we shall be late for breakfast.'"

"The child never afterwards referred to the matter, we are told, nor has it since ever been mentioned to him. The Warden says it is a mystery to him; he simply states the fact and there leaves the matter, being perfectly satisfied that he was mistaken in no one particular."

In answer to inquiries, the Rev. C. Jupp writes to us:—

"The Orphanage and Convalescent Home, Aberlour, Craigellachie.

"November 13th, 1883.

"I fear anything the little boy might now say would be unreliable, or I might at once question him. Although the matter was fully discussed at the time; it was never mentioned in the hearing of the child; and yet, when at the request of friends, the account was published in our little

magazine, and the child read it, his countenance changed, and, looking up, he said, 'Mr. Jupp, that is me.' I said, 'Yes, that is what we saw.' He said, 'Yes,' and then seemed to fall into deep thought, evidently with pleasant remembrances, for he smiled so sweetly to himself, and seemed to forget I was present.

"I much regret now that I did not learn something from the child at the time.

"CHAS. JUPP."

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Jupp says that he has never had any other hallucination of the senses; and adds, "My wife was the only person of *adult age* to whom I mentioned the circumstance at the time. Shortly after, I mentioned it to our Bishop and Primus."

Mrs. Jupp writes, from the Orphanage, on June 23, 1886 :—

"This is to certify that the account of the light seen by the Warden of this establishment is correct, and was mentioned to me at the time"—*i.e.*, next morning.

It is possible that the child's experience here was a dream; if so, the case might be taken as a link between the two classes of phenomena—collective hallucinations and simultaneous dreams—which I have referred to as so closely related (p. 468).

I will give one more "recognised" case, which presents the curious feature that the figure seen was that of one of the percipients. I have spoken before (Chapter XII, § 8, first note) of a form of hallucination, as I hold it, which consists in seeming to see oneself as a person outside one; and I have also pointed out (p. 425, note) that one of our informants who has had an experience of the sort, is also one of the few persons who have given us evidence of what I have called *casual* agency, exercised in the midst of quite ordinary life. Now the fact that a person who has, so to speak, casually impressed herself, has at other times casually impressed others, is in itself of great interest; but it leads us on to the following still more interesting case, where the "double" was seen by its original and by others *at the same time*. The account is from Mrs. Hall, of The Yews, Gretton, near Kettering, and was received in December, 1883.

(333) "In the autumn of 1863, I was living with my husband and first baby, a child of 8 months, in a lone house, called Sibberton, near Wansford, Northamptonshire, which in bygone days had been a church. As the weather became more wintry, a married cousin and her husband came on a visit. One night, when we were having supper, an apparition stood at the end of the sideboard. We four sat at the dining-table; and yet, with great inconsistency, I stood as this ghostly visitor again, in a spotted, light muslin summer dress, and without any terrible peculiarities of air or manner. We all four saw it, my husband having attracted our attention to it, saying, 'It is Sarah,' in a tone of recognition, meaning me. It at once disappeared. None of us felt any fear, it seemed too natural and familiar.

"The apparition seemed utterly apart from myself and my feelings, as a picture or statue. My three relatives, who, with me, saw the apparition, are all dead; they died in about the years 1868–69.

"SARAH JANE HALL."

The dress in which the figure appeared was not like any that Mrs. Hall had at the time, though she wore one like it nearly two years afterwards.

Mrs. Hall has had other visual hallucinations, which were all connected with ill-health or nervous shock ; one which occurred a few months before that here described had represented herself as if " laid out."

I now pass to auditory cases. I have spoken of the caution which these require ; but the following instances must, I think, have been more than mere misinterpretations of real sounds.

[No. 334 is here omitted.] The next example was sent to us by Mr. George Saxon, of Parklands, Bruton, Somersetshire, who completely confirms the narrative as far as he was concerned. The following is his wife's account :—

" February 26th, 1885.

(335) " On first coming to this house to reside, in September, 1879, myself and two servants were in the kitchen talking one evening at about 10.30 ; and we all three distinctly heard a voice coming from the next room, or the passage that leads from the kitchen to this room saying three times, ' Are you coming ? ' On the first occasion I answered and said, ' I am coming, dear,' thinking it was my husband calling, whom I supposed to be in the next room. The voice again said the second time, ' Are you coming ? ' and one of the servants said, ' You had better go ; master is calling.' The voice again said the third time, ' Are you coming ? ' I then went through the passage before mentioned, to the next room, where I thought to find my husband, there being no one else in the house except three children, who were upstairs fast asleep. On going through the passage into the next room, I found no one there, and no light, it being quite dark. I then returned to the kitchen and obtained a light, and went through the said room into the room beyond, where I found my husband, who was busy writing letters, and he had not called or spoken. This room he was in had the door shut. We all thought it very strange, and went up to see the children, who were all fast asleep. One of the servants before mentioned, I should say, had left my service and had only come down by train (10 miles) for the day, and was to return [arriving home at 8 p.m.] by the last train, which she missed and had to stay the night. She had a daughter-in-law expecting to be confined, to whom she was going back. She was an elderly person, had lost a son not long before, and used to see at times ' ghosts,' or what appeared human beings, but disappeared suddenly and mysteriously.

" CAROLINE AUGUSTA SAXON."

Mr. Saxon adds :—

" The house is quite an isolated one, standing in gardens away from a road, and about half a mile from the town. The doors and windows were closed. The voice was evidently within the house ; and could not have come from anyone in the house. Our children's ages were respectively 9 years, 7 years, 5 years and 7 months. We were sure they were all asleep at the time, as we went up at once to see. I asked them the next day ; besides, it was not the voice of the children, but seemed a low plaintive voice. Notwithstanding, my wife and the two servants thought it must have been myself calling from the next room, I being the only other being about."

I have examined the localities, and saw how natural it was that Mrs. Saxon should imagine her husband to be calling from the nearer room. She describes the voice as very distinct and startling. She has occasionally

had the hallucination of hearing her own name called, when overtired ; but never of anything else.

Here we have, in the servant's case, to note a slight tendency to subjective hallucination, which may have been intensified by recent trouble ; and, without absolutely excluding the hypothesis of telepathic influence from her daughter-in-law, I still think it more probable that a purely subjective hallucination on her part, easily referable to her anxiety about her daughter-in-law's condition, was psychically transferred to her two companions.

[Another case of this type, No. 336, is omitted. Gurney goes on to illustrate the musical type of collective hallucination with two cases, 337 and 338, and reference to a well-evidenced one in the Supplement. Considerations of space induce me to omit these here.—ED.]

The foregoing instances may perhaps suffice to show that a purely psychical account of these joint experiences—as due either partly or wholly to a thought-transference between the percipients—is at all events possible ; and that acceptance of the phenomena as genuine, *i.e.*, as percepts truly described, does not imply any materialistic theory of phantasmal beings who travel about through space (sometimes in their carriages) on their own account. And possibly a certain number of my readers may further agree with me in supposing some, at any rate, of these cases to have been in their inception purely subjective, and will not feel the need of invoking for them an unknown or *post-mortem* “agency,” however little disposed to rule the possibility of such agency out of court. I cannot, indeed, deny a certain force to an objection which Mr. Myers urges, that we know of no instances where a hallucination which can be connected with insanity or other distinctly morbid conditions in the person impressed, and which is thus quite clearly proved to be purely subjective, has become collective in the way supposed. But then neither do we know of instances where a person in one of these morbid conditions has exercised any other form of telepathic influence. We have no instances of telepathic impressions of the deaths of dying lunatics. The ultimate conditions of telepathic agency are as little known to us as the ultimate conditions of telepathic percipience ; and transient hallucinations of the sane, such as those of the preceding examples, differ so greatly in their nature and ostensible conditions from the types of hallucination to which Mr. Myers points as never transferred, that it seems rash to assume that they may not differ also in the particular point of transferability. At any rate, whatever the difficulties of that view, it is one that may be provisionally entertained by those who see equal difficulties in any other ; and whatever my own surmises as to future discovery may be, in the present state of the evidence I feel as much bound here to press the theory of thought-transference, before admitting causes of an obscurer kind, as in a former chapter to press the theory of unconscious physical indications before admitting the reality of thought-transference.

The *degree* in which the infectious character may exist is very hard indeed to determine ; for the majority of hallucinations (purely subjective and telepathic alike) occur to persons who are alone—silence

and *recueillement* being apparently favourable conditions; and we have no means of knowing how many of these hallucinations might have been shared by some one else, if some one else had happened to be present at the time. All that can be said is that, taking the whole class of transient hallucinations of the sane, the cases where the experience has been shared by a second person appear to be more numerous than those where a second person has been present, awake, and rightly situated, and has not shared the experience. Nor, again, can I at all adequately explain *why* these phenomena should be a form of mental impression specially liable to spread to neighbouring minds. That those of them which are telepathically produced in the first instance should have a tendency to spread in this way may appear, perhaps, less remarkable, if we remember that a telepathic impulse, as such, seems sometimes to have very distinct and peculiar physiological effects; witness Mrs. Newnham's exhaustion (p. 51) in experiments where the ideas conveyed were in themselves of a quite unexciting sort. But as regards the transference in purely subjective cases, all I can suggest is that sensory hallucinations, and especially the occasional hallucinations of sane and healthy people, are to begin with and in themselves very peculiar things; and that a fresh peculiarity, meeting us in something that we do not completely see round or understand, is less staggering than if it met us in something of which we have held our knowledge to be complete. At any rate the fact, if admitted, that purely subjective hallucinations may spontaneously become collective, greatly simplifies the consideration of the collective cases whose origin is traceable to an external "agent." The appearance of an absent person's figure to several spectators at once has had in it something specially startling; and when associated with the idea of death, it has almost inevitably suggested a material or "etherial" spirit—an independent travelling ghost. But as soon as the experience is analysed, it is found to involve nothing new or antagonistic to scientific conceptions. In being connected with the absent person, it is merely on a par with other specimens of telepathy—*e.g.*, many of those cited in the preceding chapters: in being collective, it is merely on a par with other specimens of hallucination—*e.g.*, some of those already cited in this chapter. Still, though a telepathic impulse from an absent person may not be an essential condition, it may be, and I believe is, an exceptionally favourable condition for a collective hallucination. And I now proceed to the final group of examples of which that condition is the distinguishing mark.

§ 6. I will begin the list with the auditory class. The following account is from Mr. J. Wood Beilby, of Redbank Cottage, Elgin Road, Beechworth, Victoria.

"October 17th, 1883.

(339) "A young lady, a friend of my wife's, staying with us in the bush, had gone some hours, on horseback, to our post-town—some eight miles distant—when my wife and I in the house, a servant-man and woman and my adopted son, a youth, in an outside kitchen, heard this young lady scream, and call out, 'Oh, Johnnie! Johnnie!'—that being my boy's name, he being a usual attendant to the fair equestrian. All simultaneously rushed out; but nothing further could be heard or seen of the exclaimant for nearly an hour, when she arrived, and informed us that at a spot

between four and five miles distant she had to open a gate. Trying to do this without dismounting, she leaned over it from her side-saddle to undo a sort of hasp. Her horse took fright at something and bounded aside, leaving her, happily, detached from him, hanging over the gate. She said she shrieked for help, and fancied 'Johnnie' was behind, but got extricated—I forget how—and her horse caught. She remounted, and came on to us without injury but the fright. It was absolutely impossible her natural voice could have been heard over a forest country intervening for even one-third of the distance. The strange thing to me is that others, not so specially gifted with magnetic impressions as I am, should have simultaneously and distinctly heard the ejaculation. All instantly acted a reply, going out of the several houses which they were in at the time, and making for an entrance gate, expecting to find the lady in some difficulty close at hand; and all were astonished that she was not even in view upon an extensive plain, skirted by the forest-land she had to traverse.

"J. WOOD BEILBY."

Mrs. Beilby corroborates as follows:—

"I perfectly recollect the voice being heard, as narrated above by my husband. I vouch for the accuracy of the narration.

"CATHERINE W. BEILBY."

In another account, written on January 28th, 1886, and signed by Mr. and Mrs. Beilby, it is more clearly brought out that the young lady, Miss Snell, actually called out the name, "Johnnie, Johnnie." The only point of difference between the two accounts is that the second, instead of saying that all four persons rushed out simultaneously, states that Mr. and Mrs. Beilby went out and called to the servants that Miss Snell had returned, and that "they said they heard her call, and immediately went to the gate of entrance to the homestead," but found no one there.

Mr. Beilby further adds:—

"The homestead is isolated from any other residence, some 3 miles; and no one was about at the time, except the servants and the employers in separate but closely adjacent buildings." He implies that he has had no other auditory hallucination.

The next account, which was first received by the Rev. W. Stainton Moses from an intimate friend of the agent's, was revised by his parents, the percipients, who have since again read it over and pronounced it correct.

"1881.

(340) "About two years ago W. L. felt England for America. Nine months since, he married, and hoped to bring his wife home to see his mother, to whom he was tenderly attached. On February 4th, however, he was taken with sudden illness, which terminated fatally on the 12th, about 8 p.m. On that night, about three-quarters of an hour after the parents of W. L. had retired to rest in England, the mother heard the clear voice of her son speaking. Her husband *who also heard it*, asked his wife if it was she who was speaking. Neither of them had been asleep, and she replied, 'No! Keep quiet!' The voice continued, 'As I cannot come to England, mother, I have come now to see you.' At this time both parents believed their son to be in perfect health in America, and were daily expecting a letter to announce his return home. A note was made of this very startling occurrence; and when a fortnight since news of

the son's death arrived, it was found to correspond with the date on which the spirit-voice¹ had announced his presence in England. The widow said that the preparations for departure had nearly been completed, and that *her husband showed much anxiety to get to England and see his mother.*"

[Unfortunately the percipients in this case dislike the subject, and it has been thought better not to press them with further inquiries. Otherwise we should of course have ascertained whether or not they had ever had other hallucinations.]

[Case 341 is omitted as remote.]

In the next case [342, also omitted] though the sound heard was apparently vocal, it was not articulate; and it can scarcely be pronounced impossible that such an effect might be produced by bubbling air, or some other local cause. The coincidence, however, appears to have been very close, though perhaps not so absolutely precise as is alleged; and the form of impression is not without analogy. [The sound heard by two percipients was "Three distinct sobs as of a person dying."—ED.]

I will add a couple of specimens of the non-vocal type. In the first, the hallucination presents a curiously close connection with the probable idea of the agent at the moment. The account is from Mrs. Paget, of Farnham, Surrey.

" June 5th, 1884.

(343) "A man-servant, who had lived with us from a child, and who was a real friend, fell into a consumption, and thinking that the climate of Ventnor might prolong his life for some months, we sent him to St. Catherine's Home in September, 1880. On the 8th of October, I received a letter from the Sister-in-charge, saying that Arthur Dunn was decidedly worse, but that the doctor thought there was no immediate danger, and therefore she did not think I need go to Ventnor *at once*. I therefore wrote to say I would be there on the following Monday, when I hoped to be able to stay with him to the last. That morning I said to my girls, 'I really must remember to speak to the new servant about putting out the gas upstairs at half-past 10, for since poor Arthur left us, it has not been put out *punctually*, and even some nights the burner close to my bedroom and my eldest girl's dressing-room has been alight all night.'

"That same evening was very warm, and my daughter and myself both left our doors open, in order to be able to talk after we went upstairs (the gas-burner being *close* to our rooms). Whilst we were both saying our prayers, the clock struck half-past 10, and at that moment we heard a man's heavy step along the passage, which stopped at the gas-burner, and then we heard the footsteps retiring. Almost at the same moment my daughter and myself came to our respective doors and exclaimed, 'Why, the man did not put out the gas after all. How like his step sounded to poor Arthur's heavy tread.'

"The next morning I received a telegram from the Sister-in-charge at St. Catherine's Home, saying, 'All was over last night.' I went down to Ventnor at once to make arrangements, and in telling Sister Mary Martha how I grieved that I had not started for Ventnor before, she remarked, 'We did not think there was immediate danger, and his mind was wandering so much that day that he was hardly conscious. It was curious to see what form his wandering took, for, after he had been very silent for some hours, the clock struck half-past 10, when he raised himself in

¹ See p. 176, second note.

bed and said distinctly, 'The clock has struck, I *must* go and put out the gas,' and fell back and died immediately.

"I ought to mention that punctuality had been a perfect mania with him. He was never, as far as I can remember, three minutes late for anything he was ordered to do, and he was most devotedly attached to us and our home.

"FRANCES PAGET."

Miss Paget (now Mrs. P. Hanham) wrote as follows, on June 11, 1884 :—

"I can only most emphatically confirm my mother's statement. I distinctly heard the 'footsteps' as described by her, and it happened at half-past 10 at night, the *exact* time, as we heard afterwards, that our poor man-servant died. I may mention that I questioned our new man-servant in the morning as to whether he had not been upstairs on the previous night; but it turned out that he had forgotten the orders given him to turn out the gas, and had not been upstairs. The footsteps, as I remarked at the time, were exactly similar to those of poor Arthur Dunn, and you may judge of my surprise when, on my mother's return from the funeral, she told us about her conversation with the Sister, who was with him at the last, and his last words having been, 'The clock has struck, I must go and put out the gas.'

"In answer to your questions :—

(1) "The occurrence happened here, and it was on October 8th, 1880, as I have since found on referring to a diary.

(2) "Neither my mother nor myself ever remember to have had any hallucinations of any sort, before or since. "GERTRUDE F. PAGET."

[The diary, which I have seen, gives the date of the death only. Miss Paget's meaning was that this was fixed on their minds next day as having happened on October 8th, on which day—as they could not then be mistaken in recollecting—the sounds had been heard.]

To a suggestion that the steps might have been those of a heavy-footed housemaid, Mrs. Paget replied :—

"I can positively affirm that the housemaid did *not* come upstairs on the night of my servant's death; for that point was inquired into at the time."

The Sister-in-charge at St. Catherine's Home, Ventnor, writes as follows, on March 6, 1885 :—

"Arthur Dunn died at 10.30 p.m. on the 8th of October, 1880. I was with him when he died; he was only with us eight days.

"MATILDA, S.S.S.M."

Mrs. Paget's account having been sent to Sister Matilda, she replied as follows, on March 9, 1885 :—

"Arthur John Dunn was only here eight days before his death. I nursed him, and was with him when he died on October 8th. I do not recollect what Mrs. Paget says at all; all I can remember was that he was in bed three days; his breathing was very laboured; he had a weak heart; he was not unconscious at all; he was a very silent man, and seldom spoke, except to answer any question asked. Just before he died he asked me the time; it was half-past 10; his words were: '*What is the time?*' I do not think he spoke after. There was nothing about the gas. He could not hear any clock strike, for there is not one in the ward or

near it. Sister Mary Martha was in charge of the house at the time, and I had the nursing of the men."

Sister Mary Martha writes from St. Margaret's, East Grinstead, on March 17, 1885 :—

"I regret that I am quite unable to recall any particulars of Arthur Dunn's death. I remember the young man perfectly well; he was at the Home only about eight days, and died *almost suddenly*. He suffered from heart disease as well as consumption. He was a very nice fellow, and we all liked him much. Mrs. Paget, I remember, spoke in the highest terms of him. My *impression* is that his end was very sudden—too much so for any last words.

"SISTER MARY MARTHA."

[It will be observed that there are two discrepancies between Mrs. Paget's and the Sisters' account. The point as to the way in which the man ascertained the time—whether by hearing the clock strike or by inquiry of the Sister—is not in itself important: the point about his mention of the gas, though not vital, has more importance. I have thoroughly talked over the matter with Mrs. Paget and her daughter. Mrs. Paget is quite clear in her recollection of Sister Mary Martha's statement; but she does not recollect having heard or realised *who* it was to whom the man made the remark. The daughter is equally clear about her mother's mention of this detail at the time. Had there been a considerable interval between Mrs. Paget's conversation with the Sister and her narration of it to someone else, it would not be hard to suppose that the incident of the man's asking the hour, combined with her own and her daughter's experience at that exact time, had gradually led to her imagining the crowning detail of his mentioning the gas; but that this detail, if it was not reported to her, should have got *immediately* impressed upon her mind as though it had been reported, seems decidedly less likely than that it has slipped from the memory of the Sisters, for whom it would have no special interest, since Mrs. Paget did not tell them what had occurred at home. And there is a further point which tells, I think, decidedly in favour of this view. On the supposition that the man made the remark about the gas, it is very easy to see how Mrs. Paget may have made the mistake about his hearing the clock strike; for the remark would become the fact of interest, and the manner in which the man ascertained the time would retain no significance. If, on the other hand, the only thing reported to Mrs. Paget had been that the man asked and was told what the time was, that would have served completely to stamp the coincidence, and to suggest the direction of the man's thoughts, and would thus have given a quite sufficient impressiveness and completeness to the story. Briefly, the introduction of the clock, on the first hypothesis, seems more easily comprehensible than the introduction of the gas, on the second.

Mrs. Paget showed me the scene of the incident. The gas-burner is at the end of a long passage, just outside her and her daughter's rooms. The house is a very quiet one, standing in grounds far back from the road; and it is difficult to imagine any sort of real sound that could possibly have been mistaken for heavy steps twice traversing the length of the passage, the doors of both hearers (it will be remembered) being open. Mrs. Paget says, moreover, that Arthur Dunn's tread was decidedly peculiar. That the steps were not those of the man-servant for the time being was practically proved (apart from his own assertion next day) by the fact that the gas was not turned off; for he could have no possible duty in that corner of the house at night, except to turn it off; and there was no other man in the house. Mrs. Paget and her daughter both confirmed the statement that

they have had no other hallucinations. They are far from being credulous or superstitious witnesses; but the strangeness of this incident made an extremely strong impression upon them.]

In the next case [344 omitted here for brevity though recent.—Ed.] the coincidence seems again to have been close to within a very few minutes; but the form [a church bell] which the hallucination (if it was one [and this Gurney after investigation on the spot finds “it all but impossible to doubt.”—Ed.]) took had no special connection with anything that we can conceive to have been present to the agent’s mind. Bells are, however, a not uncommon form of purely subjective impression.¹ And if the principle of telepathic hallucinations be granted, one would naturally expect that the rudimentary specimens of that class—specimens which do not suggest any conscious idea of the agent, but are projected, as it were, blindly under the telepathic impulse—should follow the ordinary lines of hallucinations in general.

I now come to cases where the sense of sight was involved. And I may begin with a few specimens where the experiences of the several percipients were either not exactly simultaneous or not exactly similar, and where, therefore, the theory that they were severally derived from the agent receives some slight support. (Compare in this respect the auditory case, No. 36.)

In the following example the experience of the second percipient included an auditory as well as a visual impression, and was, moreover, separated by an interval of 3 hours from that of the first. The narrator is Mrs. Cox, who wrote from Summer Hill, Queenstown, Ireland.

“December 26th, 1883.

(345) “On the night of the 21st August, 1869, between the hours of 8 and 9 o’clock, I was sitting in my bedroom in my mother’s house at Devonport, my nephew, a boy aged seven years, being in bed in the next room, when I was startled by his suddenly running into my room, and exclaiming in a frightened tone, ‘Oh, auntie, I have just seen my father walking around my bed.’ I replied, ‘Nonsense, you must have been dreaming.’ He said, ‘No, I have not,’ and refused to return to the room. Finding that I was unable to persuade him to go back, I put him in my own bed. Between 10 and 11 I myself retired to rest. I think about an hour afterwards, on looking towards the fireplace, I distinctly saw, to my astonishment, the form of my brother seated in a chair, and what particularly struck me was the deathly pallor of his face. (My nephew was at this time fast asleep.) I was so frightened, knowing that at this time my brother was in Hong Kong, China, that I put my head under the bed-clothes. Soon after this I plainly heard his voice calling me by name; my name was repeated three times. The next time I looked, he was gone. The following morning I told my mother and sister what had occurred, and said I should make a note of it, which I did. The next mail from China brought us the sad intelligence of my brother’s death, which took place on the 21st August, 1869, in the Harbour of Hong Kong, suddenly, [of heat-apoplexy].

“MINNIE COX.”

We have received from the Admiralty an official confirmation of the date of the death.

¹ See p. 325.

In answer to further inquiries, Mr. Cox (at present Secretary to the Naval Commander-in-Chief at Devonport) wrote :—

“ February 21st, 1884.

“ As my wife is too unwell to reply to your letter she has asked me to state with reference to your question on the subject of the appearance of her brother to her, that :—

“ As she has no note now in her possession, and as her mother is dead, she cannot be positive as to the hour at which her brother died. The circumstance happened about 15 years ago—both the persons she mentioned it to are dead. All that she can now state positively is that she now believes it must have been after midnight when she saw the appearance, but at the same time she is quite certain that her little nephew came into her room *before* midnight. She is sure that afterwards, when the news came from China, the time corresponded, but has nothing to prove it. I fear that she has not sufficient evidence, or in fact any evidence now ; but it is an old story she has often told me, and I have not the slightest doubt that she did see the appearance. “ JAMES COX.”

In conversation Mrs. Cox told me that she was quite certain of having put down the date, and compared it with the date in the letter. She has never had the slightest hallucination on any other occasion. The child was not in the least given to frights, and had no dread of the dark.

[If the time either of Mrs. Cox's or of her nephew's impression coincided with that of the death, the first date in the account is of course given wrongly, as 9 p.m. in England would correspond with about 5 a.m. of the next day at Hong Kong. If the first date is right, then the percipients' experiences must have followed the death by some hours. It might be suggested that Mrs. Cox's experience was due to suggestion from her nephew. But it is scarcely probable that a person who has no tendency to hallucinations should evolve one from what she took to be the dream of a frightened child.]

[Cases 346 and 347 are omitted.]

In the remaining visual cases, the impression seems to have been distinct and identical to all the percipients. I will begin with a case where it is a question whether a distant agent was or was not the source of the phenomenon ; but where the flashing of the hallucination from one of the percipients to the other seems specially well illustrated, since the figure which appeared was one which the second percipient had never seen in the flesh. The account is from Mrs. Elgee, of 18, Woburn Road, Bedford.

“ March 1st, 1885.

(348) “ In the month of November, 1864, being detained in Cairo, on my way out to India, the following curious circumstance occurred to me :—

“ Owing to an unusual influx of travellers, I, with the young lady under my charge (whom we will call D.) and some other passengers of the outward-bound mail to India, had to take up our abode in a somewhat unfrequented hotel. The room shared by Miss D. and myself was large, lofty, and gloomy ; the furniture of the scantiest, consisting of two small beds, placed nearly in the middle of the room and not touching the walls at all, two or three rush-bottomed chairs, a very small washing-stand, and a large old-fashioned sofa of the settee-sort, which was placed against one-half of the large folding-doors which gave entrance to the room. This

settee was far too heavy to be removed, unless by two or three people. The other half of the door was used for entrance, and faced the two beds. Feeling rather desolate and strange, and Miss D. being a nervous person, I locked the door, and, taking out the key, put it under my pillow ; but on Miss D. remarking that there might be a duplicate which could open the door from outside, I put a chair against the door, with my travelling bag on it, so arranged that, on any pressure outside, one or both must fall on the bare floor, and make noise enough to rouse me. We then proceeded to retire to bed, the one I had chosen being near the only window in the room, which opened with two glazed doors, almost to the floor. These doors, on account of the heat, I left open, first assuring myself that no communication from the outside could be obtained. The window led on to a small balcony, which was isolated, and was three stories above the ground.

" I suddenly woke from a sound sleep with the impression that somebody had called me, and, sitting up in bed, to my unbounded astonishment, by the clear light of early dawn coming in through the large window before-mentioned, I beheld the figure of an old and very valued friend whom I knew to be in England. He appeared as if most eager to speak to me, and I addressed him with, ' Good gracious ! how did you come here ? ' So clear was the figure, that I noted every detail of his dress, even to three onyx shirt studs which he always wore. He seemed to come a step nearer to me, when he suddenly pointed across the room, and on my looking round, I saw Miss D. sitting up in her bed, gazing at the figure with every expression of terror. On looking back, my friend seemed to shake his head, and retreated step by step, slowly, till he seemed to sink through that portion of the door where the settee stood. I never knew what happened to me after this ; but my next remembrance is of bright sunshine pouring through the window. Gradually the remembrance of what had happened came back to me, and the question arose in my mind, had I been dreaming, or had I seen a visitant from another world ?—the bodily presence of my friend being utterly impossible. Remembering that Miss D. had seemed aware of the figure as well as myself, I determined to allow the test of my dream or vision to be whatever she said to me upon the subject, I intending to say nothing to her unless she spoke to me. As she seemed still asleep, I got out of bed, examined the door carefully, and found the chair and my bag untouched, and the key under my pillow ; the settee had not been touched, nor had that portion of the door against which it was placed any appearance of being opened for years.

" Presently, on Miss D. waking up, she looked about the room, and, noticing the chair and bag, made some remark as to their not having been much use. I said, ' What do you mean ? ' and then she said, ' Why, that man who was in the room this morning must have got in somehow.' She then proceeded to describe to me exactly what I myself had seen. Without giving any satisfactory answer as to what I had seen, I made her rather angry by affecting to treat the matter as a fancy on her part, and showed her the key still under my pillow, and the chair and bag untouched. I then asked her, if she was so sure that she had seen somebody in the room, did not she know who it was ? ' No,' said she, ' I have never seen him before, nor anyone like him.' I said, ' Have you ever seen a photograph of him ? '—She said, ' No.' This lady never was told what I saw, and yet described exactly to a third person what we both had seen.

" Of course, I was under the impression my friend was dead. Such, however, was not the case ; and I met him some four years later, when, without telling him anything of my experience in Cairo, I asked him, in a

joking way, could he remember what he was doing on a certain night in November, 1864. 'Well,' he said, 'you require me to have a good memory'; but after a little reflection he replied, 'Why that was the time I was so harassed with trying to decide for or against the appointment which was offered me, and I so much wished you could have been with me to talk the matter over. I sat over the fire quite late, trying to think what you would have advised me to do.' A little cross-questioning and comparing of dates brought out the curious fact that, allowing for the difference of time between England and Cairo, his meditations over the fire and my experience were simultaneous. Having told him the circumstances above narrated, I asked him had he been aware of any peculiar or unusual sensation. He said none, only that he had wanted to see me very much.

"E. H. ELGEE."

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Elgee says :—

"I fear it is quite impossible to get any information from Miss D. She married soon after we reached India, and I never met her since, nor do I know where she is, if alive. I quite understand the value of her corroboration; and at the time she told the whole circumstance to a fellow-traveller, who repeated it to me, and her story and mine agreed in every particular, save that to her the visitant was a complete stranger; and her tale was quite unbiassed by mine, as I always treated hers as a fancy, and *never* acknowledged I had been aware of anything unusual having taken place in our room at Cairo. I never have seen, or fancied I saw, any one before or since.

"My visitant, also, is dead, or he would, I know, have added his testimony, small as it was, to mine. He was a very calm, quiet, clever, scientific man, not given to vain fancies on any subject, and certainly was not aware of any desire of appearing to me."

[This seems at any rate an interesting example of collective hallucination; though as regards its supposed origination in the thoughts of Mrs. Elgee's friend in England, one may doubt whether, after a lapse of 4 years, complete certainty as to the identity of dates was attainable. If there has been an error on this point, the case would properly belong to the preceding section.]

[Case 349 is omitted.] We owe the next account in the first instance to Mrs. Willink, of Lindale Parsonage, Grange-over-Sands. The three first-hand witnesses all appear to be persons of good sense and of some education. Mrs. Willink writes, on Sept. 9, 1884 :—

(350) "One night (Friday) my nurse, Jane, came to tell me that they had been startled by seeing a ghastly face at the kitchen window. The servants had been annoyed for some time previously by some young men coming to the kitchen window, and making a noise on the glass, and trying to look in. The flower-bed under the window had been freshly dug up and tidied, and they were hoping the visits had ceased. The dog, whose kennel was close to the window, and who had been put on a long chain to keep away these visitors, began to howl, and Helen (now Mrs. Robinson), who was sitting so as to see through the edge of the blind, looked up, and seeing a ghastly face, which she recognised as Mrs. Robinson's, told the others, who got up and drew the blind on one side and so saw the face distinctly. Their account was that it gradually faded away below the bottom of the window. Jane and Aggie then went to the

door, but though the dog continued howling (as he always does when a death in the village takes place), they could see nothing.

"I doubt the accuracy of the statement that the apparition looked at Helen rather than at the others; she sat where she could see through the space between the blind and the edge of the window, so naturally saw it first. Jane had never seen Mrs. Robinson, but some time after, on looking through a photograph-book in the village, she recognised the face, and was then told to whom it belonged. When she told me on the Friday evening of what they had seen, I rather pooh-poohed the story, as I found that the dog's howling was beginning to make them always nervous; and it was not until after service on Sunday that I was told how Mrs. Robinson had been persuaded to go to Leeds to the hospital there, and to undergo an operation, under which she died on Friday afternoon, I think, between 2 and 3. The appearance would be between 8 and 9. Mrs. Robinson had been servant to the clergyman here before she married; she had been away from the village some time before her death; was always an invalid, but none of us knew of her being more ill than usual.

"MARGARET WILLINK."

We learn from the clerk at Finsthwaite, where Mrs. Robinson was buried, that she died at the Leeds Infirmary on March 25th, 1882, and a neighbour thinks that the hour was between 8 and 9 in the morning. Friday was the 24th, not the 25th; and the coincidence was thus not so close as Mrs. Willink supposes; but the interval probably did not exceed 12 hours.

Mary Jane Farrand says:—

"It was a Friday evening, of the exact time I am not sure, but it was between half-past 8 and 9 o'clock. The other two maids, with myself, were sitting at supper in the kitchen, close to the window, when we all became conscious of being watched by a woman from the outside, whom the other two immediately recognised as a person whom they both knew as Mrs. Robinson. Before her marriage, she lived at the parsonage for some time as housemaid. She looked intently upon each one, and then turned her face quite to the cook, looking slightly reproachful, then pleadingly. They asked one of the other where she could be staying, and they said it was strange for her to be out (as it rained heavily) without her bonnet. One was just about to go and ask her in, when we saw a great change come over the face, and it looked like that of a corpse, then disappeared altogether. I never saw the person previously, or remember ever hearing of her, however indirectly. The following Sunday morning I heard that she was dead from Mrs. Willink. The cook, whom we called Nell, was married to John Robinson about two years afterwards. As we sat at the table I had such an impression of the face, eyes, and front of the hair as to be able to recognise the photograph a few months afterwards, without the least trouble, or being told.

"MARY JANE FARRAND."

A. Nicholson (now Mrs. Capstick, of Silverdale, Carnforth) writes to Mary Jane Farrand, on September 4th, 1884:—

"Woodwell.

"In answer to your letter about the face at the window, I cannot remember much about it, except that we were sitting at supper, and Nell happened to look up at the window, and said some one was looking in, then told us to come and look. It was like the face of a skeleton, and we looked, and it was a very thin face, with large staring eyes. We still

thought it was some one till you and I went to the door, but could see nothing. Nell was in the kitchen, and it never moved, but was still there when we got back. It seemed to gradually fade out of sight. I don't remember who passed the remark that it was like Mrs. Robinson.

"A. NICHOLSON."

In conversation, Mrs. Capstick stated that she has never had any other experience of a hallucination.

Mrs. Willink writes, on September 18th, 1884 :—

"In answer to your question as to when the servants told me it was Mrs. Robinson's face they saw, as far as I recollect it was that same evening. Helen knew (as we all did) that Mrs. Robinson was ill, and had been so for years with an internal complaint, from which she never could recover; but she did *not* know that she was any worse than she had been before she left the village some months before.

"They went out next morning to look for footmarks on the flower bed, which would have been disturbed by any one standing at the window, but there were no traces of any."

In answer to inquiries, Mary Jane Farrand writes, on September 24th, 1884 :—

"When I recognised Mrs. Robinson's photograph I was staying at Arnside with Mrs. Willink's children, and went to visit a person who had lived near Lindale and had not long been married, and she it was who when showing me the different things in her house, quite by chance took up her album, and showed me the photos of her friends, amongst them Mrs. Robinson. I cannot quite remember whether or not I told her that I recognised the face; for it seems so long ago to remember each fact, and I should not like to assert what I did not feel confident about, but you certainly may write to her to ask her.

"Never before had I seen anything of the kind, although I had heard of similar events, but was greatly wanting in faith with regard to such things happening, and thought it but a fancy in others, until I saw Mrs. Robinson [*i.e.*, the photograph]."

She mentions, however, that she has had two subjective hallucinations, which fell within a few days of one another—one representing Mrs. Willink, and the other a fellow-servant.

Mrs. Jackson Thompson, of Ashmeadow Lodge, Arnside, Grange-over-Sands, writes, in February, 1886 :—

"The only remark I remember Mary Jane Farrand making on the late Mrs. John Robinson's photograph was that it resembled the face which appeared at the Lindale Parsonage kitchen window.

"CHARLOTTE THOMPSON."

The evidence of "Nell" (now Mrs. Robinson), the third witness, has now been obtained, and is as follows :—

"Lakeside Cottages, Newby Bridge.

"June, 1886.

"It was one evening, about 4 years ago, that I sat in the kitchen, at Lindale Parsonage, at supper, and looking at the window I saw, at the side of the blind, which was not hanging quite straight, a very pale face looking at me. It was turned sideways when I first saw it, and thinking it was one of the young men from the village come up to make game of us, I made a face at it; then it turned full face towards me, and I saw

that it was the face of Mrs. John Robinson, my present husband's first wife. It looked very pale. I watched it with the other servants for about 3 minutes perhaps, and then it dropped down and disappeared. I could see all round it, so that I could see that it was not a real face, and it was too close to the window for that. It looked as if resting on the sill.

"I have never on any other occasion seen anything which was not really there.

"HELEN ROBINSON."

[The next case No. 351 is here omitted.—ED.]

The following case is from Mr. S. S. Falkenburg, of Uniontown, Ky., U.S.A., decorator and house painter.

"Sept. 12th, 1884.

(352) "The following circumstance is impressed upon my mind in a manner which will preclude its ever being forgotten by me or the members of my family interested. My little son, Arthur, who was then five years old, and the pet of his grandpapa, was playing on the floor, when I entered the house a quarter to 7 o'clock, Friday evening, July 11th, 1879. I was very tired, having been receiving and paying for staves all day, and it being an exceedingly sultry evening, I lay down by Artie on the carpet, and entered into conversation with my wife—not, however, in regard to my parents. Artie, as usually was the case, came and lay down with his little head upon my left arm, when all at once he exclaimed, 'Papa! papa! Grandpa!' I cast my eyes towards the ceiling, or opened my eyes, I am not sure which, when, between me and the joists (it was an old-fashioned log-cabin), I saw the face of my father as plainly as ever I saw him in my life.¹ He appeared to me to be very pale, and looked *sad*, as I had seen him upon my last visit to him three months previous. I immediately spoke to my wife, who was sitting within a few feet of me, and said, 'Clara, there is something wrong at home; father is either dead or very sick.' She tried to persuade me that it was my imagination, but I could not help feeling that something was wrong. Being very tired, we soon after retired, and about 10 o'clock Artie woke me up repeating, 'Papa, grandpa is here.' I looked, and believe, if I remember right, got up, at any rate to get the child warm, as he complained of coldness,² and it was very sultry weather. Next morning I expressed my determination to go at once to Indianapolis. My wife made light of it and over-persuaded me, and I did not go until Monday morning, and upon arriving at home (my father's), I found that he had been buried the day before, Sunday, July 13th.

"Now comes the mysterious part to me. After I had told my mother and brother of my vision, or whatever it may have been, they told me the following:—

"On the morning of the 11th July, the day of his death, he arose early and expressed himself as feeling unusually well, and ate a hearty breakfast. He took the Bible (he was a Methodist minister), and went and remained until near noon. He ate a hearty dinner, and went to the front gate, and, looking up and down the street, remarked that he could not, or at least would not be disappointed, some one was surely coming. During the afternoon and evening he seemed restless, and went to the gate, looking down street, frequently. At last, about time for supper, he

¹ For a phantasm seen in a position which would in reality be impossible compare case 205.

² See p. 153, note.

mentioned my name, and expressed his conviction that God, in His own good time, would answer his prayers in my behalf, I being at that time very wild. Mother going into the kitchen to prepare supper, he followed her and continued talking to her about myself and family, and especially Arthur, my son. Supper being over, he moved his chair near the door, and was conversing about me at the time he died. The last words were about me, and were spoken, by mother's clock, 14 minutes of 7. He did not fall, but just quit talking and was dead.

"In answer to my inquiries, my son Arthur says he remembers the circumstances, and the impression he received upon that occasion is ineffaceable.

"SAMUEL S. FALKINBURG."

We have procured a certificate of death from the Indianapolis Board of Health, which confirms the date given.

Mrs. Falkinburg writes to us, on Sept. 12, 1884 :—

"In answer to your request, I will say that I cheerfully give my recollection of the circumstance to which you refer.

"We were living in Brown County, Indiana, 50 miles south of Indianapolis, in the summer of 1879. My husband (Mr. S. S. Falkinburg) was in the employ of one John Ayers, buying staves.

"On the evening of July 11th, about 6.30 o'clock, he came into the room where I was sitting, and lay down on the carpet with my little boy Arthur, complaining of being very tired and warm. Entering into conversation on some unimportant matter, Arthur went to him and lay down by his side. In a few moments my notice was attracted by hearing Arthur exclaim : ' Oh, papa, grandpa, grandpa, papa,' at the same time pointing with his little hand toward the ceiling. I looked in the direction he was pointing, but saw nothing. My husband, however, said : ' Clara, there is something wrong at home ; father is either dead or very sick.' I tried to laugh him out of what I thought an idle fancy ; but he insisted that he saw the face of his father looking at him from near the ceiling, and Arthur said, ' Grandpa was come, for he saw him.' That night we were awakened by Artie again calling his papa to see ' grandpa.'

"A short time after my husband started (Monday) to go to Indianapolis, I received a letter calling him to the burial of his father ; and some time after, in conversation with his mother, it transpired that the time he and Artie saw the vision was within two or three minutes of the time his father died.

"CLARA T. FALKINBURG."

Asked whether this was his sole experience of a visual hallucination, Mr. Falkinburg replied that it was. Occasionally, however, since that time he has had auditory impressions suggestive of his father's presence.

Here it may perhaps be suggested that Mr. Falkinburg's hallucination was due to the child's remark. But I know of no evidence to support such a hypothesis. Where sensory hallucinations have been traceable to verbal suggestion, as I have already mentioned, (pp. 477-8), there has either been a previous abnormal dominance of one person by another, or the effect has been worked up among a considerable number of people, in an atmosphere of emotion and excitement. Till evidence is brought, we must, I think, decline to credit the words of a child of five with such magic sway over its father's mind as is exercised by a practised mesmerist over the "subject" whose will he has annulled, or as causes the visions of a hysterical fanatic to spread to her like-minded companions,

[Cases 353 and 354 are omitted.] In the next example of the two persons present, one of whom was son, and the other a stranger, to the agent, the stranger alone saw the phantasm, though both seem to have shared in a singular auditory experience which they connected with it. The incident thus closely resembles that described in case 242, where the phantasm appeared not to the dying man's sister, but to a servant who was with her. The narrative was copied by the present writer from a notebook of the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, formerly of Manchester, and now of Rhyl.

(355) "On August 13th, 1879, I sailed to Hamburg with Captain Ayre, of the ss. 'Berlin,' of Goole, who related to me that, about 25 years before, he was staying with a friend named Hunt, at a small farmhouse at Arming Grange, about 2½ miles from Goole. On a summer evening, about 9 o'clock, Captain Ayre and his companion went to their bedroom, when they both heard a noise at the side of the house, and both went to the window to see what was the matter. The captain distinctly saw a man walking outside, but Hunt could see nothing there, though he had heard the tramp of feet as well as the captain. Being astonished that Hunt could not see the man, Captain Ayre proceeded to describe him. He was a man of short stature, with a stoop, and wore knee breeches, a red-fronted waistcoat with sleeves, and a little black hat. Hunt instantly identified the description as answering exactly to his own father. Captain Ayre assured me he had never seen Hunt's father. After this the men went to bed, and both now heard a noise as if the end of the bedstead had been wrenched, which continued until about midnight, when Hunt's brother arrived on horseback from Gilberdyke with the news of their father's death, which occurred about three hours earlier that evening. The noises then ceased."

Mr. Macdonald adds :—

"This was taken down by me in pencil from Captain Ayre's own lips, and transcribed when I returned from the voyage. The pencil account was read over to Captain Ayre, and pronounced by him to be perfectly correct. I cross-examined him carefully on every point. He specially described the lonely position of the house, and the unlikelihood of any stranger moving about in the vicinity or creating a disturbance in the bedroom.

"JAMES ALEX. MACDONALD."

This account was sent to Captain Ayre, who replied :—

"SS. 'Dresden,' Goole.

"November 4th, 1884.

"I have carefully read over the narrative, as given by the Rev. Mr. Macdonald; but it is so accurate in every detail that I fail to be able to add anything thereto.

"CHAS. AYRE."

[Our efforts to trace Mr. Hunt have been unsuccessful. Captain Ayre has not heard of him for some time.]

In the next case the agent was not dying, but was in a somewhat alarming fainting-fit. We have had other similar cases (*e.g.*, No. 20); they recall what was said above (p. 387) as to the number of the death-cases where the mode of death has been drowning. The narrator is Mr. H. G. Barwell, of 33, Surrey Street, Norwich.

" 1883.

(356) " During the last week of July, 1882, Mr. and Mrs. W. and family had settled themselves comfortably in a house they had hired at the Lizard, Cornwall; and a few days later Mr. Cox, an amateur artist from Liverpool, joined them. Mr. Barwell arranged to meet Mr. Earle, an artist residing in London (both of whose names are appended), on Monday, 7th August, 1882, dine with him and together take the night mail at Paddington, booking for Penryn, Cornwall, the station from whence conveyances take passengers to Helston, and thence to the Lizard, whither they were going to join Mr. W. and family, as on many former occasions.

" Barwell and Earle therefore started according to arrangement by the 8.10 p.m. mail train from Paddington, on the evening of Bank Holiday, Monday, 7 August, 1882. They travelled all night; the train on arrival at Penryn was a little more than 15 minutes late, reaching there on Tuesday morning, 8th August, 1882, at 7.23 a.m. No other passengers alighted there from that train. They had some difficulty in getting a porter to convey their luggage to the omnibus standing at the station, the driver of which announced that if they could not come at once, he must start without them. Passengers were nothing to him, he had to take charge of and deliver the mail bags at various villages on his route. They roused up the porter and insisted on his attention; in the meantime their train had departed and another train, from Falmouth to London, ran into the station (due 7.24 a.m.). Their luggage was being placed on the omnibus; Earle had already climbed to his seat next the driver, and Barwell, having now seen all their luggage safely deposited on the vehicle, was climbing up next him, when Earle exclaimed: 'Why, look there!' And on Barwell looking up, he saw in the train, just leaving the station for London, their friend W. from the Lizard, waving his hand to them while eagerly stretching his head out of the window to ascertain, apparently, if they had arrived. They both cordially returned the salute and the train disappeared round a curve, W. still looking out of the window waving his hand.

" The two friends now made various conjectures as to the why and wherefore of W.'s departure on the very morning of their arrival; they considered it very disappointing that he should thus be obliged to leave, on the day our friendly party was about to be reunited. Earle was greatly depressed about it, and wished to leave all further discussion on the subject until they should ascertain from Mrs. W. the cause for his leaving the Lizard just before their arrival. Amongst the surmises which they made for W. being in the train which came from Falmouth, and not from the Lizard where he was staying, was this: that he had probably received at the Lizard, on Monday, the 7th August, a telegram requiring his immediate attendance in London or elsewhere, and that to prevent a very early start by trap on Tuesday morning from the Lizard to catch the 7.30 a.m. train to London at Penryn, he had made use of a return Bank Holiday excursion steamer from Falmouth to the Lizard; sleeping at Falmouth, and starting by train from there at 7.15 a.m. for London, namely, the train they saw him in.

" They arrived in due course at Helston, had breakfast, and sauntered about the old town till the next coach started for the Lizard at 11 o'clock a.m. On nearing the Lizard, they were anxiously on the look-out for the children of Mrs. W., to receive their usual hearty and sincere welcome on arrival of the coach, and to learn from them where their respective domiciles in the village had been chosen. The coach arrived, but none of the W. family were to be seen.

"The luggage was taken off the coach and left on the village green in front of the hotel, till information could be obtained as to where rooms had been engaged. The two friends strolled away, but soon met W.'s two boys, who on being asked why their father had gone away, seemed somewhat surprised at the question, and replied that their father was lying ill at his lodgings, and that their mother was also at home and very anxious about him. The boys accompanied Earle and Barwell to their father's house in the village, when Mrs. W. came out and greeted them cordially, telling them briefly that Mr. W. had had a serious fainting fit that morning, and that she was watching him with considerable anxiety.

"Mr. Cox now came in from his morning's work, and after the exchange of salutations with Earle and Barwell, related to them the following details of Mr. W.'s fainting fit; That he, Mr. W., and his two boys started from the Lizard village to Housel Cove to bathe, at 7 o'clock that morning, a distance a little over half a mile. When W. came out of the sea, and was leaning against a rock, in a sitting posture, he fainted quite away. Cox was dreadfully shocked and alarmed, for at one time he could discover no action of the heart, and he feared he might be dead or dying. He used all the means he could think of, and placed W. in a more recumbent position, which seemed a more favourable one, for pulsation was then discernible, and W. partially recovered, but was too weak to move for a long time. Mrs. W. was fetched, and then breakfast was taken down to the Cove, and when vitality and strength had sufficiently returned to enable W. to climb the steep ascent with assistance, they started home.

"The fainting of W. occurred at 7.30 a.m. at Housel Cove, the Lizard, at the precise time when Earle and Barwell saw W. waving his hand to them from the train at Penryn.

"The question has been put to Mr. W. whether he thought of or saw Earle or Barwell, either just before or during his seizure, but he remembers nothing of the kind.

" (Signed) {	" CHARLES EARLE, 9, Duke Street, Portland Place, London.
	" H. G. BARWELL, Surrey Street, Norwich.
	" CHARLES H. COX, Shrewsbury Road, N., Birkenhead."

In reply to inquiries, Mr. Barwell says: "Both Earle and I have very good sight. My impression is that the person I saw looking from the train window wore a soft, flexible, round hat." He can recall no other experience of hallucination, except one which occurred many years ago, at a time when he was not yet fully recovered from a severe fever.

Mr. Cox writes, on January 2nd, 1885:—

"I was at the Lizard, in Cornwall, when my friends, Earle and Barwell, saw (as they believed) the 'double' of my friend W., whom, at the time, I was instrumental in bringing round after his attack of illness. My part in the affair was simply resuscitating Mr. W. from a very serious condition.

"C. H. Cox."

[Here, again, mistaken identity must be recognised as a possibility; but there are several points which combine to make it improbable. The fact which the appearance forced on the minds of the two friends—namely, W.'s departure—was so little in accordance with their expectations that it distinctly surprised them; they were thus in a wholly different attitude from that (say) of awaiting a friend's arrival, when the senses are on the alert for anything at all resembling him. Again, the figure seen seems to have given unmistakable signs of friendly recognition; so that we should

not only have to suppose that the percipients mistook *someone* for their friend, but that they mistook for him someone who was known to them, or at any rate to one of them—clearly a much more unlikely occurrence. It will be observed, moreover, that the difficulties of assuming a mistake as to identity are immensely increased where two persons with good sight would have had to share in it. Still, it is conceivable—though scarcely compatible with the account—that the first sign of recognition was given by Mr. Earle; and that a stranger, seeing this sign, returned it, either in joke, or imagining that the giver of it must be some one that he had known and ought to recognise.]

[Gurney concludes this section with a more complete account than had yet been published of the well-known Wynyard case—the apparition of John Wynyard at the time of his death in 1785 to his brother and Sir John Sherbrooke. To the latter he was unknown. This case is here omitted.—ED.]

§ 7. The cases of the preceding section, and of § 2, though not evidentially among the strongest in our collection, are sufficient, I think, to establish a strong presumption for the genuineness of this collective type of telepathic hallucination. But the establishment of facts, in “psychical” as in other departments of Nature, may far outstrip our power of satisfactorily accounting for them; and such account as I can render of these phenomena is here put forward rather as a suggestion or adumbration than as a final view.

To begin with, it would, I think, be irrational not to recognise a special significance in the fact that in all the cases of § 6, and most of those of § 5, the several percipients were *together*: to that extent, at all events, conditions of place seem to enter vitally into the phenomena. But there is nothing in this that need drive us for a moment off idealistic or “psychical” ground. I have spoken often, throughout the book, of a *rapport* between the parties concerned in a psychical transference—meaning by the word simply some pre-existing psychical approximation which conditions the transference. The *rapport* has usually been that of kinship or affection. But I regard these collective cases as strongly indicative of a *rapport* of a different sort—consisting not in old-established sympathy, but in similarity of immediate mental occupation. I suspect that such a *rapport* might be induced by a common environment—by partnership in that particular piece of the “life of relation” within which the hallucination happens to fall. That is to say, I should regard the fact that B’s hallucination spreads to C, when B and C are in the same place, as possibly largely due to the fact that a very important part of the contents of B’s and C’s minds is—and has been for some hours, minutes, or moments preceding—identical. The local condition would be, not any physical presence or centre of influence in the circle of space outside them, but the community of scene, and of other objective impressions, in the two parallel currents of ideas which are their real two existences.¹ It must be remembered

¹ A similar explanation may be suggested for the fact that thought-transference experiments rarely succeed when agent and percipient are so far withdrawn from one another as to have quite different environments. This fact would otherwise seem explicable only by some hypothesis of “brain-waves” diminishing in strength with the increase of the distance between the parties—a hypothesis which has the disadvantage of being quite inapplicable to many of the facts of spontaneous telepathy (p. 93). [More success with experiments at a distance has been obtained since this was written and it is such success that the S.P.R. now aims at.—ED.]

that we have no *a priori* means of knowing what the mental conditions that favour telepathy are likely to be. And I venture to think that if, by some process of psychical chemistry, the elements and affinities of different minds at particular moments could be analysed and estimated, mere community of scene and of immediate sensory impression might count for more—might prove, that is, to involve a larger amount of real correspondence or identity—than the external and accidental character of such passing experience might have led us to expect.

But this idea, if tenable, seems capable of being extended. If community of environment opens a channel of supersensuous communication between B and C, we come to conceive a greater fluidity (so to speak) in the directions of telepathic transference than the more usual cases of a distant agent and a single percipient could reveal. And this brings me to what I suspect to be a more correct account of the collective telepathic cases that have been passed in review.

In the earlier part of this chapter, I consulted clearness by keeping separate the hypothesis (1) of joint and independent affection of B and C by A, and the hypothesis (2) of C's affection by B who alone is directly affected by A. Now looking back at these hypotheses in the light of the evidence, the objections (see § 2) to the assumption of independent psychical affection of B and C by A come back on us with only increased force. As long as telepathic hallucinations are rare, and lead by their rarity to the conclusion that they generally require not only an abnormal condition of the agent, but specific susceptibility in the percipient, nothing can make it seem otherwise than astonishing that two closely similar specimens of them, in connection with the same agent, should independently concern two percipients at the same moment. One might admit such an astonishing coincidence once or twice—I have suggested its application to a few cases in § 2 above;¹ but it seems impossible to lay it down as a *principle* of explanation, by which any number of collective hallucinations may be accounted for. No view which shrinks from assuming a local and physical presence of A, and at the same time rejects every sort of direct transference between B and C, can avoid this difficulty; and the consideration seems to me of such weight as to exclude hypothesis (1) in the form stated. I feel absolutely driven to suppose that where C's experience resembles B's, it is *in some direct way* connected with B's; this is the only alternative that I can see to admitting a physical basis to the percept. But this does not necessarily imply the adoption of hypothesis (2) in its crudest and most obvious form; the "direct way" need not, I conceive, be a transfer between B and C wholly unconnected with A—a transfer, that is to say, which must have equally taken place had B's hallucination been purely subjective. Though the evidence in § 5 above inclines me strongly to the opinion that sensory hallucinations, as such, are transferable things, I do not believe this to be the complete explanation of the later telepathic cases. And I now venture to suggest that with slight modification the two hypotheses—of joint affection by A, and of direct transference be-

¹ In all of these, however, where the two percipients were near together and had been sharing the same life, I think it probable that the experiences were not truly independent.

tween B and C—may be amalgamated; and that the amalgamation is really more probable than either hypothesis in its isolated form.

Where A, the distant agent, is in *rappport* both with B and C, it is possible to suppose that B and C are jointly and independently impressed by A, though the particular form—the hallucination—in which they simultaneously embody their impression is still an effect of B's mind on C's, or of C's on B's. The joint impression from A may be conceived as having in itself a tendency to facilitate this further effect—that is to say, psychical communication between B and C may find a readier and wider channel at the exceptional moments when they are attuned by a common telepathic influence than, *e.g.*, when one of them is staring at a card and the other is endeavouring to guess it. But even for these cases, I think it so dangerous, in view of the apparent rarity of "psychical" affections, to assume any sort of *independent* psychical affection of different minds at the same moment, that I should prefer to regard A's influence on C as derived through B. And this certainly commends itself as the process where C is a stranger to A, or not a person whom it would have seemed natural that A's vicissitudes should in any way affect.¹ In such cases I conceive that, while C's experience depends on B's presence or existence, and even probably on the form of B's experience when the two are similar, yet A's influence may really and truly extend to C; that in fact there is a *rappport* between A and C, established *ad hoc* by the *rappport* of both of them with B. B would be thus not the instigator, or not solely the instigator, but the *channel*, of C's percipience—the assumption being that a mind in which B holds a prominent place, such as C's, may be abnormally susceptible to an influence which abnormally impresses B. Especially would this conception relieve the difficulty of such extreme cases as Nos. 242 and 355, above; where B's part in the occurrence was to all appearance suppressed, and C, a stranger to A, was the sole percipient.² We can scarcely doubt that the presence of B, the near relative of the supposed agent, was a condition of C's percipience; while at the same time it seems absurd to suppose that B infects C with a sensory hallucination which he himself does not experience. We seem driven, then, to regard B as a mere channel of influence; and *that* is a part which there is no absurdity in supposing to be played unconsciously. For the better established facts of telepathy have familiarised us with both unconscious reception and unconscious propagation of telepathic impulses; and however unexpected, it is at least quite conceivable that the two events should take place as part of a single process—which is all that the transmission of an impulse from A to C through the unwitting B implies.

The above view, of *rappport* through community of mental occupation, may likewise afford some explanation of the otherwise puzzling cases where the telepathic influence exercised by A seems itself to have depended rather on *local* than on personal reasons; as in case 29 in Chapter V, where the agent's form was seen by a person only slightly connected with her, in a spot in which she was known to have been considerably interested;³

¹ *e.g.*, cases 339, 348, 350, 357 [the Wynyard case].

² See also case 307, where A's bond, such as it was, was with B and not with C; and compare case 311.

³ It is probable that a local explanation would apply to cases 239, 343, 350.

or in cases where the actual percipient had little or no connection with the agent, but was situated in a place where the agent might naturally conceive some other and nearly-connected person to be;¹ or in cases where a dying person's form is alleged to have been seen by strangers in that person's old home; or in a converse case in the Supplement, a lady's veridical dream of the death of a comparative stranger in her own old home. It is not necessary that two persons should know one another, for certain daily scenes and local impressions to be deeply stamped in common on their two minds; and in this way locality might constitute an ideal bond between A and B who are apart, as we conceived that it might do between B and C who are together.

An even further extension could be given to this idea, if we admit the supposition that A's own susceptibility may be quickened, in the way that was so strongly suggested by some of the reciprocal cases in the preceding chapter. I there pointed out (pp. 460-1 and 462) the indications afforded of a special sort of clairvoyance; *telepathic*, in the sense that it depends on B's living presence in the scene which A perceives; but *independent* in the sense that B and his surroundings are perceived while B's own state is not critical but normal—the abnormality of state being confined to A, whose extension of faculty in trance or at death makes him percipient of B, as well as the agent of B's percipience. A view akin to this has been developed by Mr. Myers [in the Note omitted in the present edition]; and the temptation to apply it to the collective cases is considerable, since it enables us to conceive the scene, and the sense of being present there, as common to the minds of A, B, and C alike; and so far as such community is a favourable condition for telepathic affection, it would explain A's power to affect the other two. To some joint hallucinations, however (*e.g.*, case 329, and perhaps 348), where A, the original of the phantasm, has been in a normal waking state at the time, such an explanation seems quite irrelevant; and its admissibility elsewhere must, I think, depend on our obtaining more proof than we yet have of A's reciprocal percipience, in collective cases which are clearly due to his agency. The reciprocal type having seemed, on the evidence, to be a rare if not a doubtful one, we ought to be doubly cautious of making it the ground of explanation for further and more perplexing phenomena.

And indeed any conjectural explanations of these more outlying telepathic phenomena have, I am well aware, an air of rashness and unsoundness. This may very likely be due to their being really rash and unsound; but it may also possibly be due to the fact that our view of the field before us is still very partial and dim. The duty of caution in all evidential matters does not exclude the duty of keeping the mind open to new conceptions on this threshold of new knowledge, and not allowing any hypothesis that has provisionally commended itself to become a rigid barrier, within which further facts must be forced or else disallowed. And if our central thesis stands—if "psychical" transferences from mind to mind be admitted as *in rerum naturâ*—the rashness, I think, would be in attempting to set a limit to the possible implications of this admission. Its tendency, at any rate, is to give a tangible meaning to that solidarity

¹ *e.g.*, No. 242 just mentioned; and compare No. 307.

of life which Idealism proclaims ; to lead us to regard individual minds, not as isolated units, but as all in potential unity—as entering into a scheme whose relation to the telergic influence somewhat resembles that of the physical world to electricity. And in such a scheme we need not be surprised if the manifestations of action and affinity between the parts are as sudden and shifting, and to the superficial view as isolated, as in the physical world those of electrical relations between different pieces of matter. But a far larger basis of well-attested cases is, no doubt, needed before reflections of this sort can be profitably pursued ; and I will not further run the risk of inverting the relation of speculation to evidence which it has been throughout my endeavour to maintain.

CONCLUSION

§ 1. IN bringing to a close the principal division of this work—the presentation of the case for spontaneous telepathy as supported by a considerable body of first-hand records—it will scarcely, I think, be necessary to attempt anything like a summary of the foregoing chapters. It is indeed impossible effectively to summarise facts the whole force of which lies in their cumulation. One point only I would once again emphasise—the one with which I started—to wit, that radical connection between *experimental* and *spontaneous* telepathy, the importance of which in my own view I may best express by saying that I am unable even to guess what effect the body of testimony to the latter class of cases would have on me, were I not convinced of the reality of the former. This being understood, so far as the evidential position of the subject admits of a brief connected statement, I have endeavoured to state it in the closing pages of the fourth chapter. Neither there nor subsequently have I extenuated the evidential shortcomings of many of the spontaneous cases; but for the evidence taken as a whole, it may be claimed that it resembles not so much a shifting shadow, which may be left to individual taste or temperament to interpret, as a solid mass seen in twilight, which it may be easy indeed to avoid stumbling over, but only by resolutely walking away from it. The temptation to walk away from it—to dismiss it with a hasty glance—will be very strong. The matter presented is from a literary point of view monotonously dull, from a scientific point of view confusingly inexact: the study of it in detail is hard work, while at the same time it is work which affords none of the stimulus of high intellectual activity. Yet it is only by detailed study that my colleagues and I have arrived at our own view; and so far are we from putting ourselves into antagonism to the sceptical attitude of Science, that we should regard any conclusion formed without such study as premature. On this still dubious territory, a number of direct and independent attestations, which would be utterly superfluous elsewhere, will be—or ought to be—demanded; and others will need, as we have done, to have the true nature and amount of the evidence far more distinctly brought home to them than is necessary in realms already mastered by specialists to whose *dicta* they may defer.

But in point of fact, the dulness of the work in detail scarcely needs apology; for it would never be specially remarked except in connection with that totally unscientific view on which I commented at the very opening of the treatise. The whole subject of psychical influences has been mixed up in the public mind with ideas of the supernatural or uncanny—with nervous thrills and spurious excitements. When such associations are carefully excluded the details of the inquiry cannot be expected to have

more, and may perhaps have not much *less*, attraction than those of the recognised physical sciences. And so far as the unexciting character of the present collection—poor in thrills, but tolerably rich in verified dates—tends to make this sober view prevail, it will be a direct advantage. For, exactly like the physical sciences, the research has to go on, methodically, not sensationally; and it has only just begun to be methodised. The present instalment of facts, though probably solid enough to surfeit those who are not troubled by *a priori* difficulties, and to repel the mere seeker after marvels, cannot be expected to convince every reasonable searcher after truth; and no one (as I have remarked before) can fix the precise amount of testimony which a candid mind is bound to regard as adequate. And we accept this view of the position rather as an incentive than as a discouragement. For we are fortified by the belief that it is not so much the necessary material, as the combined effort to render it available, that has hitherto been lacking. Even the record now presented, as I have pointed out, is drawn from the comparatively small number of persons who have heard of our existence, and much of it from the limited circle of our own acquaintance. We are justified, therefore, in regarding the area hitherto explored as but a corner of a very much larger field, which may be gradually swept; and the very flaws in the present collection will have had their use, if they direct attention to the true standard of evidential requirements, and if through them future telepathic incidents stand a better chance of being caught at the critical moment, while the opportunities for investigation are complete.

§ 2. The commoner difficulties which hamper progress may, moreover, be expected largely to disappear, as time goes on. As the idea of Telepathy becomes understood, the difference will be more and more realised between facts which make for it and facts which do not; aid towards the establishment of some strong item of proof will not so often be refused on the ground that no proof is needed—that everybody has had presentiments fulfilled, or has occasionally guessed what his friend was thinking of; and efforts will be more profitably directed through the mere existence of a scheme into which the results may fall. And further, a rational public spirit in the matter may be trusted to develop. The reluctance to give any prominence to what are often legitimately regarded as very private experiences will gradually give way, when it is recognised that the significance of each item of evidence, even as matter for private contemplation, depends on the combination of many items; and among those who take this wider view, fewer will shrink from the direct attestation which alone can ensure the result that they profess to desire, and which they would readily give to any other sort of fact in heaven or earth that they truly believed in. As for the merely negative difficulties—the general grounds of objection to our work—we see them already diminishing from the mere spirit of the age. The set of that spirit is very observably towards a wider tolerance—a distrust of finalities and restrictions, by whatever party imposed, and a faith in free inquiry, wherever it may lead. Men are already ceasing to argue that the alleged facts *did* not happen because they *could* not happen; or that telepathy is perhaps not true, and, therefore, if true, is not important; or that the recognised paths of labour, along which

steady progress is being made and may still be made to an unpredictable extent, are so various and abundant that it is mere trifling to desert them for a dubious track, where progress, even could it be supposed possible, would still be a useless anachronism.

§ 3. But though "psychical research" is certain in time to surmount ridicule and prejudice, and to clear for itself a firm path between easy credulity on the one side and easy incredulity on the other, the rate of its advance must depend on the amount of sympathy and support that it can command from the general mass of educated men and women. In no department should the democratic spirit of modern science find so free a scope: it is for the public here to be, not—as in anthropological researches—the passive material of investigation, but the active participators in it. We acknowledge with warm gratitude the amount of patient assistance that we have received—how patient and forbearing in many instances, none can judge who have not tried, as private individuals, to conduct a system of strict cross-examination on a wide scale. But unless this assistance is largely supplemented, our undertaking can scarcely hold its ground. Its interest must not for a moment be supposed to be of the merely curious sort, sufficiently illustrated in a loose batch of more or less surprising facts; indeed, so far as the facts excite surprise, it is a proof that the work is only beginning. If the natural system includes telepathy, Nature has certainly not exhausted herself in our few hundreds of instances: that these facts should be genuine would be almost inconceivable if she had not plenty more like them in reserve. And here is the practically interesting point; for, till the general fact is universally admitted, the several items of proof must ever tend to lose their effect as they recede further into the past. This peculiarity of the subject cannot be gainsaid, and must be boldly faced. For aught I can tell, the hundreds of instances may have to be made thousands. If the phenomena cannot be commanded at will, the stricter must be the search for them: if they are exceptionally transient and elusive, all the greater is the importance of strong contemporary evidence. The experimental work needs to be, and easily might be, enormously extended: for many a year to come the spontaneous phenomena must be as diligently watched for and recorded as if each case stood alone in its generation. And whatever the defects of the present attempt, so far as it supplies an impulse or lends an aid in either of these directions, it will not have failed in its object.





Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Nov. 2004

Preservation Technologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

