

# Light:

*A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.*

"WHATEVER DOTH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT."—Paul.

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 517.—VOL. X. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1890. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

## CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way .....	569	Experiences of the Occult.....	575
Another Tombstone Inscription..	570	Spirits and Conjurors.....	577
Phantasms of the Living .....	571	Elias and John the Baptist .....	578
Séance at Captain James's .....	571	Invisible Opponents of Spiritu-	
Clothes Spooks .....	572	alism .....	578
Phenomenology of Spiritism .....	572	Dr. Suddick's Case .....	579
Law of Sacrifice .....	573	When does the Soul Enter the	
Signs of Change .....	574	Body? .....	579

## NOTES BY THE WAY.

Contributed by "M.A. (Oxon.)"

Respecting the Mattei remedies, it seems to me desirable to gather evidence from all parts. Dr. Robert Theobald makes a valuable contribution to the last number of "LIGHT," in anticipation of his paper on January 13th before the London Spiritualist Alliance. I understand Dr. Theobald to contend that analyses by such methods as are employed by a public analyst are useless as tests for such substances as the Mattei medicines; that is to say, that a powerful remedy may totally escape attention under ordinary analysis. I need not say that I am quite unable to decide where doctors differ. But I learn from a purely orthodox authority that this may well be so. But I do not think I quite understand whether Dr. Theobald claims for the medicines of Count Mattei some virtues which analysis, as conducted by Dr. Snow, cannot trace, or whether he ascribes the remedial properties of the "electricities" to the potency of unseen and untraceable forces—of faith, or will, or the like—which do at times prove very operative. If analysis can find nothing in these medicines, what is the curative property that it cannot find? Is there any more refined analysis which would discover it? Is there anything definitely traceable in Mattei's electricities of which anyone could assuredly say that such and such a substance was discoverable on analysis, and would produce such and such an effect? If there is not, how are the alleged effects traced and referred to certain causes? If there is, then can their action be definitely predicted, laid down, and subsequently verified? I understand that Count Mattei has not the guarantee of a medical education and qualification. That may or may not mean much by its presence, but there can be no doubt as to what the absence of it means. I do not think that I quite follow Dr. Theobald when he finds Mr. Stokes "highly amusing," nor, after printing a good deal of evidence on the one side, do I think I can be reasonably blamed, even "in the interests of truth and justice," if I give Mr. Stokes space to say what, as a public official, he specifically records and signs with his name.

Be this as it may, here is something on the other side. I have the disadvantage, in consequence of illness, of writing away from any possibility of reference. But I am in the recollection of my readers, and they will remember that I cited the evidence of a friend (November 14th) respecting the efficiency of these Mattei remedies. I said that the testimony, coming from such a source, impressed me greatly. I have collected in "LIGHT" a great number of cases of alleged cure of disease by methods where effects

could not be traced to causes, e.g., faith-healing, and all the cases which belong to Lourdes, Knock, and such places. I do not know, and cannot say, whether these alleged cures are permanent or not. I cannot tell what the effect of the human will may be when exerted for a definite purpose. I do not know what Count Mattei claims for his medicines. Their composition is his secret, and he is well within his right in refusing to disclose it. But it is, perhaps, not altogether beside the point to quote the opinion of a public analyst on the subject. Further testimony of my friend, added to that already published, is to this effect:—

"November 14th.

"I see in 'LIGHT' that you have judged my testimony to Mattei worth mentioning. As you have so kindly given a certain weight to it (and at any rate it is honest and unbiassed) I think I ought to add more. And, by-the-way, I would willingly detail any experiences of my own and of friends I can trust for your speaker on January 13th if such are needed. About the Electricities, I forget if Dr. H. Snow obtained his test-bottles from Leath and Ross, or anyone who sells them, with the Count's own label and the patent stamp. The remedies are to be had from St. John's House, Cheltenham, as your advertisement specifies; formerly Mr. David Apperly was the manager, and I believe he, to some extent, made his own preparations. This year I had a violent toothache, proceeding from a mere shell, and only half of that, which had been stopped twice. Sleep was utterly impossible, and ordinarily such pain and throbbing could only end in one thing—extraction. I had very little hope of anything better. I painted the seat of the nerve, the cheek, and the gum with *Electricita Rossa*, and my imagination certainly is not equal to devising such a very unpleasant sensation as followed. It was exactly as if the gum were contracting and being drawn up from the tooth—in fact, what a very slight touch of electric cautery might be. In an hour I slept, and slept on, and in a day it was cured. My French friend, whom you know, also felt a powerful tingling and great relief when I painted her arm and hand for rheumatism.

"Excuse a nasty subject and I will tell you of my cure. *Acne rosacea* was my misery. I had a hard time when my father died, and ran down altogether. I was covered with gathered pustules, head, ears, face, fingers, legs, and even feet. Some would not heal, and I was not nice to be with.

"Drs. Robson, Roose, Collett Fox (Tilbury Fox was just gone), a personal friend in the country, and our own doctor each took me in hand, with no result but a slight improvement for a few weeks. I was worse than ever, when my cousin told me of Mattei's medicines, and in a few weeks I was comparatively free, and now, I thankfully say, I am quite free; and almost for the first time I began to enjoy work. Since then I have a power of endurance, when necessary, which my old friends simply marvel at, and for which I thank Mattei and the Wisdom that inspired him."

I had not the advantage of being present at the last meeting of the Society for Psychical Research, and am glad to find from Mr. F. W. H. Myers's letter that the

impression conveyed to the correspondent who wrote to "LIGHT" was not such as Mr. Myers received. I also recognise that the "one speaker," who apparently represented the view which I called in question, had not read the *Proceedings* or *Journal* of the Society. I could wish, personally, that the destructive criticism, for which the Society has established a reputation which it will not easily shake off, could be tempered with some acceptance of evidence which, coming from the very varied quarters that it does, extending over the wide area and the long course of time that it does, ought to command much more respect and attention than it has received from the Society in question. There is no need to lay stress on the unfortunate fact that Spiritualists, always unwilling to take trouble about collecting and collating their facts, are still more unwilling to do what Mr. Myers thinks so natural, and to submit them to a criticism which seems to them to start from an adverse or hostile point of view, and to deal with facts so familiar to them that to prove their existence in each fresh case is not to be expected. Rightly or wrongly, they have not considered that Spiritualism has had fair treatment, and they pursue their investigations in their own way. I am afraid that Mr. Myers's method of dealing with Dr. Suddick will not tend to increase our confidence in the Society which he represents with such ability and energy. C.C.M., in a letter to which my readers can refer, deals with some points in Mr. Myers's letter that I do not now touch. But I will say, as the result of some sixteen years' experience, careful study, and exceptional opportunities for investigation, that the so-called scientific method, as applied to the observation of the fugitive phenomena of Spiritualism, is not, in my opinion, likely to be a success.

But on this and similar questions my friend C. C. M. has said all that is necessary very much better than I can. It is only as one who has lived day and night in the midst of this subject for many years that I offer an opinion which I strongly hold. We can't make the "intelligent operator at the other end of the line" do as we choose. Perhaps the operator is not in all cases intelligent; perhaps he does not understand; perhaps he has a way of his own. At any rate "coercion" does not work, whereas patient receptivity does. This does not, of course, touch the question of care on our part. Let our observations be clearly made—within certain limits which experienced Spiritualists will know—and let our records be exact. I have insisted on this as much as most writers. But I am not able to follow Mr. Myers in his criticism of Dr. Suddick. I am not able to see that what was a matter of town talk, known, therefore, and watched by many eyes, is not to be accepted as good evidence. If one of these citizens had made affidavit of what was expected it would have been more precise, no doubt; but the affidavit of one man is not to me more convincing and valuable than the facts detailed by Dr. Suddick. "Not worth one little scrap of dated and attested writing!" In those few words seem to me to be written the strong condemnation of the methods which the Society for Psychical Research has elected exclusively to use. It has been engaged in a long struggle to get such evidence as it pleases, and the struggle has been a failure and will be so to the end. All experience shows that we have to take what we can get and make the best of it. So approached, the evidence is conclusive and overwhelming.

#### REMINISCENCE AND RE-INCARNATION.

Mr. T. Shorter's address on "Reminiscence and Re-incarnation," at 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, on Tuesday evening next, should draw a large audience. Mr. Shorter is always worth listening to.

WORK to-day, for you know not how much you may be hindered to-morrow. —PLINY.

#### "ANOTHER TOMBSTONE INSCRIPTION."

In "LIGHT" of November 15th we published a letter from our correspondent "Edina," accompanied by an automatically written communication respecting a tombstone said to be in Sherborne Church. This has elicited some correspondence, the whole of which we think it is worth while to print, for it is instructive. The private letters accompanying what we print add little to our information. We may have more to give our readers, but, if there be no more, there is plenty of food for reflection. We shall have remarks to make when our correspondents have exhausted themselves. We print all that we receive because we believe that we may thereby throw light on some vexed problems.

SIR,—Will you permit me to state with reference to the communication under the above heading that the verses quoted, and correctly stated to be on a tombstone in Sherborne Church, are by the poet Pope, familiar to all who are well acquainted with his writings, and published, together with other epitaphs which he wrote for personal friends, in his collected works? Immediately on reading the article in "LIGHT," I referred to my own copy of Pope's poems, and the following I copy verbatim. As reproduced by mediumship the verses are somewhat garbled.

68, Kensington Park-road, W. E. P. RAMSAY LAYE.

On the Monument of the  
Hon. R. Digby and of his sister Mary,  
Erected by their father, Lord Digby,  
In the church of Sherborne, Dorsetshire.

Go, fair example of untainted youth,  
Of modest wisdom and pacific truth,  
Composed in sufferings, and in joy sedate,  
Good without noise, without pretension great;  
Just of thy word, in every thought sincere,  
Who knew no wish but what the world might hear.  
Of softest manners, unaffected mind,  
Lover of peace, and friend of human kind;  
Go live! for Heaven's eternal year is thine,  
Go, and exalt thy mortal to divine.  
And thou, bless'd maid! attendant on his doom,  
Pensive hast followed to the silent tomb,  
Steered the same course, to the same quiet shore;  
Not parted long, and now to part no more.  
Go then where only bliss sincere is known,  
Go, where to love and to enjoy are one!  
Yet take these tears, mortality's relief,  
And till we share your joys forgive our grief;  
These little rites, a stone, a verse receive,  
'Tis all a father, all a friend, can give.

SIR,—Your correspondent, "Edina," will be interested in the following, which is copied from "Hutchins's History of Dorset," Second Edition, Vol. IV., p. 110.

EDITH L. BOSWELL-STONE.

Shute Haye, Walditch, Bridport.

Against the south wall (Sherbourne Church) on a black marble tablet fixed in the wall under the great south window, surmounted by a flaming urn, is this inscription by Mr. Pope:—

In Memory of  
Robert, second son,  
and Mary, eldest daughter, of  
William, Lord Digby.

Go, fair example of untainted youth,  
Of modest reason and pacific truth;  
Compos'd in sufferings, and in joy sedate,  
Good without noise, without pretension great;  
Go, just of word, in ev'ry thought sincere,  
Who knew no wish but what the world might hear;  
Of gentlest manners, unaffected mind,  
Lover of peace, and friend of human kind;  
Go, live, for Heaven's eternal year is thine;  
Go, and exalt thy mortal to divine.  
And thou, too close attendant on his doom,  
Blest maid, hast hastened to the silent tomb;  
Steer'd the same course to the same quiet shore,  
Not parted long, and now to part no more.  
Go then, where only bliss sincere is known,  
Go, where to love and to enjoy are one!  
Yet take these tears, Mortality's relief,  
And, till we share your joys, forgive our grief;  
These little rites, a stone and verse, receive,  
'Tis all a father, all a friend can give.

A. POPE.

In the printed copies are several variations. Robert died April 21st, Anno Dom. 1726, æt. 34; Mary died March 31st, Anno Dom. 1729, æt. 39.



SIR,—On seeing "Edina's" letter relating a message which his daughter received concerning an inscription in St. Mary's Church, Sherborne, I turned to an old book, "Beauties of England and Wales," published in 1803. There I find the accompanying little poem. I send it in case none of your correspondents should be able to verify the communication in the church itself. From the same publication I verified the former inscription from a church in Southampton.

M. S. S.

Near this is a tablet to the memory of a son and daughter of William, Lord Digby, with the following beautiful lines by Mr. Pope:—

Go, fair example of untainted youth,  
Of modest reason, and pacific truth;  
Go, just of worth, in ev'ry thought sincere,  
Who knew no wish but what the world might hear;  
Of gentlest manners, unaffected mind;  
Lover of peace, and friend to human kind;  
Compos'd in sufferings, and in joys sedate;  
Good without noise, without pretensions great;  
Go, live, for Heaven's eternal year is thine;  
Go, and exalt thy mortal to divine.  
And thou, too close attendant on his doom,  
Blest maid, hast hastened to the silent tomb;  
Steer'd the same course to the same quiet shore;  
Nor parted long, and now to part no more.  
Yet take these tears, mortality's relief,  
And till we share your joys forgive our grief;  
These little rites, a stone and verse receive;  
'Tis all a father, all a friend, can give.

Subjoined is a copy of the inscription, kindly made, at the instance of a correspondent, by one of the masters of Sherborne School. No doubt the attention of our readers will be directed to the variations in the text of the inscription. This is an authentic version:—

In Memory of  
Robert, Second Son,  
And  
Mary, Eldest Daughter,  
Of  
William, Lord Digby.

Go, fair Example of Untainted Youth,  
Of modest Reason, and Pacific Truth;  
Go, just of Word, in every Thought Sincere,  
Who knew no Wish, but what the World might hear:  
Of Gentle Manners, Unaffected Mind,  
Lover of Peace, and Friend of Human kind;  
Composed in Sufferings, and in Joys, Sedate,  
Good without Noise, without Pretension, Great.  
Go, live, for Heaven's Eternal Year is thine,  
Go, and exalt thy Mortal to Divine.  
And Thou, too close Attendant on his Doom,  
Blest Maid, hast followed to the Silent Tomb,  
Steer'd the same Course, to the same quiet Shore,  
Not parted long, and now to part no more.  
Yet take these Tears, Mortality's relief,  
And, till we Shere your Joys, forgive our Grieff.  
These little rites, a Stone, a Verse, receive,  
'Tis all a Father, all a Friend, can give.

A. POPE.

Robt. dy'd Aprl. 21st, An: Dom: 1726. Æt. 34.  
Mary dy'd March 31st, An: Dom: 1729. Æt. 39.

#### A PHANTASM OF THE LIVING.

My cook is a Scotch woman, and it tells something in favour of what is called superstition that, hard-headed as the Scotch are, yet they are very superstitious.

Before my cook came to live with us she had a house of her own, and her brother lodged with her, going to work daily. One evening her daughter, who resided with her, said she heard her uncle enter as usual on his return from labour, whereupon the mother went into his room to see if he needed anything. She saw him seated by the fire, but with his hat still on. She spoke, but as he made no reply she thought him tired and drowsy, and so quitted the apartment. Shortly afterwards she met him coming in at the front door, and on being told of his prior appearance, he protested that he had not entered before, adding that "this was a bad sign." He died shortly after this curious occurrence.

E. H.

A SYMPOSIUM concerning the future life, contributed to by several eminent writers, is announced for immediate publication by Mr. Elliot Stock, under the title "Our Dead: Where are They?"

#### SEANCE AT CAPTAIN JAMES'S.

On October 25th, Captain James being our host, a private circle met, consisting of Mr. Rita (medium), Dr. and Mrs. Allen, Dr. D., Mr. Wedgwood, and the writer.

We sat in darkness at 9.15 p.m. Presently light knocks were heard, when the musical box was set going—and I will mention here that this was sometimes wound up by Captain James, and sometimes by our spirit friends, who had less difficulty in doing this in the dark. Very shortly the voice of "Charley" was heard, which was at first husky, soon becoming, however, strong and clear.

On a side-board there was a corked bottle containing phosphorus in water. "Charley," observing this, made an inquiry regarding it. Presently the bottle was brought by an invisible force and placed in the middle of the table at which we sat, its luminous contents enabling us to see it distinctly. The bottle was now carried round the room, in full view of the sitters, and replaced on the table. Once more, it was raised to the ceiling. This time I saw a hand grasping the bottle, which was clearly outlined by the light-yielding substance within it. "Charlie" now became visible, and asked Dr. Allen and Dr. D. to place their hands on the bottle. Then "Charlie," with his hand, which we clearly saw, appeared to draw light from the bottle by placing his hand close to it. Finally the bottle was carried back by unseen agency to its original position on the sideboard, and coming into contact with some glasses there, it produced an audible clink as it reached its destination.

Several spirits materialised at this sitting, both white and coloured. One, that of a male Indian, did so with great distinctness, force, and vivacity, appearing at first above the centre of the table, and afterwards passing round at the backs of the sitters, coming close to all successively. Sometimes he seemed only three or four feet above the ground, and then raised himself to his full height.

During a conversation with the controlling spirit "Charlie," he told us he lived on earth about forty years, and quitted it thirty years ago. When his spirit left the body, he said, he remembered seeing the corpse on the bed, surrounded by his friends. He recollected his earthly career, but he volunteered no information regarding it.

At a séance we held a week before this one, the voice of a greatly perturbed spirit, called "Herne," was heard for the first time. This belonged to one who had lately passed away, but who was doubtful as to his new condition, and fancied he had not left the body. This voice was now heard once more as if in conversation at a distance with other spirits. We could only catch a word or two now and then. The tones of this low, mysterious, and apparently distant colloquy had a weird and singular effect on the listeners. We afterwards had a few audible remarks addressed to ourselves by "Herne," who seemed much more composed than on the former occasion. He recognised us, greeted us, and promised to come again, and "give us his experiences." On this occasion the tones of perplexed alarm which had distinguished him before were conspicuously absent. "Charlie" explained that "Herne," who lately would hardly accept the new conditions of his emancipated spirit, was now convinced as to his present state, and seeing the sitters had greatly helped to convince him.

During an interval in the manifestations "Charlie" asked me if I had seen the table lifted, or seen cloaks and hats brought through locked doors, adding that on some future occasion we should have such a manifestation of power. Some one said, "But we must have the doors properly secured," on which "Charlie" readily assented, "Of course, the doors must be locked." Shortly after this "Charlie" made a remark to Dr. D. about his coat hanging in the hall, which on account of its plaid lining he called a "coat of many colours"; saying he had found something in it which he would presently restore to the owner. After a brief interval a pocket handkerchief was thrown over Dr. D.'s head, which afterwards proved to be one he had left in his overcoat. It is only on a superficial view that this feat resembles a *tour d'escamotage* by spirits. It is something much more interesting than this, and opens up questions as to the properties of matter, and as to the powers which can vapourise and again solidify them, which will be referred to on a future occasion.

A lady's figure appeared to us at this sitting, but took no notice of any of the circle except Mrs. Allen, to whose side the spirit went. It was that of her deceased sister, Mrs. G. I could see the greyish hair over her face in bands. Mrs. Allen tells me her departed sister whispered to her, "Dear Jane," kissing her, and touching the coral necklace on Mrs. Allen's neck, which had once belonged to the lady who had gone from us. This spirit only stayed a few seconds, and was very quiet, her subdued behaviour being in marked contrast to the active Indian spirit already mentioned.

In a minute or two the deep tones of "John King" were heard saying, "Good-night, glad to see you. God bless you." "Charlie" added a few courteous words of farewell. Then came a minute of silence, followed by a few raps held to be a signal for a light, which, being procured, this interesting sitting was ended.

CLEMENT SCORCE, M.R.C.S.

31, Fairholme-road, West Kensington.

#### CLOTHES SPOOKS.

That our personality overflows our bodies, and saturates our clothes, is an indisputable fact; but in what sense this is true, and to what extent, are questions more easily asked than answered.

Garments long used not only become moulded to the figure of the wearer, but absorb from day to day the exudations of the skin, so that to the keen sense of the dog they are clearly recognisable. The more or less greasy bonnet of a missionary saint, together with her crumpled gloves, were they not rightly venerated by her disciples, as pathetic fractional portions of her very self? Again, grateful to an old garment for warmth and protection, and endeared to it by association, do we not cling to it with real affection and part from it with regretful sighs? Alas, that so few relics of departed personalities are left to the world! What a privilege would it have been to handle the biretta of Raphael, still more the peaked hood of the melancholy Dante.

Enough of sentiment. The idea that comes to me is that as our carnal frame is constantly casting off effete particles, so (by the doctrine of correspondences) our spiritual body must be also constantly throwing away an etherealised sort of matter, and these two combined, and further strengthened by the atoms of dress fabrics, might form a phantom strongly resembling the real person from whom they emanated. Do not the oft-repeated stories of apparitions of the living favour this theory?

When I lay aside my daily clothes, who can say how much of my personality I hang on a wooden peg, and may not these subtle outgoings during the night disentangle themselves, and float about as a kind of soulless spook, till the breath of morning rends them asunder, or the light of day makes them invisible?

Anent this subject, a curious incident came under my notice in the parish of Leckhampton, near Chetelnham. It was reported to me that the ghost of a pair of trousers had been seen in Pilley village, and on investigation the facts proved as follows:—There were two semi-detached cottages standing a little retired from the main road. In one of them an old man had recently died. Not only were his footsteps heard by several people round the house after nightfall, but a woman living next door, on going out one bright moonlight night to fetch linen from the garden, saw the well-remembered trousers of the aged defunct against a wooden fence in the adjoining garden, precisely in the spot where he used to stand to watch passers-by. The percipient was in no way alarmed, because she concluded that his daughter had put out the trousers to air, but next day, on enquiry, she found that such had not been the case.

Of course various solutions may be suggested, but one is, that the corduroys had proved more retentive of the exudant atoms of his personality than the rest of his clothes, so that if the woman had looked before, she might, perhaps, have seen a more perfect spook, though why in that particular spot does not appear. The footsteps of the old man naturally point to his real presence, and if he were leaning over the fence his head would not be seen.

Again, memory is the maker of many ghosts. She had seen him so often in that very place that her brain furnished, probably, an imperfect image of his figure, as her ear had

also echoed his well-known footfall. Taking into consideration the occupation of the percipient at the time, and that even corduroys are submitted to soap-suds occasionally, the story reduced to its lowest term stands thus, "*Hallucination of a washerwoman*," and not even a clothes-spook.

M. W. G.

#### PHENOMENOLOGY OF SPIRITISM.\*

The October number of the "Sphinx" contains a paper with the above heading, by Dr. Carl du Prel, with whose work, "The Philosophy of Mysticism," many of the readers of "LIGHT" will be familiar through Mr. Massey's excellent translation.

I regret that the length of the present essay renders it out of the question for me to translate it in its entirety for the benefit of those readers of "LIGHT" who are unable to read it in the original German, as it is well worth perusal, but I will give a few extracts from it which will enable the reader to form a tolerable idea of the essay and of Du Prel's views on what he calls the "Phenomenology of Spiritism."

The article is a critical review of State Counsellor Aksakow's great work "Animism and Spiritism" (of which I sent a short notice to "LIGHT" some months ago), as well as of Hartmann's pamphlet, "Der Spiritismus," to which the former was an answer, and Du Prel commences with the observation that up to the present time there had been no "Phenomenology of Spiritism" published, in which the facts were systematically collected and arranged, and then proceeds as follows:—

A phenomenology of Spiritism, which was so much needed, is now given to the world in the work of the Russian State Counsellor Alexander Aksakow entitled "Animism and Spiritism." The origin of this book is not without interest.

A few years ago, Edward von Hartmann published a short pamphlet against Spiritism. It was as though he looked up to the sky, saw a few drops of rain falling, and put up his umbrella. But upon this Aksakow now opened the flood gates and let loose a torrent against which it was of no avail. Hartmann's pamphlet consisted of but 118 pages, while Aksakow's answer to it is contained in two volumes, comprising more than 800 pages. The contrast is made the more apparent when we read these words of Hartmann: "As I have never been present at a séance, I do not feel myself competent to give an opinion on the genuineness of the phenomena in question" (p. 16), while with Aksakow we read: "Since I began to interest myself in the Spiritistic movement in the year 1855, I have not ceased to study it in all its details, in every part of the world, and all the literature connected with it. At first, I took the facts on the testimony of others, and it was only in 1870 that I began to study them personally in private séances, formed by myself of a circle of intimate friends." (Preface, p. 25.)

The conclusions which Hartmann draws from the Spiritistic phenomena may be thus summarised: "That these phenomena are not due to spirits, but to the mediums themselves, who are beings of abnormal and yet pathological natures. Mediums, in his opinion, are at the same time auto-somnambulists and—with reference to the circle—magnetisers. Under psychical stimulus, they give forth a nerve force, which, being transformed into heat and light vibrations, becomes a physical force, and is capable of producing remarkable phenomena, even at a distance. It can counteract the gravitation of objects, and perform writing without the pencil being touched, while this nerve-force, which is able to penetrate matter, can even produce the impression of the medium's hands or feet upon a prepared surface. By means of it the medium acts upon the circle as a powerful magnetiser, places them in a state of masked somnambulism, and transfers his own ideas to them as hallucinations, so that they believe that they see or touch things which have no existence in reality," &c., &c. (p. 78.)

This preposterous theory of Hartmann's surpasses everything ever asserted by Spiritualists. The latter at least have an uniform explanation for the facts, while Hartmann divides them into two heterogeneous halves, one of which he ascribes to the nerve-force of the medium, the other to the universal spirit. Even transfigurations and materialisations are accounted for by Hartmann in the same way, as being illusions or hallucinations on the part of both medium and spectators, while for the fact advanced by Spiritualists that spirit forms have been photographed, he has only a contemptuous smile, in short, according to him, all transfigura-

\* "Phänomenologie des Spiritismus." Von Dr. Carl du Prel.—"Sphinx," October, 1890.



tions or materialisations are but illusions transferred from the medium to the spectators.

Hartmann's attempt to account for all the phenomena as coming from the medium must be considered as a complete failure. It may be admitted that he has correctly described the conditions under which experiments may take place free from suspicion, and that he has laid down methodical principles for the guidance of Spiritualists; but Aksakow has proved that Hartmann himself acts contrary to these principles, and that Spiritualists have long ceased to hold by the conditions recommended by him. Aksakow overwhelms his antagonist with facts, which prove that all he demands has already been accomplished, and so the work "Animism and Spiritism," begun as a reply to Hartmann, as it proceeded far overstepped its original purpose. It has assumed the character of a handbook, which comprises all that is best worth knowing in the voluminous literature of Spiritualism; so that anyone who cannot or will not take the trouble to read through all its literature should at least peruse this handbook, which is a compendium of the phenomenology of Spiritism.

After speaking of the many doubts and difficulties which beset the path of the inquirer, he writes:—

But Aksakow was not one of those who became convinced without much and long-continued inner conflict; many years elapsed before his doubts were settled. He himself thus describes this process: "The materials which I collected both by reading and practical experiment were inexhaustible, but the solution came not. On the contrary, as years went on, all the weak side of Spiritism became more evident to me and even magnified; the bad taste of the communications, their intellectual poverty, even when they were not mere common-places; the mystifying and deceiving character of the greater part of the manifestations; the unreliability of the physical phenomena, as soon as they were put to the test of exact experiment; the credulity and blindness of Spiritists and Spiritualists, and finally the imposture which took place at dark and materialisation séances, and which I was obliged to admit, not only from what I read, but in my own personal experience with the most celebrated mediums; in short, a mass of doubts, obstacles and mystifications of all kinds only added to the difficulty of the problem." (Preface, p. 26.) Every inquirer has had similar experiences and had to undergo the tormenting doubts caused by them. I quite agree with Aksakow in not entitling his book "Mediumism and Spiritism," as such a title would be misleading, even though the medium is necessary for both classes of phenomena. It is much to be wished that the distinction between "Animism and Spiritism," in such phenomena as those described by Aksakow, were more recognised. "Animism" applies to those phenomena whose cause the medium is, but "Spiritism" to those for which the medium affords the conditions, but which are actually produced by intelligent beings, who are generally, though not always, invisible. By "Animism" Aksakow wishes to be understood the soul—*anima*—not in the sense of the materialists, as a simple function of the organism, but as an independent substance, quite distinct from the body, of which it is not the product, but the producer, &c. Spiritists are without doubt much to blame, in frequently taking Animistic phenomena for Spiritistic, and in placing every kind of problem under one category, while Hartmann falls into the opposite error of merging Spiritism in Animism, his theory fitting many of the problems about as well a child's cap would the head of Bismarck.

Du Prel then proceeds to a somewhat lengthened and detailed review of Aksakow's book, which occupies about seven pages of the "Sphinx." I can only say here that the work deals with all the phenomena generally known as "Spiritualistic," which are systematically arranged in parts or chapters, Aksakow not only reproducing the best accredited accounts of others, but giving those of his own experiences extending over twenty years, which he thinks most worthy of record. After this follow some concluding remarks, before translating which I will just say that having myself read "Animism and Spiritism," I can cordially recommend it to all who can read German. It is not probable that a work of such bulk will ever be translated into English:—

In the preceding pages I have given but a relatively cursory review of Aksakow's remarkable book, but not to incur the rebuke of being a blind partisan of a work written by one in whose views I share, I will not deny that I find some faults in it. For instance, I miss a chapter on psychometric mediumship; there should likewise be an index of names and facts, which is of great use in a work of this nature. Further, while it must be acknowledged that Aksakow has completely refuted his opponent, the reference to Hartmann, which continues throughout the entire work, gives one the impression of a scaffolding which one would willingly see removed, and without which the book would

certainly be improved. And finally, I would rather that Aksakow had dwelt upon the philosophical results arrived at by the facts of Spiritualism in a more general way, rather than have made use of them only to refute Hartmann's system. Hartmann has elsewhere said that—the truth of Spiritism being assumed—all he felt called upon to do was to insert an incidental chapter (*Zwischencapitel*) in his metaphysical system, and it appears as though Aksakow shared this opinion. To me, on the contrary, the import of Spiritistic facts seems of far greater extent; the incidental chapter, which Hartmann can no longer attempt to add to, will shatter the whole force of his system. Hellenbach has already proved that if we add Spiritism to the world's recognised beliefs—which it no longer depends on our pleasure to do—Pessimism, which is absolute with Hartmann, must soon be transformed into transcendental Optimism. The phenomena of Spiritism are now recognised as facts. Its opponents fight against these facts with theories only; however slow man's habit of thought may be in changing, it is but a question of time when Spiritism will be openly recognised. Its phenomena prove the existence of an individual soul, and this fact proved must exercise a beneficial influence upon our whole conception of the world and life, as well as upon our conduct.

At the end of his preface Aksakow puts this question to himself: "In the decline of life, I sometimes ask myself, 'Have I really done well to have devoted so much time, labour, and means to the study and propagation of the Spiritistic phenomena? Have I not been following a false road? chasing an illusion? Have I not spent my existence without anything seeming to justify or repay me for my trouble?'"

But to this question of Aksakow there can be no other answer than that given by himself: "There can be no higher aim for the employment of an earthly life than to attempt to prove the transcendental nature of human beings, who have a far more exalted destiny before them than mere phenomenal existence!" "V."

#### THE LAW OF SACRIFICE.

One might as well ignore the law of gravitation as the law of sacrifice. It meets us at every turn and is always about us. No new life ever looked out on the world but was paid for by throes of anguish; and the sooner men acknowledge this law and act in obedience to it the better, for, like other Divine laws, it can grind the transgressor to powder. As there is a foolish, ignorant, offensive, and even highly immoral way of holding the sacrifice of Christ, so there is also a wise, instructed, beautiful, and highly moral way of holding it. To speak of it as unique, except in the sense of supremacy and perfection, is senseless, for have we not all our Gethsemanes, aye, and in all humility our Calvaries too, whereby, "filling up the measure" of His sufferings, a regenerate humanity shall yet be born? The truth as it appears to the writer is that in meekly yielding up His life to a rancorous priesthood, a howling mob, and an unscrupulous government (a very triumvirate of hell) He only bowed His head to that great law of sacrifice which we are also called on to obey.

That a great and to us at present inscrutable mystery lies behind all this anguish who can doubt? Nature is as a gigantic mask, into whose orbes sockets we look in vain for some kindly response to all our doubts and questionings. Alike to gentle and simple is she not dumb?

Let us deal gently with the poor red-jerseyed Salvationist, who, if he speak of an inexorable Judge, can we (philosophers though we be) speak otherwise than of an inexorable law? Nay, is not his position the more logical of the two, for how can there be a law without a lawgiver? And is not the phrase, "inexorable law," open to condemnation, for the word Law implicitly includes the idea of unintelligent inexorability? It is the Judge only who can be either exorable or inexorable in a really correct sense. M. W. G.

A GOLD-FINDING DIVINING MAN.—A while since we published the case for the water-finding divining man as presented by a gentleman who was, if we remember correctly, a member of the Royal Society. We now read in a colonial contemporary that some excitement was caused lately at Creswick, the well-known gold-digging centre near Ballarat, by experiments which were conducted at the Sunny South Quartz Mine with a man who claims to be able to tell by walking over the ground whether it is gold-bearing, and whether it is payable, and at what depth. The test is described as wonderfully successful so far, and the "divining man" appeared to be in a fair way of doing good business.—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"  
2, DUKE STREET,  
ADELPHI, W.C.

#### NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post-free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 10s. 10d. per annum, forwarded to our office in advance.

The Annual Subscription, post-free, to South America, South Africa, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, is 13s. prepaid.

The Annual Subscription to India, Ceylon, China, Japan, is 15s. 2d. prepaid.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed "— & Co."

All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and not to the Editor.

#### ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

Five lines and under, 3s. One inch, 4s. 6d. Column, £2 2s. Page, £4. A reduction made for a series of insertions.

#### NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may also be obtained from E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria-lane, London, and all Booksellers.

## Light:

EDITED BY "M. A. (OXON.)"

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29th, 1890.

**TO CONTRIBUTORS.**—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. It will much facilitate the insertion of suitable articles if they are under two columns in length. Long communications are always in danger of being delayed, and are frequently declined on account of want of space, though in other respects good and desirable. Letters should be confined to the space of half a column to ensure insertion.

Business communications should in all cases be addressed to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, W.C., and not to the Editor.

#### SIGNS OF CHANGE.

In an age when it is still supposed and believed by many that all things have been reduced by positive knowledge to little more than simple mathematical formulæ, it is a little startling to find fifteen columns of the *Times* occupied with the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, a case where we have again to do with those "Popish rags" which our Puritan forefathers thought they had destroyed 200 years ago.

And not less impressive is it to note that after political economy has from Adam Smith downwards so gradually shaped our social life according to its premisses that its tyrannical equation has been received as the law of that life, it has been found necessary to start an English economic association, an association which shall so deal with economics, says the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as "to include all that is generous and ethical, and to command not only the intellects and the heads of men, but their hearts also."

That the two circumstances, the foundation of a new society of economists in which the "heart" is not to be ignored and the delivery of the Archbishop's judgment in which symbolic ritual was dealt with very tenderly, should have happened within forty-eight hours of each other is impressively significant of the passing away of the epoch of scientific materialism. Not that it has gone, but that it is going, and going fast.

And, moreover, there seems good reason for singling out these two events from among many others that might be cited as almost equally significant, because these two are not only significant but typical. A decision which recognises that religious symbolism should be treated with some consideration comes simultaneously with the recognition that the old political economy which considered man as a machine is a thing of the past.

Let it be quite understood that this reference to the Lambeth judgment is only made on general principles; nothing is implied or suggested as to the sectarian aspect of that judgment: with such things we have nothing to do. We have, however, to do with all things that appertain to Spirit, and the war against symbolism helped to destroy that recognition of the Spirit which made the cruel creeds of the latter day political economists easy.

It is, of course, quite possible that the interpretation of the symbolical ritual of all the churches which have not got rid of such symbolism may be wrong, but their destruction can in no way help a man to their deeper meaning. Even the "blood and fire" banners of the Salvation Army may cause some inquiring soul to work out their real meaning, and so enter by a most unlikely gate into a more perfect way to a better finding of Christ.

The spirit is reviving. The recognition of the "heart," as a factor in the economic relations of life by a man whose office would almost seem to preclude all ideas but those of the most perfect materiality, is a sign of change which it is impossible to overrate. The *Times*, which may fairly be taken as representing the ordinary business mind, speaks with some asperity about the new ideas, yet it adds this remarkable testimony: "To the age of faith, when men took their doctrines of wages, strikes, and currency from accredited economists, as they took their time from Greenwich, has succeeded a period when all is controverted, when axioms and elementary truths are in dispute, when political economy is a cluster of furiously conducted controversies, and the heretics outnumber the orthodox."

The recognition of the emotions as a factor in men's social relations is a recognition by implication of man's having something more about him than his material body. The recognition of that soul, whose existence half-developed science has sought to deny, is not very far off.

The signs of change are everywhere, and with that change must of necessity come much suffering and trouble. Birth brings with it pain, and we must hardly expect to escape. The passage from one position of stable equilibrium to another can only be accomplished by the passage through a position of unstable equilibrium, so new and strange developments may be expected; some, indeed, we have already. The wild cry of the Anarchist mingles with the glory shouts of Mr. Booth's converts.

We, Spiritualists, are, perhaps, too apt to watch for the evidence of spirit action in the immediate vicinity of ourselves and our own circle, and to ignore too easily the evidence equally important and equally clear of that same spirit action on the world around us. So it behoves us to watch, whether it be in order to guide or to be guided. If we know more, so much the greater is our responsibility. To the dalliance with phenomena must succeed the application of the knowledge which those phenomena bring.

#### "RUFIN'S LEGACY."

The old story of a possible metempsychosis has been utilised again by the writer of "Rufin's Legacy" to account for certain strange psychical phenomena with which he is but imperfectly acquainted. Metempsychosis is to supersede death as soon as mesmerists or hypnotists are sufficiently expert to maintain for an indefinite period what they are now able to do for a few hours, or, as in some instances, days. This, at least, is the logical inference drawn from the strange facts enumerated in this story, and it opens up a vista of inexplicable possibilities with which in the near future we may be fully acquainted. Esoteric Buddhists will hardly welcome a book which charges them with fanatical acts such as would disgrace Thuggee, but the author is most dreadfully in earnest when denouncing shams, and his imputations cannot be entirely ignored. K. F.

**A NEW VEHICLE.**—This news comes to us from the "Pall Mall Gazette":—"The 'unattached members,' by which are meant members not affiliated to lodges of the Theosophical Society, are," the London correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" says, "to be catered for by a new monthly 'vehicle' of Theosophical information, to be called the 'Vahan,' an Indian name for the word I have used to describe it. The first issue of the 'Vahan' is to take place on Monday, the 1st prox., and will contain an epitome of the chief contents of the periodical and other publications of the society, wherever these may be issued."



**ASSEMBLY OF THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE.**

On November 18th an Assembly was held at the rooms of the Alliance, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. Among members and their friends who were present we observed the following :—

Mr. J. T. Audy, Mr. W. Arbuthnot, Mr. G. H. Baker, Mr. Thomas Blyton, Mr. Batty, Mrs. Brinckley, Miss E. Bainbridge, Dr. Pullen Burry, Mr. J. F. Collingwood, Miss A. M. Collingwood, Mrs. Coates, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Carter, Mr. Horace Carter, Mrs. Despard, Mr. and Mrs. Davidson, Mrs. Davis and family, Mr. and Mrs. Everitt, Mr. and Mrs. Finch, Miss Marie Gifford, Mr. Gunn, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. Hankin, Mr. R. B. Holton, Mrs. Hunt, Mrs. E. M. James, Miss Lee, Mr. J. H. Mitchiner, Mr. Mayers, Mrs. E. Nelson, Mr. C. Pearson, Mr. E. Dawson Rogers, Mrs. Stapley, Miss Simmonds, Mr. and Mrs. Morell Theobald, Colonel Taylor, Miss F. J. Theobald, Miss Rowan Vincent, Mrs. Western, Mr. Alaric A. Watts, Mr. H. Withall, Dr. George Wyld, Mrs. Williamson, &c., &c.

Mr. Alaric A. Watts presided, the President being incapacitated by illness. Mrs. Gordon delivered the following address, which was listened to with marked appreciation :—

**SOME EXPERIENCES OF THE OCCULT.**

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I feel that your President has paid me a great compliment by inviting me here to relate to you my Occult experiences. In doing so, I propose to confine myself to those phenomena which I believe to have been directed and controlled by living human beings; for most of you are well acquainted with the phenomena which occur in connection with mediumship. In addressing the present audience, I am spared the difficult task of reasoning on the possibility of such occurrences, and have no necessity for bringing forward arguments in defence of psychic phenomena generally.

I returned to India from England at the end of 1878, having, during that year, investigated the phenomena of Spiritualism, and convinced myself of their truth, and in 1879 I published in a leading newspaper there an account of some sêances held in my house in London. Mr. Sinnett was the editor of that paper, and the connection thus began led eventually to my acquaintance with Madame Blavatsky, to see whom I took a long journey of nearly thirty hours to Allahabad, and at the same time I met for the first time Mr. and Mrs. Sinnett and Mr. and Mrs. Hume. This was in the winter of 1879-80. During this visit I heard raps produced at will on tables, glass doors, and elsewhere, and a large glass clock shade was often used, we being able to see the hands from underneath this, and so be certain that they did not move. From Allahabad, Madame Blavatsky, Colonel Olcott, the Sinnetts, and myself went to Benares for a few days, a Rajah there having lent us a house. We met Swenin Dycummel Saraswati, a great Sanscrit scholar, and other learned pundits. Probably most of you have read Mr. Sinnett's book, "The Occult World," in which this visit is recorded, and may, perhaps, remember the account of the showers of roses. One evening in the drawing-room, some native and European visitors were sitting with us, when several roses fell from the ceiling; they came straight down with some force, and there appeared to be no possibility of their arrival, except through Occult means. Just as our guests were on the point of departing, a German professor asked if he might take some of the roses with him, when Madame Blavatsky said "We will have some fresh ones," and another lot fell. But I saw one rose produced which I thought a more interesting phenomenon. It happened in the morning out in the open air. A native lady, a recluse, or "holy woman," had come to see Madame Blavatsky, and we were all sitting on a well-raised platform, about fourteen feet high, overlooking the garden. Madame Blavatsky went to the balustrade and stood there a moment, and when she turned round I saw a beautiful fresh rose in her hand, which she presented to the native lady. I knew this rose must have been obtained by Occult means; I particularly remarked its very fresh look, the leaves standing out firmly on the stem, showing that it was freshly gathered. I went afterwards to the balustrade, believing I should find a red rose tree nearest within sight, and there was one just below, but quite out of reach. I thus accounted for the colour of the rose, as there were roses of other colours in the garden.

We had more phenomena at Benares; lamps nearly went out, and then lighted up without being touched, and the name on a card was rapped out on a table without contact, we not knowing how the name was spelt. I do not say, or believe, that Madame Blavatsky did all these things herself; she was aided, I conclude, directly or indirectly by the "Brothers"—Adepts. But it need not be supposed that the higher Adepts assist in such minor phenomena; there are chelas or disciples of all grades who might be deputed to do such trifles.

In the summer of 1880, I went to Simla on a visit to Mr. and Mrs. Hume. Madame Blavatsky was there part of the season, the guest of Mr. and Mrs. Sinnett. In "The Occult World" much of the phenomena I propose speaking of is recorded, and, probably, you have all heard of the cigarettes which were disintegrated and re-integrated. I saw this done several times, but will only mention in detail the one cigarette which was especially made and manipulated for me. I went one morning unexpectedly to see Madame, and found her alone in her room. Our conversation turned on phenomena, and I asked her whether she could send anything to my husband now, or to me after I returned home. She said she could not, as she must know the place in order to direct her thought there. But she added that as I never bothered her for phenomena, she would like to do something for me, and suddenly remembering that she had been somewhere that morning (to the dentist) suggested sending a cigarette there if I would go directly and fetch it, to which I consented. She then took out a cigarette paper, and in broad daylight, I standing quite close watching her, she tore off a corner and gave it to me, telling me to take care of it, which I did, putting it into my purse at once. She made a cigarette with the other piece of the paper, and was on the point of crushing it between her hands, when she bethought her to try a new experiment, saying, if it failed it was of no consequence, as it was for me, and so she put it into the fire. In a few seconds she said it was all right, and told me where I should find it. I started at once for the house, and astonished my friends by asking them to look under a cloth on a table in a certain room for a cigarette, and there sure enough we found one. On opening it and comparing the paper with the piece I had with me they fitted exactly. Of course, it sounds like a conjuring trick, but I feel quite sure that I saw the piece of paper I held torn off the very paper from which the cigarette was made.

You have doubtless read of the so-called astral bells. These I have often heard in Madame Blavatsky's presence, both indoors and out of doors. The nearest approach to the sound is that produced by striking softly a thin wineglass, which produces a clear, musical sound. Sometimes there were several sounds in succession, forming a cadence. I remember on one occasion a gentleman going into the next room to that in which Madame Blavatsky was sitting, and there he also heard the bell-like sound. We had at that time phenomena almost daily, and were almost always on the lookout for something to happen. One day it suddenly occurred to me that I should like to write to Koot Hoomi. We seemed to know him so well, there being so many communications from him; so I wrote a letter, and took it straight to Madame's room and asked her if she thought he would take it from me; I did not expect him to do so, I admit. She said she did not know. I then showed her an envelope which contained the one I had written, and she told me to place it under the tablecloth at the place where she always sat when writing, and see if it was taken. I did so. There was no one in the room but ourselves, and she then suggested that I should not lose sight of her, which I did not. We went to luncheon, and on our return she told me to look under the cloth. My letter was no longer there. I received an answer from Koot Hoomi, but it was given me by Madame Blavatsky. I believe that letter was taken by Occult means, though the evidence would not be very conclusive to an outsider; one must always appear too credulous when not entering into details and giving reasons.

I will now relate a phenomenon of which I was the sole witness with Madame Blavatsky. I had gone unexpectedly to her room when we were both staying at Mr. Hume's in Simla, in 1881. She was sitting writing at her table, which was placed close to a small window. The room being very warm I suggested a little fresh air, and proposed opening

the window, which swung from the top on hinges. With some difficulty I pushed it out from below, but in swinging back it came down on to the piece of wood intended to hold it open, which went through the glass. Madame became excited, and I, thinking it was because the glass was broken, said, "Never mind, we can get it mended." She exclaimed, "No, no, keep still; I saw a hand; something is going to happen." I was standing close to the window-ledge, between Madame and the window. Presently she said, "Draw the curtain"—a small one just coming as far as the ledge, but I had scarcely pulled it across when she said, "Draw it back," and there in front of me was a letter directed to Mr. Hume, and "Favoured by Mrs. Gordon," in the handwriting so well known to me as that of Koot Hoomi. This I concluded was done that Mr. Hume might have evidence that the letters really arrived phenomenally, and I am perfectly certain that the letter was not in the place where I found it one half-minute before, and quite as certain that no human hand in the flesh put it there.

The brooch, belonging to Mrs. Hume, which was brought by Occult means has been much talked of. I was present on this occasion; it was the evening of the day on which the cup and saucer were found, which phenomenon I did not witness. We were eleven in number, dining at Mr. Hume's, and the conversation, as usual, turned on these subjects; but there was nothing said to lead up directly to a demand for this brooch, as many suppose, though I have no doubt that Mrs. Hume was psychologically impressed to ask for it. Madame Blavatsky inquired whether there was anything she had lost which she valued for sentimental rather than intrinsic reasons, and while Mrs. Hume was trying to think of something, Madame Blavatsky said she must have the article very clearly defined in her mind. Mrs. Hume told me afterwards that at first she was trying to recall to memory a marquise ring, diamond-shaped, and covered with small pearls. Suddenly a light appeared to shine as if from behind her, and she saw suspended in front of her a round brooch, which she remembered at once and described, drawing also a picture of it. Madame Blavatsky then took two pieces of cigarette paper, wrapped them round a coin she wore on her chain, and hid them in the folds of her dress. She mentioned to Mr. Hume soon afterwards that the papers had been taken away. We all retired to the drawing-room, and shortly afterwards Madame Blavatsky said she had seen the locket fall on to a star-shaped flower-bed in the garden. Now, I had been living in that house for some time, and been in the garden often, but had never noticed a star-shaped bed, and I am sure Madame Blavatsky from her own knowledge was not aware that there was one, as she had never been in that garden by daylight, having been merely carried up there to dinner in a Sedan chair. Mr. Hume, Mr. and Mrs. Sinnett, and others got lanterns and went down to the star-shaped bed, which Mr. Hume, of course, knew where to find, and after a short while we who remained up on the terrace near the house heard the exclamations of those below on finding the little white parcel, which was brought to the room and there opened by Mrs. Sinnett. I should, I think, mention that Madame Blavatsky did not go down to look for the brooch. On opening the white papers, which were found to be cigarette papers, the brooch was at once recognised by Mrs. Hume, who was very much astonished at seeing it. She assured me she had almost forgotten its existence, as several years had passed since she parted with it. Many questions arose in regard to the whereabouts of the brooch during this period, and these it would be difficult to answer; the only thing which stands out quite clear is that Mrs. Hume was psychologically impressed to ask for it, and that the cigarette papers which Madame Blavatsky wrapped round her coin were used to enable her to see where the brooch fell, for on examination of the papers the distinct mark of the coin was visible on the soft tissue, and the mark also of the larger brooch with its rough pearl edge. Did such a case stand alone it would not be worth much in the eyes of the world as proof of Occult power, as it may well be argued that the whole thing could have been arranged beforehand by the aid of a confederate; but of the psychological impression there can be no doubt, and there is no doubt of the truth of this phenomenon in the minds of those who know the whole of the circumstances and the chief actors.

One of the most interesting among the phenomena of those days was the finding of a brooch and letter in a

cushion. The whole story is fully related in the "Occult World." Mr. Sinnett had reason to believe that he was visited by an Adept one night; he had a kind of dream vision, and in the morning he was in some way, I forget how, led to understand that proof would be given him that he had been so visited. Mrs. Sinnett on going to her dressing-table missed a familiar and oft-worn brooch, and in some way they were informed that this brooch would be returned by phenomenal means. We had arranged to have a picnic on the top of a hill where once before a small phenomenon had taken place. We arrived there and were all sitting in our Jhanpans, a kind of Sedan chair, when the question arose as to where this brooch should be found. I remember quite well Madame Blavatsky saying that she could not suggest any place, or it would be supposed that she had put it there. We were puzzling our heads to think of some really good place, and at last Mr. Sinnett suggested the cushion at the back of my Jhanpan. We all had these cushions or pillows in our chairs. Mrs. Sinnett suggested that if it was to be found in anybody's pillow it ought to be in hers. After a few seconds Madame Blavatsky said it should be in Mrs. Sinnett's, and told her to place it on her knees under the rug. In a few seconds more she was told to take it out, and then began the troublesome work of opening the sewing which was very strongly done. The outer case being opened an inner one was found, but at last both were opened sufficiently for Mrs. Sinnett to put her hand in. I well remember the long time she seemed to be hunting about among the feathers before she found anything. Suddenly she felt a piece of paper and pulled it out—it was a letter in the well-known handwriting, and on searching again for a moment she found the brooch, and "K. H." scratched on the back since it left her room. The letter was as follows:—

"My Dear Brother,—This brooch, No. 2, is placed in this very strange place simply to show you how very easily a real phenomenon is produced, and how still easier it is to suspect its genuineness. Make of it what you like, even to classing me with confederates. The difficulty you spoke of last night with respect to the interchange of letters I will try to remove. One of our pupils will shortly visit Lahore and the N.W.P. (North-West provinces), and an address will be sent to you which you can always use; unless, indeed, you would really prefer corresponding through pillows! Please to remark that the present is not dated from a 'Lodge,' but from a Kashmere Valley."

This letter, as will be seen, refers to matters which had been talked of and written about previously, and, therefore, can only be explained by reference to what had gone before, to do which would take up too much time. Of course, only those present on such occasions can appreciate the convincing nature of the evidence, and no evidence, much less such a meagre account as this, could carry conviction to those who are not already believers in the phenomena of Spiritualism.

I will conclude with a short account of the receipt of the letter which was brought to me from Mr. Eglinton while he was on board the s.s. Vega. He had been staying with us for six weeks at Howrah, near Calcutta, and we had some very interesting sésances. When on the point of leaving for England a question was raised as to whether a letter to Mr. Hume or myself could be brought from him after he had sailed. It will doubtless be remembered by some present that a letter had been brought by the spirits, just previously, to Mr. Meugens, from London. Mr. Eglinton did not see how it could be done without a medium at our end, and somehow it came about that the subject was referred to Madame Blavatsky. I should like it to be quite understood that from first to last Mr. Eglinton neither wrote to, or received letters from, Madame Blavatsky or Colonel Olcott. He was not interested in, nor did he believe in, the Occult powers possessed by the Adepts or Brothers, as we called them, and was, I think, jealous of them. But when he was in a trance we questioned his guides, and found that they professed to know about these Adepts, which we told him when he awoke. To make a long story short, he expressed himself willing to do what he could in connection with these Adepts. He left on March 14th, nothing being then settled, but on the same day a telegram came saying the Brothers had consented to transmit a letter from him to me. I sent this telegram after him by a steam launch, which left on the 15th, to catch up the steamer at the mouth of the river. He answered by the pilot. The letter was dated False Point, Wednesday, and said: "The B.'s came on



board about four and gave me your letter and Madame's enclosures. Personally, I am very doubtful whether these letters can be managed, but I will do what I can in the matter." He ends after a few more lines, "I shall send a letter from Suez if you don't receive one in the meantime by K. H."

I suggested in my letter to Mr. Eglinton that he should get some one, whom I knew on board, to mark the envelope so as to strengthen the evidence. But this part of the arrangement failed. The telegram I sent him from Madame Blavatsky said that after the president, Colonel O came to us, the letter from him would be brought. Colonel Olcott came on the 19th, and somewhere about the 22nd I was asked by Madame Blavatsky to fix a day for receiving the letter. She, I should mention, was at Bombay, which is about sixty hours' railway journey from Calcutta, near which I lived. Therefore letters from her took three days to reach me; so telegrams were exchanged. I telegraphed on the 22nd that I would be ready on the 24th, at 8.30 p.m., Madras time. I remember I was engaged on the evening of the 23rd, or I should have fixed that date, being impatient to get the promised letter. On the morning of the 23rd, I received a telegram dated the evening of the 22nd, saying "K. H. Just gone on board the *Vega*." Before this telegram came, at about eight o'clock, Colonel Olcott called up to me and told me he had heard this news from his Guru or Master. Well, on the evening of the 24th, Colonel Olcott, my husband, and myself sat in a lighted room, and at the exact time Colonel Olcott saw the forms of two Brothers, whom he named, at the window of the room (this window was raised high above the ground with no balcony). One of them pointed to the ceiling above where we were sitting, from whence a packet fell, striking my shoulder on its way to the ground. While Colonel Olcott's eyes were directed to the spot indicated the Brothers vanished. He was all in a tremble with excitement, and no one present could have doubted that he saw the messengers who brought the letter. His heart was beating violently. We were very sorry not to have had the same cause for excitement and a fluttering heart. The letter began as follows:—

"My Dear Mrs. Gordon—

"At last your hour of triumph has come. After the many battles we have had at the breakfast table regarding K. H.'s existence and my stubborn scepticism as to the wonderful powers possessed by the 'Brothers' I have been forced to a *complete belief* in their being living, distinct persons, and just in proportion to my scepticism will be my *firm, unalterable* opinion respecting them. I am not allowed to tell you all I know, but K. H. *appeared* to me in person two days ago and what he told me dumbfounded me. Perhaps Madame B. will have already communicated the fact of K. H.'s appearance to you. The 'Illustrious' is uncertain whether this can be taken to Madame or not, but he will try, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way. If he does not I shall post it when I arrive at port. I shall read this to Mrs. B. and ask her to mark the envelope. But whatever happens you are requested by K. H. to keep this letter a profound secret until you hear from him through Madame."

There are a few more but unimportant remarks in the letter. Attached to the letter were three cards of Madame Blavatsky's, dated Bombay, 24th, and filled with writing, and a larger card, one such as I had seen in Mr. Eglinton's possession, written on by Koot Hoomi and the "Illustrious," another "Brother" who often wrote to us. By post in due course I received a letter from Bombay signed by seven witnesses who saw the letter arrive in Bombay, and certified that Madame wrote on three of her cards and attached them to the letter with a bit of blue silk. They say they saw this letter and cards "evaporate."

Now, in this instance, I was the only person who had anything to say to the time and place of receiving the letter. No suggestion of any kind was made to me, and I am as certain of the genuineness of that phenomenon as of any event which is of daily occurrence. Of course, no evidence could convince the ordinary mind of such an occurrence, but Spiritualists have many experiences as extraordinary, if not so well planned. Mr. Eglinton wrote to me from Suez, fully relating the manner and time of Koot Hoomi's appearance to him and the conversation he had with him, described him, and spoke of his beautiful smile. Mr. Eglinton assured me he was in his normal state and his cabin well lighted. He omitted to say how Koot Hoomi disappeared, but said

that he himself felt exhausted afterwards, as though a materialisation had taken place. It may be well to mention again that Mr. Eglinton had been at sea eight days when Koot Hoomi appeared to him, and the ship was then out at sea; two days later the letter was brought to me, also from mid ocean. That men now living should by a certain course of life and training have obtained such a command over the Occult powers of Nature presents no great difficulty to those who have studied the history of Occultism in past ages. We need not go to the East for traditions of many persons who have possessed such magical powers, and undoubtedly the secret of how these powers may be obtained has been guarded until the present day by the Eastern School of Adepts, Mahatmas, Brothers, or Masters as they are variously called.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### Spirits and Conjurers.

SIR,—I have long existed in the belief, sometimes expressed in your pages, that a good deal of the conjuring of the present day is mixed up with Spiritualism, by no means always from a high source. It may be remarked that the absence of the old-fashioned paraphernalia that used to encumber the table of the prestidigitateur has dated from days soon after the Rochester knockings. It must be forty years since I noticed this absence, in the case of Bosco, the Italian conjurer, and I felt certain then that he could not have done all he did without the help of beings from the other side. I am not a frequenter of this sort of amusement, and perhaps the next piece of conjuring I saw was at Nice twenty-seven years ago. If I remember right, the conjuring was provided by a member of the English society there, for the amusement of friends. The conjurer distinctly averred that he was helped in his performance by the spirit of his grandfather. This avowal, of course, shocked some excellent persons who were present; and some of them evidently felt that if they had known that before they never would have come.

Perhaps it is twenty years ago since I saw Signor Bosco again. On that occasion he called two lads to the platform and put them about eight or ten feet apart from each other. One of them was a friend of ours. Signor Bosco put a shilling into the right fist of one of the lads, and said, "Repeat after me: *Spiriti infernali ubbidite*." (Spirits infernal, obey.) The lad repeated those words. "Now," said Signor Bosco, "Open your hand." The young man opened his hand and the shilling was gone. "Now," said Signor Bosco to the other lad, "open your hand." The shilling was in the hand of the second lad, and with the magic words signifying "Infernal spirits obey" these two boys banded about the shilling from one of their shut fists to the other's several times. On walking home, no one expressed more surprise than our young friend who had been one of the performers.

Now, the above was all fair play, but when "infernal spirits" are made use of by conjurers without acknowledgment, then the abomination begins. I have heard the subject entered upon at a séance for the direct voice; and none seemed more vexed that such things should occur than those on the other side.

Here is another instance of honest conjuring, by aid of spirits. This is what happened last year at the sea-side, on the sands, in a blazing sun. The conjurer made a circle of the crowd of children and the curious, like myself. He then called a boy present, and gave him a penny. The *ingenuus puer* is always at hand. "Now, throw this penny down, within the circle, on the sand," said the conjurer. The boy did so. "Now, throw down another penny," said the conjurer. The boy did so, and perhaps half-a-dozen in all, in succession. "Now pick them up again," said the conjurer. There was not one of the pennies that so many eager eyes saw thrown down in the circle now remaining there. "Here they are," said the conjurer, opening his hand. Now how could this phenomenon have occurred without spirit help? The conjurer never moved from his place. He finished his performance by a clever "rope trick," and for those who would buy it, he sold a little pamphlet, the outside leaf of which I send you. It is evidently ornamented with a picture of one of the Davenportes being tied up outside his cabinet. There was no humbug there.

There has been nothing more amusing of late, I think, in "Punch," than the "Voces Populi." In that of November 15th, 1890, we find an account of a German, or quasi-German,

conjurer, who prefaces his performance by the following: "Lyties and Shiltelmans, pefoor I co-mence viz my hillions, I ave most hemphatically to repoodiate hall hassistance from hany spirrids or soopernatural beins vatsohever." We have but to read through the lines to see that the writer evidently himself believes that the performance could not have been effected without the aid of the other side. The paper is well worth reading by Spiritualists. It is but a sign of the times, Mr. "Punch."

AN OBSERVER.

#### Elias and John the Baptist

SIR,—I have only just read Mr. Maitland's letter in "LIGHT" of October 11th, with his remarks on a letter of mine, and I feel bound to say in return, while expressing my gratitude to him for much which he has taught us, that I cannot but think his substitution of the ideal for the real is sometimes too marked, as well as misleading and tortuous.

Mr. Maitland tells me that "For John the Baptist to have been a Re-incarnation of Elias the same soul must have belonged to both men." What is a Re-incarnation if it be not the same soul inhabiting two bodies successively? That is just what I believe; just because Jesus, speaking of John the Baptist, said: This is Elias which was to come." That is enough for me. These words of Jesus have been for more than thirty years the groundwork of the only argument I have ever used for my belief in Re-incarnation, combined with my trust in general laws for humanity, which imply what happened to Elias may happen to all, i.e., Re-incarnation in, I hope, generally, a better and higher condition successively, such as was, I believe, that of John over Elijah, a "preacher of righteousness" over a very powerful physical medium, who once at least outrageously abused his medial powers by the indiscriminate slaughter, as far as he could with his own hands, of all those who differed from him in religious belief; and that great sin was committed immediately after a phenomenon of unusual power had been vouchsafed to him.

Mr. Maitland substitutes for the words of Jesus, "This is Elias which was to come," the following strange assumption: "John was simply overshadowed by the angel or perfected spirit of Elias." An amazing liberty, in my idea, and a sad misapprehension of the fitness of words and things. Would he infer that Re-incarnation generally implies being "simply overshadowed by an angel"? I do not believe he would. For then Re-incarnation would be no longer Re-incarnation, and Mr. Maitland tells us in his letter, "The whole system of Biblical Christianity is founded on the doctrine of Re-incarnation." Again, was Elias "a perfected spirit"? Was he "fully regenerate" as Mr. Maitland says he was? I doubt it. Mr. Maitland assumes that Elijah being "fully regenerate" accounted for his ascent in a chariot of fire. What Bible authority has he for saying that?

The Author of that grand apothegm, "Love your enemies," never could have preferred Elijah, in his character of the cruel, revengeful medium of the Old Testament, to his newly re-incarnated holy character in the New Testament. He could not, in justice to his own perfect discrimination. And Elijah was certainly not the greatest of men, of the Old Testament even. But "among men born of women, there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist." That was a new and happy attainment indeed for Elijah in his new life, a reward for the good deeds of his former life in contradistinction to his evil deeds. Why did Elijah fly from Jezebel after his evil deeds? Because he knew that she would take vengeance on him for the murders he had committed. So he was frightened and ran away from her and hid himself in the wilderness, and with his groanings and lamentations there came, we may hope and surmise, repentance. But he soon departed after his cruelty and cowardice. Yet the Nemesis was upon him. Vengeance came, but it halted until his new life, and because it was for deeds of righteousness in that new life for which he received his death blow, that death blow came to him as a martyrdom instead of as a just reward for a fearful abuse of medial powers. It was Herodias, instead of Jezebel, who killed him, that was all. And who knows that Herodias was not a Re-incarnation of that bloody queen?

Mr. Maitland seems concerned at John the Baptist not having attained to the "Kingdom of Heaven." I do not doubt but that he has attained it now. But this is quite certain: if he has not attained it, neither has Elijah,

because they are the same soul, for Jesus has told us so, speaking of the Baptist, "This is Elijah which was to come."

From what I have already written it must be quite plain that I utterly disagree with Mr. Maitland when he says: "It is evident that so far from John 'being upheld by Jesus as a typical Re-incarnation,' there is no question of Re-incarnation in the matter."

Again. I think if Mr. Maitland will take the trouble to re-peruse what I wrote, he will find that I did not quote the words, "Before Abraham was, I am," as he alleges, "as an argument for Re-incarnation," but as an argument for pre-existence.

With regard to Mr. Maitland's advice to read "The Perfect Way," I may add that I possess the book, and have read it; and I am quite in accord with him when he tells us in his letter of October 11th, "The doctrine of Re-incarnation is necessary to afford the experience of the earth-life, by and through which alone man becomes 'perfected through suffering.'"

It seems probable, however, that the knowledge of the Copernican system has opened out vistas of hope to suffering humanity in new directions, which were not dreamed of in earlier days, and above all to a higher estimate of the attributes of God. And I do not see what right any man has to turn Scripture topsy-turvy for a mere theory.

AN OBSERVER.

#### Invisible Opponents of Evidence.

SIR,—There is just one passage in the letter of Mr. Frederic Myers upon which I should like to make a few observations. Mr. Myers incidentally remarks: "Spiritualists sometimes—perhaps half jocosely—suggest that there may be some league among the Invisibles to prevent the phenomena from ever attaining to scientific proof." The suggestion—if it has in fact been made—of a "league" perhaps goes beyond what may be required for any explanatory purpose. Such a "league" supposes seriously concerted opposition, founded upon some principle, good or bad. I am so far at variance now, I am afraid, with other Spiritualists, as to be at least able to conceive that such a principle might be a good one. But really that is not what is meant. And I cannot see why there should be anything half or at all jocose in the supposition, as it is more usually entertained, of a mischievous or malicious opposition. I have occasionally presumed to urge on the Society for Psychical Research that it is not consistent—I confess it seems to me extremely stupid—to investigate at all on the hypothesis (among others) of conscious agency behind the scenes, and yet to exclude from practical consideration any of the consequences of that hypothesis which our positive knowledge of voluntary agencies must suggest. It really seems to be imagined that "spirits" concerned with the phenomena we try to investigate, if they exist at all, must be all as honest and as scientific in purpose as the investigators are, or should be, in observation. Suppose (perhaps we must suppose) that many of them are. Was there ever a serious plan of action in this world of our own that has not had to experience interference, either from serious opponents, or from malice, or mere levity? The Spiritualistic hypothesis supposes the representation of all varieties of motive and character among the invisible agents, with whom we have to deal in these phenomena. The old class of "exposers" never, in their dense ignorance and conceit, gave a thought to what was implied in the conception of "mediumship," or to what at any given moment might be the agencies behind it. To them, one of the most difficult and complex problems of an abnormal psychology and physiology was of transparent simplicity. They could not be expected, perhaps, to entertain the idea that a medium being a person *ex hypothesi* of abnormal sensitivity, would be peculiarly liable to be hypnotised from the other side, if another side there were, and that then everything would depend on the *bona fides* of the suggesting agencies. But it would be simply scandalous to the knowledge and intelligence of such a body as the Psychical Society not to see and seriously realise that mischievous and thwarting suggestion by unseen agents is a possibility to be reckoned with. For my own part, I can easily suppose that a great deal, if not of the most pronounced "fraud," at least of what is *prima facie* suspicious, may be referred to the suggestive force of suspicion in the investigators themselves, and I am certainly disappointed that we have not already generalised



more, hypothetically, from known facts of telepathy and hypnotism. At all events, these may be factors of indefinitely greater power when an agent, free from physical hindrances, finds a percipient (or recipient) partially free from them, as I conceive to be the case with "mediums." I know it has been said that if we have to make such a supposition as that of opposition to evidence from the invisible side, we may as well give up investigating at once, for the first condition of proof is thus denied. But this objection seems to be conceived rather in a petulant than in a scientific spirit. It does not follow that opposition will always be present or will always prevail. But it is much more likely to prevail if it is ignored.

November 21st.

## Dr. Suddick's Case.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words about the main subject of Mr. Myers' letter in last week's "LIGHT"—Dr. Suddick's case of predictive manifestation by tilts? Everyone, I think, must agree with Mr. Myers, that if there was no written record before verification, that was a most regrettable neglect, and that if there was, Dr. Suddick should have mentioned it in his letter. But I submit that Mr. Myers goes much too far in disparagement of the evidence as alleged (or nearly as alleged) in treating it as of almost incomparably less value than documentary proof. The principal definite fact of the prediction was that C. Varris, "already known to be very ill," would die forty days after the communication, that is, on October 8th. Now what we want is proof that just that day really was fixed upon. And Mr. Myers says, "all the 'town talk,' of Cuba, Mo., all 'the furore of excitement in our village,' is not worth one little scrap of dated and attested writing containing the prophecy before the event." Of course, the suggestion is that, granting the town talk before the fulfilment and excitement after it, testimony cannot make us quite sure that this talk and excitement—especially the former—were referable to the particular date of October 8th, as that for fulfilment. Now, it cannot be with any probability supposed that there would be much talk about the prediction of the death of a man known to be dying, or "very ill," unless the prediction included the exact date of the death. I assume—but perhaps Dr. Suddick ought to have stated it—that the illness of Mr. Varris was known generally, and not merely to the circle. Otherwise, of course, the mere prediction of his approaching death might get talked about, and there might be subsequent excitement, without the necessity of supposing that the date was fixed in the public mind before the fulfilment. But even the evidence of the circle, if showing after due cross-examination an independent recollection of the fact, stated by Dr. Suddick, that the prediction fixed the time of fulfilment as forty days from the date of the sitting, and that October 8th was fixed by counting, would amount to a very strong case, as showing a circumstantial recollection and fixing of the impression. And if it turned out additionally that intelligent witnesses, not of the circle, were positive as to their minds having been directed to October 8th before that date, and could give, as almost certainly in that case some of them could, a circumstantial account of their recollection, then I submit the case is reduced to one of mere general credibility of testimony, and is hardly at all inferior to documentary evidence which must itself depend, some extent, on the good faith of the persons concerned.

November 21st, 1890.

C. C. M.

## "Looking Backward."

SIR,—The following admirable criticism of "Looking Backward" is given by Monsieur Bentzon in the "Revue des deux Mondes":—

"To summarise it (the Golden Age) in a word, it is too industrial; it must end inevitably—the very doubtful taste of the public being the sole criterion in questions of art and literature—in the triumph of cheap chromo-lithographs and newspaper novels. Perhaps it may suffice for new peoples—the Australians, for example—but we should always crave for a few essential refinements without which this rich and rude pervert of positive progress would leave us indifferent. Would not a society which was without degrees, without passions, without contrasts of any sort, be terribly dull? Admitting that it could exist, would not some souls still regret the poetry of the suffering and heroism involved in the struggle between the strong will and the obstacles it has

set itself to overcome? . . . If this should ever come to pass, it remains for us to thank God that we have been born at a time when the world, however sick it may be, leaves still a little room for each man's individuality, and is something else besides a formidable industrial machine, organised on the pattern of the German army." S. S.

## An Appeal.

SIR,—May I be permitted to make an appeal through your columns on behalf of Mrs. Ayers, of 45, Jubilee-street, Mile End? Mrs. Ayers has for the last twenty-seven years thrown open her house free to all those who wished to investigate Spiritualism, and by so doing has called down upon herself much obloquy. She is now seventy-one years of age, and in very distressed circumstances, and I venture to make this appeal on her behalf in the hope that some of your benevolent readers may in their turn assist one who has always been ready to assist others. Anyone caring to help will please forward to the following address, and will receive due acknowledgment.

218, Jubilee-street, Mile End-road, E. W. MARSH.

## When Does the Soul Enter the Body?

SIR,—The teaching of the doctrine of Re-incarnation had not its origin in Europe during the present century, "through some mediums with whom Allan Kardec experimented," as Dr. Cyriax informs us. It was not until after 1850 that Kardec and his mediums were ever heard of. The doctrine of Re-incarnation had been propounded fully in the year 1839, in a book published in that year in French and English, by the late Duc de Normandie. The English version I have in my possession. The Duke was a medium from his early days, and the first of the three books published by him, under control, was the book I have alluded to, called "La Doctrine Celeste de notre Seigneur Jésus Christ." I have shown in previous pages of "LIGHT," as well as in the pages of "La Revue Spirite," that Kardec had no pretension to being the first to introduce the doctrine of Re-incarnation in the present century to European readers. The general doctrines of the Duke of Normandy and those of Kardec are very similar, as I have shown in former numbers of "LIGHT,"; but there is one point in which they differ, viz., the method whereby the soul enters the body, and this method, according to the Duke of Normandy, is as far removed from the method of Kardec as it is from that of Dr. Cyriax. So it is interesting to know, at the present moment, how he deals with this vexed question of heredity and "the cuckoo's egg" of Dr. Cyriax. Here is an answer given by the Duke's spirit guide to a question on the above subject, as published in the book alluded to in the year 1839: "The body is not the soul and the soul is not the body. The body comes from the union of two beings, male and female, in the natural way, but the body conceived in the womb of woman is not inhabited by a soul, for man, according to the wisdom of the Almighty and the natural order of things is, by the will of God, creator of the body of the child, but God alone is creator of the soul; and the soul, of which God is the Father, only takes possession of the body, of which man is the father, at the moment when the earthly body is born."

Question: "This is very well," said I to the Angel "What, then, is this body and how can it be that it already lives in its mother's womb before its birth?"

Answer: "Man's body consists of two principal substances, namely, of flesh and blood; it is the blood which animates the body; and when the body is strong enough in the womb of the woman it moves, and the mother feels thereby that her child has life. This life, however, is merely a vegetative life, and it only becomes spiritual after the soul has taken possession of the body."

Question: "Then the Lord Jesus Christ never was in the womb of Mary?"

Answer: "Never; and this is why He said when on earth, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' But the world did not understand it."

I do not pretend myself to give any opinion on the above question. If beasts have souls, and I believe they have, when does their soul enter their body?

Here is a short extract from the Duc de Normandie's book, in which he deals with the subject of Re-incarnation. "Certainly, said the Angel of the Lord to me, I am descended once more by command of God Almighty to

accomplish what our Heavenly Father put into the mouth of Jesus Christ; for it is He Who said (according to the evangelist, Matt. xi. 13): 'For all the prophets and the law, until John, have prophesied what is to happen, and if you understand it well, he is Elias, who is to come.' I am Elias; I am Raphael; I am John the Baptist, and I am he of whom our Lord Jesus Christ spoke—(xvii. 11) 'He shall come first and re-establish all things.' T. W.

### SOCIETY WORK.

[Correspondents who send us notices of the work of the Societies with which they are associated will oblige by writing as distinctly as possible and by appending their signatures to their communications. Inattention to these requirements often compels us to reject their contributions.]

23, DEVONSHIRE-ROAD, FOREST HILL, S.E.—Last Sunday Mrs. Bingham recited some of her own poems, after which Mr. Davies read Mrs. Tappan's exquisite discourse on "Charity."—GEO. E. GUNN, Hon. Sec.

KING'S CROSS SOCIETY, 182, CALEDONIAN-ROAD, N.—Next Sunday morning at 11 o'clock there will be an open meeting. At 6.45 p.m. (doors closed at 7 p.m.), Mr. A. M. Rodger will give an address.—L. T. RODGER, Hon. Sec.

CARDIFF PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—On Sunday the morning class was held as usual at 11 a.m. and the Lyceum at 3 p.m. In the evening Mr. Adams (vice-president) read an interesting paper. Next Sunday Mrs Emma Hardinge Britten will lecture morning and evening in the Town Hall, lent by kind permission of the Mayor.

GLASGOW.—On Sunday morning Mr. G. Finley discoursed on "Ideas on God, Finite and Infinite." In the evening Mr. J. Robertson gave a paper on the "Facts of Spiritualism." On Thursday a soirée was held, to bid good-bye to Mr. A. Cross, who is about to return to Portland. The meeting was full of good feeling, and the time was spent very happily. The Lyceum continues to be well conducted and attractive.—J. GRIFFIN, Sec.

WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM, S.E.—Mr. Hopcroft was with us on Sunday morning and evening, and gave some good clairvoyant descriptions. Sunday, November 30th, an old Theosophist, Mr. Yeates, will speak at 11.15 a.m. on "The Unsoundness of Theosophy"; at 7 p.m., Mrs. J. M. Smith, of Leeds, trance address and clairvoyance.—J. VEITCH, Sec.

MARYLEBONE ASSOCIATION, 24, HARCOURT-STREET, W.—On Sunday morning Mr. Vango's healing powers were brought into requisition by several of the sitters. In the evening Mrs. Spring occupied the platform, giving advice to many and some tests to others. In one instance she gave a description of the mother of a sitter, which was recognised, singing the first verse of a hymn, "Could I but read my title clear," &c., it being the last hymn which she sang before passing over. Her child's name, Alice, was also given. Next Sunday, at 11 a.m., healing, Mr. Vango; at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Mr. T. S. Malone, "Experiences." Monday, at 8 p.m., social. Thursday, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Treadwell. Saturday, at 7.45 p.m., Mrs. Spring.—C. WHITE, Hon. Sec.

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUALISTS SOCIETY, CHEPSTOW HALL, 1, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—The services on Sunday were in aid of our building fund. Mrs. Yeeles gave her valuable assistance, and, in addition to the material aid in the shape of a substantial collection, many were deeply impressed by the number of spirit descriptions given, which were mostly recognised. Solos were rendered by the Misses Yeeles, and were much appreciated. We beg to thank Mrs. Yeeles for her visit and the help afforded us. In aid of the same object Messrs. Drake and Hopcroft have promised their aid on Sunday, December 7th. Next Sunday, Mr. R. J. Lees at both services (11.15 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.). Healing on Fridays at 7.30 p.m.—W. F. LONG, Hon. Sec., 36, Kemerton-road, S.E.

LONDON OCCULT SOCIETY, SEYMOUR CLUB, 4, BRYANSTON-PLACE, BRYANSTON-SQUARE, W.—Last Sunday evening Miss Vincent, a lady who has recently developed her mediumship in a private circle, made her appearance on the platform and described a number of spirits, most of whom were recognised by the audience. This lady's mediumship is of a peculiar character. She does not see the spirits, but her guides describe them to her by whispers, and also by impression. We hope soon to be favoured by another evening with the same medium. Next Sunday, at 7 p.m., Mr. Read will lecture on "Theosophy," criticising its latest development, it being now alleged that a belief in the Adepts, or in Madame Blavatsky's good faith, is not essential to Theosophy. On December 7th, a gentleman from the East will relate his experiences in Occultism amongst the Turks and Egyptians. This will be a most important lecture, and I hope your readers will not miss it.—A. F. TINDALL, A. Mus. T.C.L., President.

14, ORCHARD-ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH, W.—Tuesday's and Saturday's séances were well attended, with good results. The Sunday service was crowded, and in the absence of Mr. Earl, who did not arrive, our spirit friends came to the rescue and

controlled our local mediums, Mrs. Mason and her daughter. Mr. Mason also gave us a good address which elicited an interesting discussion at the close. Tuesdays and Saturdays, at 8 p.m., séance, Mrs. Mason, trance and clairvoyance. Thursdays, at 8 p.m., physical séance, Mr. Mason, for members only. Sunday next, at 3 p.m., Lyceum; at 7 p.m., Mr. W. Towns, Psychometry. On Sunday, December 7th, our esteemed friend, Mr. T. Everitt, will address us. Owing to our meetings being over crowded we have decided to open a new meeting room for the convenience of friends coming from a distance, at No. 1, Lawn-terrace, North End-road, West Kensington, commencing Wednesday, December 3rd, and every Wednesday; séance at 8 p.m. Medium, Mrs. Mason.—J. H. B., Hon. Sec.

PROPOSED SOCIETY IN NORTH LONDON.—The following letter appeared in last week's "Barnet Press":—

SIR,—Permit me to invite those of your readers who are interested in Spiritualism and kindred subjects, and would welcome an opportunity for conducting an organised system of experimental study, to communicate with me at their convenience in order to facilitate arrangements for a preliminary meeting to consider a proposal for the establishment of a local society. This is the only means of reaching sundry anonymous friends who wrote me respecting a previous letter of mine published in these columns on April 5th last, and who may now gratify their desire for obtaining experimental experience and contact with those similarly interested. I am already in communication with several well-known and respected residents of the surrounding districts, and feel assured that widespread interest felt in these matters will warrant the formation of a local centre for mutual assistance. It is proposed that the society shall assist in the conducting of séances, reading and discussion of papers, arrangement for lectures, &c., and formation of a lending and reference library, as well as advising generally for the benefit of students.—Yours faithfully,

THOMAS BLYTON.

Durie Dene, Bibbworth-road, Finchley, N.

### BOOKS, MAGAZINES, AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.

[Any acknowledgment of books received in this column neither precludes nor promises further notice.]

"Thoughts of Marcus-Aurelius Antoninus." Translated by G. LONG. (Bell and Sons, York-street, Covent Garden. 6s.)

"My Lyrical Life." By GERALD MASSEY. (Poems old and new. Two series; 5s. each. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.)

"The Theosophist" (Madras), "Lucifer," "Theosophical Siftings," "The Weekly Vanguard," "The Phrenological Journal," "The Detroit Free Press" (Christmas number), "The Vegetarian," "The White Cross Library" (No. 56.), "Lyceum Banner" (No. 1), &c.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for any opinions expressed by his Correspondents. He declines respectfully to enter into correspondence as to rejected MSS., or to answer private letters except where he is able to give specific information. He further begs to say that he cannot undertake to prepare MSS. for the press. Communications sent should be written on one side of the paper and be without interlineations and underlining of words. It is essential that they should be brief in order to secure insertion. Matter previously published can be received only for the information of the Editor. MSS. cannot be returned. All matter for publication and no business letters should be addressed to the Editor at the office of "LIGHT," and not to any other address. Communications for the Manager should be addressed separately. Short records of facts without comment are always welcome.

TO SEVERAL CORRESPONDENTS.—The Editor is greatly obliged by many communications. He is unable to give any more favourable account of himself to his friends, whom he thanks collectively. Many letters, which would otherwise have been attended to at once, are unavoidably put aside. He begs the indulgence of correspondents whose letters may be apparently neglected. With a recurrence of working power all shall receive attention.

E.C.—Thanks. My private correspondence has been much disarranged by illness. I am now too ill to do more than acknowledge your kindness. Whatever you send me has always my best attention. My kindest personal regards.—"M. A. (Oxon.)"

MANY responses have been sent in answer to our request for a verification of our correspondent "Edina's" automatic message. We have printed such as seem to us valuable. For the rest our thanks are due.

EDINA.—Thank you. Some interesting correspondence for you this week. Very glad to hear your satisfactory news. Will write when better.

EVERY temptation that is resisted, every noble aspiration that is encouraged, every sinful thought that is repressed, every bitter word that is withheld, adds its little item to the impetus of that great movement which is bearing humanity onwards towards a richer life and higher character.—FISKE.



## RELATION TO TRUTH, LOVE OF TRUTH, AND "CON-VICTION OF SIN."

A Paper read before the Christo-Theosophical Society, Nov. 20th.

By C. C. MASSEY.

Probably most of us occasionally read the publications of the Theosophical Society. I do not know if others share my impatience of the rather pretentious platitude which regularly meets the eye on the first page of books and periodicals, often far more instructive in their contents than such a motto would lead us to expect. "There is no religion higher than truth." Who ever said there was? We may suspect an intention to give some sort of shock to some sort of dogmatic sentiment, though he would be a feeble dogmatist indeed who could not without misgiving subscribe to the terms of the proposition, which are so innocent of disputable significance that no one would dream of wishing to controvert them. This profound verity might almost be adopted by a compiler of harmless aphorisms for a children's copy-book in a Sunday-school.\*

There is, however, a sense in which it is possible to attribute to this seeming platitude a deep significance, and it is that which I shall try to express and enforce. And there is another sense in which it conveys a dangerous fallacy, exactly opposed to that higher meaning, and which will be sufficiently exposed and refuted, if the other can be sufficiently recommended. In both these latent senses of the proposition—in the thesis and in the antithesis—it is implied that what is highest is a relation to truth. But it makes all the difference in what way we understand this relation. It may be a relation of formal knowledge, an affair of the intellect, however spiritually or transcendently that may be employed, religion in any other sense than this being conceived as out of essential relation to truth. According to the other interpretation, relation to truth is that wherein religion itself consists, and so far from this relation being conceived as formal or intellectual, it is just that aspect in religion, the dogmatic, which is represented as inferior and subordinate.

Dominant as the *cultus* of intellect now is, loud as are its pretensions to measure human worth and progress, there are still many who understand philosophically, besides those who believe traditionally, that its place in the constitution of man is not primary, but secondary. Yet perhaps few of these would think it a perfectly appropriate expression of their view to say that the primary in us, our will, is a faculty relating us, in its best direction, immediately and specifically to truth. They would say, no doubt, that the will may be directed to truth, as the love of truth, but that this would be by an action on the intellect, stimulating it to research in whatever order of truth the will desired. There are others, again, among whom Theosophists of every school are ranked, who believe that we have transcendental faculties, capable of development even in our present mode of existence, by which truth may be, and often is, intuitively apprehended, a belief which I so thoroughly share that I would even go further, and contend that the intuitive faculty is the only one really constitutive of our knowledge, and originating it, the formal intellect being merely recipient and regulative.

That, however, is not the relation to truth which you are now invited to consider. If it is essential to a true relation to truth that it should take a true form in the mind, that supposes certain recipient conditions, or a preparedness of intelligence, unless the human understanding is to be altogether superseded by a supernatural illumination, which it could neither appropriate nor express. But that would be mere disorderly mediumship, not the regular descent of inspiration through the graduated principles of the human constitution. We cannot, for instance, imagine such an interpretative exegesis as that contained in the work, entitled "The Perfect Way; or, the Finding of Christ," coming intuitively to a mind not naturally and by training adapted to intellectual presentation. I do not, of course, refer to the mere form of literary culture and expression, but to the concepts of the book. Jacob Boehme again, though not an educated man, had

\* The Sanskrit word translated "religion" in the sentence quoted is *Dharma*, which has that meaning in a secondary sense, but rather as prescriptive ritual or *sacra* than as denoting a whole system of belief and devotion. Thus the sentence would have a special significance in the original text which it has not for us.

studied Paracelsus, and his mind was saturated with the ideas and terminology of that author, and his own subsequent inspirational works are moulded in that form. Now let us consider to what a result we are driven if we refuse to admit that there can be a true relation to truth without an intellectual participation requiring such conditions. We must hold by far the greater portion of the human race disqualified for that relation, and the more we exalt the spiritual importance of truth the more embarrassed are we by the conclusion that this supreme privilege of relation to it depends upon accidental conditions of life and culture which may be described as relatively exceptional. We all see now that religion cannot consist in belief in the historical character of alleged events, which must in their nature be questions of evidence for a few highly qualified scholars. But how are the generality better off by the substitution of conceptions which must remain for most esoteric, at least until what may be called the dispensation of parable and allegory has passed away? Surely, if "there is no religion higher than truth," if truth, therefore, is the highest spiritual requisite of man, and this truth is formal knowledge or understanding, religion, so far as it is the best, is still the property of the few, and that few rather favoured than meritorious. The doctrine of Election would be preferable to that. Thus the conception of truth as spiritual, and as intuitively discerned, does not at all dispense with intellectual conditions, but really presupposes them. For the *formulation* of truth is still by the intellect, and must follow the acquired constitution of that. The intellect is the medium, and it is now well understood that media are not merely conduits, but give external form and quality to what enters and passes through them. Moreover even a pure spiritual form of truth is an externalisation in the mind, and we may possess this form intellectually, without being, therefore, in a true relation to truth at its source and in itself. In a word, I submit that any intellectual presentation is rather a means of relating us to truth than the relation itself. And what I would especially insist upon is, that as a means its efficacy need not at all depend on the spirituality of the presentation, the requirement being that the more concrete and phenomenal form which is dispensationally first should contain the spiritual form, not because the latter relates to truth more directly—which may not be at all the case—but because this involution is the law of revelation. If the phenomenal does not contain the spiritual form, if the latter cannot be evolved from it, it has no right derivation; but the eventual evolution of the interior signification does not make our relation to truth more intimate; it only marks a stage of intellectual progress at which one form has ceased to be an appropriate means and the other form has become a necessary means. The evolution of a spiritual form of truth may thus revive a decadent faith; it is a new revelation of truth, but it is not a revelation of new truth. This is a consideration which might well make us less impatient with ecclesiastical custodians of doctrine, even were we to credit them with esoteric knowledge, for they see that intellectual progress is not uniform, and are, therefore, rightly conservative of forms of belief which are still indispensable to the many. Certainly their position at epochs, like the present, of evolutionary transition is difficult and embarrassing; but only, I think, because it seems that affirmation of the new involves at least tacit denial of the old; and perhaps the solution of their problem is to be found in a philosophy which represents the allegorical significance of history itself, maintaining that the process of spirit is appropriately represented in the phenomenal order. That, however, is beside the question on which we are now engaged.

In this society I may, perhaps, be allowed to assume that love, if perfect and central, will assuredly carry us to its object and unite us therewith. And no conception of truth and of the love of truth should satisfy us which does not place that attainment within reach of the most intellectually ignorant of mankind, which is not independent of every educational means other than what is guaranteed by a direction of the will in any circumstances of life. We must, therefore, distinguish between truth and truths, and allow that there is a relation to truth which is vital, and not merely or even at all intellectual. The desire of the lover of truth in this transcendent sense is not of intellectual apprehension, not of what is definable as know-

ledge; it often only consciously begins in the soul as an experience of the insufficiency of all that. It always ensues upon a great discovery, the greatest that unregenerate man can make, for it is the beginning of wisdom. It is a discovery seldom formulated in the proposition which really and truly expresses it, a proposition to which it is unfortunately quite possible to give a notional rather than a real assent. The real assent to it, however, if you bear in mind Cardinal Newman's account of the distinction between real and notional assent,\* is just what brings the religious consciousness into its first relation with truth, or, rather, which is that consciousness, stripped of all disguises or accessories. What, then, is this wonderful, this all-revolutionising formula? Is it not this? "The Universal alone is; the un-universalised individual is absolutely worthless, false, and unreal." The equivalent phrase most familiar in religious experience is "Conviction of sin"; and that, again, is the "real assent" to the theological dogma of "original sin."

We may for the present disregard the connection of the doctrine of original sin with that of a "fall." But it is essential to note that the idea of original sin is just that of an *individual* centre, origin, or principle of energy in a being at a stage of capability for functional manifestation of an *universal* principle. We cannot relate religious to philosophical and scientific conceptions otherwise than by showing them to be really identical. If we want to know what right or wrong condition or relationship means in the spiritual order we must see what these things are in the physical order, and in that part of the physical order where the analogy is suggested by the terms, health and disease, or generally by correspondent facts. That, of course, is the organic, and preferably the animal organic. The health of any part of an organism depends on due participation of the integral life. Disease results from privation or perversion of supply from the vital centres. The individual parts, or cells composing them, become independent and self-centred, and are then immediately exposed to the influence of agencies which the organic life resisted. If a cell thus dissociated from the general organic life were conscious, its disintegrative tendency would seem voluntary. In fact, it *would* be voluntary (or spontaneous), as pursuing the affinities of its elementary life with cognate external forces. So far, no doubt, analogy suggests a "fall," but in the power of depraved subordinated centres to generate tissue homogeneous with their own separative and thus diseased life, we have that physical condition which exactly corresponds to the conception of "original" sin in the offspring of this generation. Moreover, we have in the fact of unassimilated food, substances offered to the organism, but not yet chemically assumed into it, an analogy, *without* that of the "fall," to beings who *ought* to partake of the integral life, and to be resolved into it, but who have not already experienced it, and who, being still self-assertive, resist the assimilating power. Now the organism and its actual or possible components stand in the relation of universality and individuality. The actual components are particles which have yielded up their elementary independence of life and quality—their individualism—to a process of conversion made possible on that condition alone; the organic, that is, the Universal, has given to them, has made spontaneous in them, its own life and will-spirit, and thereby the elementary, that is, the individual, is said to be universalised, in that it now exhibits the integral will-spirit, its own independent will-spirit being completely in abeyance. Universalisation is not destruction of *individuality*, which remains as functional and conscious; but of *individualism* it is the destruction. Whether, infinitesimally, we might not discover "individuality" itself to be integration in a lower order, and so on as far as we can trace the conception in nature, is not here the question, though that the fact is so I am myself philosophically convinced. It is sufficient for the present purpose to assume individuality in a *relative* sense; as that which, in the order of ascent, presents itself as the unit for a higher integration.

Analogy, therefore, justifies the definition of original sin as neither more nor less than individualism. So, also, it carries the consequence that individualism is not "curable" by the individual as such, who cannot be morally improved out of it without the agency of the universal principle, which must thus be conceived as in energy, and not merely *in posse*. Upon the great metaphysical question of whether

individuality has any necessary or eternal subsistence, or is merely a mode, limitation, or determination of the universal self (Atma), we need not now enter. We are also exempted for the present from the problem of "Free will," which may be defined as the power of the will to get behind its modality, behind its apparent self, and find a deeper self in a negation of that. Free will leads ultimately to self-identification with the Absolute and Universal, and the doctrine of Free will is the dynamical correlate of the doctrine of the Atma. Now, as has been already said, a conception which can mediate our relation to truth is not at all necessarily one which presents truth in an unexceptionable metaphysical form to the intellect. Least of all shall we allow ourselves to be embarrassed by those different senses of the word "self," which, for the practical religious consciousness, are a mere verbal juggle. It is the modal self, the modal will, the self and will of consciousness, which seems to condemn itself, however metaphysically true it may be that that very condemnation is the first evolution in consciousness of the "self within the self." What we are concerned with is that at the moment of "conviction," "sin" is conceived quite otherwise than in the sense of "transgression." For at that moment consciousness goes to the root of the matter, no longer knowing sin only by the occasional light of conscience, as this or that *manifestation* which might have been avoided, but seeing it in its essential character as self-centrality. That is the religious moment; all preceding ones are merely moral. It is the "real assent" to the dogma of original sin. While the individual is "under the law" (morality), he has no conviction of sin, but only of sins. He does not know (and he is now seldom taught) that the moral life is not the state of Christianity, and still less that it may even be far from a good preparation for that state. Nothing, for instance, can more strikingly betray the remoteness of the so-called religious classes of this country from religion, than their excessive horror of transgression, commonly degenerating into excessive condemnation of the transgressor. I am not for a moment questioning the wholesomeness, in its own order, of a strong moral sentiment, though it is preferably directed to oneself than to others. But I do deny that it is a religious sentiment, and we cannot fail to see that it is usually mistaken for that. No one under true conviction of sin will ever fall into that mistake. Those who have made this experience, and are fired with the zeal of a conversion which they often prematurely suppose to be consummated in themselves (whereas it is a later, though proximately later, moment), are especially animated by the love of sinners, and moral indignation disappears altogether in Christian charity and fervour. This is due entirely to the fact of their discovery that nothing but sin is to be expected from self-centred humanity, and that sin revealed in transgressions is more likely to open the soul to the great "conviction," than sin coiled up like a serpent in the bosom of the "moral" man. Another note of the superficiality of the latter is the disproportionate attention he gives to certain transgressions belonging to crises of passion and temptation, whereas little, daily manifestations of the most hateful dispositions seem to him comparatively unimportant. He cannot, forsooth! "condone sin," his estimate of "sin" being altogether conventional, and his own spiritual status somewhat on a par with the position, æsthetically, of the uncultured mind, whose imagination can only be stimulated by the sensational horrors of the "Penny Dreadful."

Swift on "conviction of sin" follows real assent to the great mystery of religion—regeneration, definable as the universalisation of the individual, his resurrection in Christ, the Universal Manhood, after death to self-centred individuality. Conviction of sin is the terrible moment of knowledge that the individual is under this condemnation. It is the first consciousness of the individual that this is the will of the Father in him, and that this cup cannot pass away. The true revelation of Christianity had not to wait for any date of exegetical unfoldment. It was explicit in the Christian world from the very first moment of recognition that Christianity is the Imitation of Christ. That was the one thing needful. And this recognition is also the first consciousness of the love of truth. It is not truth in a proposition that we can truly love. It is the truth which makes us *free*—free from the horrible slavery of the nascent Humanity in us to attach-

\* In his work, "The Grammar of Assent."



ments of the flesh and of the mind, free from that self which sums up sin and is its reality and root. It is the truth in which we can "walk." It is also emancipation from a great power outside ourselves to which our own separation from the universal principle has subjected us. When we understand the power of what is rightly, but to most unintelligibly, called the "astral," we shall know that we are constantly hypnotised by mighty influences, and that many dispositions, opinions, and sentiments which seem most spontaneous, most closely and entirely our own, are really of the order of those suggestions, which in a partial psychical experience we are now learning to recognise. Communities, parties, sections of society are always thus hypnotising their members. "Madness," said Jacobi, "when epidemic, is called reason." "It is certain," said Novalis, "that my conviction gains infinitely the moment one other soul believes with me." Half of our opinions are caught by infection, or become passionate prejudice by sympathetic environment. But collective dispositions are acted upon and inflamed, and their effects are aggravated, by cognate influences which stream upon the world from the psychical qualities and activities of the solar system. When the phenomenon of telepathy comes to be fully recognised among ourselves, there will be less difficulty than is now felt in conceiving, first, that such psychical activities must be greatly more powerful for projection when accumulated in groups of agents, whose unanimity individualises them for the purpose; and, secondly, that this world is, in fact, acted upon in this way by other world-souls of the universe, and doubtless reacts upon them. The hypnotisation of the world is a study for a future philosophy. Only one will, one spirit, is beyond the power of this hypnotism, and that is the Universal and Divine. That, therefore, is the truth. But it can only dominate and inspire us if we give ourselves up to it, foregoing that independence which became subjection to the astral powers. Let me illustrate this by a historical reference. After the Northern conquerors established themselves finally over the provinces of the old Roman Empire, and introduced the feudal system, the original proprietors who were left in possession of their lands, were not all at once subjected to the conditions of feudal tenure. Their estates were what was called *allodial*, and were free from service. But in the new condition of society this independence was soon found to be intolerable. Outside the organisation of the feudal system hardly any protection from rapine and lawlessness existed, and so it came to pass that the free proprietor came voluntarily into that system, surrendering his lands to a lord, whose "man" he undertook to become, and receiving them back on the condition of service and with the right of protection. Well, our case is analogous to that. Property is only an external symbol of that most intimate *proprium*, our will. It is this, as individualistic, which we surrender, and receive again, impressed with universal quality, from our "Lord." We cannot protect our independence from the powers of delusion, we must become God's "men," and enter the Divine organisation.

The love of truth was just now described as ensuing on the conviction of sin. It would be more accurate to say that the latter is the first manifestation of the former. Let us take a rapid survey of this moment of spiritual experience, having regard only to what underlies its accidental expressions under the influence of religious preconceptions. Conviction of sin is the real assent to a proposition of which we can easily get a notional apprehension from philosophical observation of the world and of ourselves. It is the *vanity of vanities* of the Preacher; it is the pessimism of modern despair. The truth is not in us; it is not in the world; it is not in culture, not in civilisation, not in intellect. Enough for the individual that it is not in him. What does that mean? And how is "sin" translatable for us? Let us see.

As nothing in the universe is isolated, or exists for itself otherwise than as itself is a part of the whole, the truth of anything is in right relationship. But nothing which should be a part of the whole can ever discover of itself its true place in the whole—its right relationship—without such a knowledge of the whole as belongs only to the integral spirit or life. In the case of individual man, that spirit or life may be in him, and then he is assuredly in right relation to the world, which is by no means equivalent to saying that the world is in right relation to him.

In every organic whole the integral spirit is a will which has superseded every separatist tendency by conversion of component wills to itself. This conversion has in it the two moments of sacrifice and reconstitution, of death and resurrection. But we are now concerned with what is anterior to that. The end of man being organic unity, this end is offered to his consciousness for recognition in many persuasive but inexplicit ways. And so the recognition, when effected, will follow just that mode of representation by which it was procured. The result will be true, but the statement of the result will take the appropriate religious form which may be current. Now, "conviction of sin" is nothing more nor less than a sense of non-accordance with the true law of our being, and consequent false relationship. It is as if a comet should suddenly discover that it ought to be a planet, that it was intended by Nature to belong to a solar system, out of which it has wandered by its own eccentric will. But it is always by a revelation of the true motion that the existing motion is seen to be false. The fervent exhortation to "come to Jesus" could excite no emotional response if it did not awaken the consciousness of a false orbit by reference to a true one. Popular religion cannot be expected to distinguish accurately the several movements of the critical experience which it mediates. Thus "conviction of sin" is often spoken of as "conversion." It really is merely the first "real assent" to a proposition of which the notional apprehension was already familiar through dogmatic instruction. It is not in itself a turning of the will to its right centre. It is not the death of self-sacrifice, and still less is it the glorious moment of resurrection by restoration of integral Humanity. The anticipation of this consummation may impart to it a premature joy, which is facilitated by merciful ignorance of what the *process* of the Cross really implies. When the soul in Egyptian bondage first proposes its liberation it knows nothing of the wilderness. There seems but a step across the frontier to the Promised Land. But in its true character, conviction of sin is a passage from peace of mind and sense to a profound disturbance of the whole consciousness. As a man is not affected by a misfortune or latent disease while he is still ignorant of it, or incredulous of warnings, so the whole comfort of the world depends on absence of any "real assent" to the idea that it is aberrant from its centre. There is no doubt that people are far happier when they have flung aside religious teachings altogether, than while there is a notional assent always in danger of passing into a real one. The most uneasy people in the world, as they are also the least sincere, are the half religious. It is perhaps this circumstance, rather than any offence to æsthetic or cultured sensibility, that makes it so depressing to mingle in some Protestant congregations. In Catholicism, on the other hand, the high significance attached to the sacramental system and rites appropriates much of the real assent which these features in it are so well adapted to develop, and thus in the churches of the old faith we are moved not less to sympathy with what is sincere, than to admiration of what is beautiful, and love of what is venerable.

The account given sufficiently distinguishes the conception of *sin* from that of sins, or transgressions. We may at first be disposed to regard the latter as mere fruitage or evidence of the false will in which sin consists, symptoms of the disease rather than the disease itself, and then to be perplexed by such expressions as forgiveness or remission of sins, which seem to regard the act and effect rather than the source and cause. But every act or expression of the will is a substantialisation or embodiment of its quality. No psychical act evaporates as soon as it seems to be done with; it weaves organically, lays down a line of least resistance for future energies, and clothes the naked will with nature. That is the primary effect. But until this process of naturing evil is far advanced, there is another effect, a shock of the soul at the self-revelation of its will, which may be so vehement as only to require confirmation by a correspondent act to make it a sufficient counteraction. This shock is repentance, its confirmatory act is penance.\* As conviction of sin is a radical disclosure

\*I know that many would protest against this, crying out, "not penance, but amendment." This, however, is to confuse two distinct things. Amendment is a (possible) consequence, and awaits opportunity, whereas what is here regarded is the *fixing* of a psychical state of uncertain force, definitude, and duration, by an immediate act and expression. Penance is the objective completion of contrition.

of the evil of the very will itself, and has its confirmation in that radical consequence of the total sacrifice of the will; so repentance is the same thing in relation to that small accretion of evil investment which is the effect of every transgression. Confirmed repentance is thus in itself the remission of a sin, that is, the removal of its natural consequence, and absolution is only the announcement of this fact, for the peace of the soul. But forgiveness or remission of sins is no more than a re-establishment of what, in diplomatic language, is called the *status quo ante*. It replaces the will in its state before the transgression which is remitted, and has no greater efficacy or significance. It does not go to the root of the matter.\*

Let us now return to the original proposition to which all that has been said refers, that relation to truth is not primarily of the intellect, but of the will. Our truth, the only truth essentially important to any one, is *true being*. The problem of religion is a very simple one, and is in perfect scientific analogy with the process of nature. It is the spiritual integration of mankind. The true social integration here on earth will follow upon that surely enough, and will follow upon nothing else than that. We have got to fall into position. Scientific religion appeals to physiology,† founding itself in earnest on language which the so-called Christian world has long regarded and repeated as mere figure of speech. To be in Christ, to be members of His Body, to be born again in Him, and similar phrases familiar to us have a realistic significance for those who believe that nature on our plane is correspondent in regard to constructive processes, and a revelation to us in these of Divine conditions. That life in every order substantialises, and always upon a similar formative idea or plan—this is the clue we have to follow, and which we shall follow with the more confidence, finding that the scientific analogy leads to just that result which is accordant with the conceptions of philosophical religion. Only in organic integration is the reconciliation of the Universal with the Individual, of God with Man, possible. The one must govern, animate, and inspire; the other must function. But then we must not be content with this general idea, but must have regard to the process of its realisation. Many now seem to believe in a self-organising power, in a power of the human atoms so to polarise themselves by sympathy that they have no occasion to look beyond themselves and each other for the integral result. We hear much in these days of the Brotherhood of Man, and comparatively little—even when the idea is not explicitly rejected—of affiliation to God. Those who can get at the fraternal relation except through the filial may be congratulated on a discovery. But it is not Nature; nor does science offer any warrant for expecting a conversion of aggregation into organism without the operation of a life which is assimilative and constructive. Science cannot tell us, I do not think she expects ever to be able to tell us, what the organising principle is. Biologists will no longer call it Vital Force, but are unable to give it any other name expressive of positive knowledge. Whatever it should be called, it is a power of assimilating what is subjected to it, of bringing whatever is capable of being so converted into the organic unity. Thus analogy requires spiritual integration to be effected by a power other than that of the particles to be integrated. These must be capable of the conversion; there must be latent affinity. That is only to say that the particle must be digestible. Very strikingly does the French Theosophist, Claude de St. Martin, put the case as regards man, when he says: "We must be devoured as a prey by all the powers of the Lord." All through Nature it is the same; mediation by proximates. The vegetable takes up the mineral, the animal the vegetable; the higher animal organism converts the lower to its own tissue. In every case there is subjection of the lower to the higher, not an originally spontaneous activity of the lower. If the truth of man is his true being in integration, and love of truth is a turning to the universal which is the principle of integra-

tion, then love of truth must take the form of *faith* in the universal, because the latter is not yet manifest in integration. And this is my conclusion, that love of truth is just that very faith to which Rationalism would oppose it. How this object of faith is formulated for the intellect is a matter of secondary importance. If anyone likes to call it his own higher self there is no objection, if only it is remembered that this higher self, in the sense required, is not *only* yours or mine, but the higher self of us all. Nevertheless, I do not mean that faith is to turn away from any individual manifestation of the universal principle on our own plane of existence. The man of faith will discern this more readily than others. He will know that the vitality of his own faith, or love of truth, can only be tested by promptitude to co-operate with the universal spirit whenever and wherever he can see it to have obtained, or to be struggling to obtain, footing on the earth. But he will not be solicitous about results after he has done all in his own power to secure them. Apparent failure will not disturb a faith which does not rest on manifestation. He knows that "except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it," and it may well be that efforts to promote public justice or sympathy, or to help one another externally, though possibly true testimonies, a beginning of universal life in the agent, may not be the right means of awakening the universal life in those whom it is proposed to benefit or to persuade. And that is the only end which the integrating spirit can regard. To our sensuous condition of well-being as an end in itself that spirit must be perfectly indifferent. Perhaps it is indifferent to much besides, that we regard as important. All this, however, is only added to repel the supposition that there is no essential connection between public effort or private philanthropy and faith in the unseen. Many now imagine they have no faith because they have no longer a formula. But wherever there is love of truth, of true-being, of true relationship, there is Faith.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

A few words may be added on the characteristic distinction between the conceptions of denial of individual self in Christianity and in Buddhism, as also in the Advaita, or non-dualistic school (represented by Sankaracharya) of interpretation of the Upanishads.

In Christianity the denial is a *refusal*, whereas in Buddhism, &c., it retains, and primarily has, its first signification of *negation*. The one religion says: The personal Ego must be *overcome*, turned away from, refused; the other says: It is *not*; you must see it to be a fiction of consciousness, a mere self-limitation of the Universal, which is the only true "Self." The discipline, or method, of the Eastern religion is thus apparently rather intellectual than what we should call devotional. Religion is arrived at through philosophy. But it is a philosophy so intense, so realised, so in earnest, that every moment of contemplation carries with it a practical renunciation. In both systems there is a realisation in consciousness of what is by a negation of what essentially is *not*; but in the one, the Divine Union is conceived as identification without distinction; in the other, the Christian, the Union is conceived as organic, an idea which is followed in the foregoing paper.

**THE JOY OF TRUTH.**—The days of martyrdom for opinion's sake are over; but even when it was at its height, the joy of the belief, the faith and the trust which the truth inspired, rose triumphant over all the pains and sorrows which the cruelty of man could devise. And that joy remains to all who care for truth. To those who search for her and find her, and treasure her when found, she will prove a friend who will never disappoint, and a joy which none can take away.

**THE UNIVERSAL CHRIST.**—Christ is not shut up. Neither in churches nor in nations can He find room to breathe. He is all men's sky—the Vital Element in which all souls have their being. Nations and churches have their partialities and boundaries: He is impartial and universal. Otherwise, indeed, He would not be the Christ of God. If we assume His Name and consecrate ourselves to His Service we must minister in His own Spirit, and not in the narrow and hard spirit either of Conformity or Nonconformity. Whoever goes forth to men in Christ for Christ, in him Christ will go forth, sowing His precious seed, and doubtless He shall come, by-and-bye, to the kingdom of Kingdoms bringing His golden sheaves.—REV. JNO. PULSFORD.

\* Herein the teaching of the Council of Trent is explicit; that "Sin which separates the soul from God is only annulled by love which unites it to Him."

† Says the Theosophist, James Pierrepont Greaves, "It is not, perhaps, too much to hope, that a day is not very far distant when the religious philosopher will, from a few anatomical, physiological, and pathological observations, be led to confirm, in a scientific manner, the simple plan after which the Divine Architect generates, and of which the joyful fact has been mystically revealed as His own being."—"Triune Life Divine and Human," p. 46. Elliot Stock, 1880. (I am sorry to say that this admirable little book is now out of print.)