

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—*Goethe.*

"WHATEVER DOETH MAKE MANIFEST IS LIGHT."—*Paul.*

No. 664.—VOL. XIII. [Registered as a Newspaper] SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1893. [Registered as a Newspaper] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Notes by the Way	481
What do the Dead Know of the Living?	482
Foreign Papers	482
Records of Private Seances	483
Rev. Minot J. Savage on Mr. Jay Hudson	484
Mysterious Fires in Holland	485
Rudyard Kipling and the Occult	486
The Founders of the Theosophical Society	487
Saints and Mediums	487
Psychical Phenomena	489
Letters to the Editor	489-92
Society Work	492
Idealism	493

Leymarie rehabilitated in 1892. Into the merits of the case we have no wish to enter, we were only desirous of pointing out certain inaccuracies patent in the story as given in "L'Irradiation."

NOTES BY THE WAY.

An important supplement is issued with this week's "LIGHT." "C.C.M.," our able and ever-welcome contributor, has written with his usual insight on Idealism. This supplement is most valuable.

We are not likely to get much from the Church Congress which has been just sitting in Birmingham. One thing, however, has already been brought out—the curious notions entertained by members of the ecclesiastical body on the subject of worship. Lord Halifax having pleaded that the celebration of the Eucharist was the only true act of Christian worship, Sir R. Lighton followed, and spoke on the opposite side, saying that "A material God, locally present, demanded recognition; incense, lights, and posings all belonged to the conception of such a God." Then the Dean of Winchester made some strange remarks for a dean. He said, "If worship was full and well-balanced it answered to the right development of man's nature on every side—his soul, his social nature, and his intellect. If the groping after the unseen, the desire to realise the divine, was the only element of our worship, we ran a risk of sinking to the level of that sacrificial and localised worship which was the mark of heathendom." "Groping after the unseen" is a strange phrase to be uttered by a dignitary of a Christian Church in this semi-contemptuous connection; for the desire to realise the divine evidently does not commend itself to the Dean of Winchester. But, then, how could it?—witness the decanal view of man's constitution—his soul, his social nature, and his intellect.

We have received a letter from Madame Leymarie, who writes, in the absence of her husband, to contradict the report that he has ceased to be Editor of the "Revue Spirite." Not only does Madame Leymarie indignantly deny the asserted retirement, but she sends very important evidence, in the shape of a notice which appears in the "Revue Spirite" for September, according to which notice subscribers are requested to still send their subscriptions to M. Leymarie, 1, Rue Chabanais. We desire to make this rectification, and regret that the information came too late for last week's issue. With regard to the "Note by the Way" in "LIGHT" of September 23rd, from an account of the trial of MM. Leymarie and Buguet which has been forwarded to us our Note seems to be quite justified. However great may have been the miscarriage of justice, and however much sympathy we may have for M. Leymarie, the accusation was that of obtaining money by false pretences in the matter of spirit photographs, and not for saying "imaginary and fantastic things." Buguet afterwards, when he was in Belgium, made an affidavit exonerating M. Leymarie from all complicity, and the judgment was reversed and M.

And here the remark may well be made, that "LIGHT" gives gleanings from the foreign journals simply as such, without endorsing the assertions made in them. The names of the papers quoted are always given, and it is on those papers that the responsibility lies for all the assertions made. Some of them bear their own condemnation on their very face, yet there may crop up now and again certain truthful stories of strange and uncommon psychic experiences which it would be a pity to lose. There is, for instance, in this week's "LIGHT" an extraordinary story of fire-raising which looks at first ridiculous in its improbability, yet in "LIGHT" for October 7th, p. 476, we find an account of similar occurrences vouched for by no less important a person than M. Aksakoff.

There is once more an outburst of Occultism, or Magic, or whatever they may choose to call it, in the magazines. Now one begins to wonder how these stories are manufactured. The "Proceedings" of the Society for Psychical Research used to be responsible for many of them, but those "Proceedings" have become too prosaic. Your magazine ghost, like all other intoxicants, must have more potency as its use becomes more general. A haunted house! Well, we can away with that. We are so used to it now that all the bells in the world, if all rung at once by unseen hands, would not turn a hair of us; so we want something more piquant, and profitably ghastly. Apparently acting on some such principle, the "English Illustrated Magazine" has a short article called "The Claw," which is a story of soul-selling to the devil of the good old type, only with prettier pictures than of yore. There are also bottle-imps in the tale, which bottle-imps come out when "The Claw" catches the magician and have a good time, the innocent victim who is brought in to account for the catastrophe having an equally bad time.

Now, what does this kind of story mean? If such a history as that of "The Claw" is founded on fact, why not let us have the facts? If there are no facts, the story is not a compliment to the intelligence of the readers of the magazine in which it appears. That the greater number of the important personages living in Venice when Jessica was so troubled had sold themselves to the devil, is very likely true, but the parchment evidence of these sales is quite another question. Of course it may be said that all stories of the supernatural are false; but if so, they need not be silly. Moreover, they are not all false.

An announcement of considerable interest appears in another column of "LIGHT." This announcement is that a memorial edition of "Spirit Teachings" will shortly be issued. No more fitting monument could be raised to Stainton Moses than this issue of his best and most enduring work. Intending subscribers should send in their orders without a day's delay, as it is necessary, before completing the work, to have some idea of the number required.

WHAT DO THE DEAD KNOW OF THE LIVING?

In the *Revue des Nouvelles Idées*, published in Paris, there has appeared a paper on the above subject, by Israel Lévy. The *Literary Digest* gives the following condensation of the article:—

The tomb is a mystery which has puzzled the doctors of the Talmud. If the rabbinical writings are more sober than those of the Christians when they treat this question, the former have, nevertheless, bequeathed to us many proofs of the discussions to which this insoluble problem has given rise. There are some particularly interesting pages of the Talmud in which this point is argued. On the one hand, it is asked: "Does not the Bible say that 'the dead know not anything' (Ecclesiastes ix. 5)?" To this question the answer is given: the dead of whom this verse speaks are not those who are really dead, but the wicked, who even in their lifetime are already called dead.

On the other hand, the opinion of a number of rabbis is cited, all of whom appear to admit the continuance of sensibility in the dead, at least for a time. In support of this opinion a number of anecdotes are related in the Talmud. These anecdotes shock our taste, and make us ask if grave doctors really could have used arguments of such a kind. It would be easy to believe they had not, if other theologians of the same period had not, in discussing the same question, made use of similar arguments. Who would expect to discover in St. Augustine a repetition, and, as it were, illustration of the Talmud? Yet you can find in his works exactly such things. In his commentary on the 108th Psalm he says:—

"Are the dead pained by what happens to their family after they have passed away? Can we believe that they know of it, when we are aware that, far from this earth, their feelings are absorbed in their own happiness or wretchedness, according to their merits? I will answer, first, that it is a grave question which there is not space to discuss at this moment, because of the long explanation it would require to make clear whether the spirits of the dead are acquainted with what passes on the earth, as well as how far and how they have such acquaintance. I can say to you, however, in a brief sentence, that if the dead take no interest in us, the Lord would not have put in the mouth of the rich man tormented in Hell these words, expressing a wish to have Lazarus sent to his father's house: 'For I have five brethren: that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.' (Luke xvi. 28)."

Subsequently St. Augustine treated the subject at length in a little work entitled "*De Cura Gerenda pro Mortuis*." Here he cites the cases of the dead who have appeared during sleep or in some other manner to living persons, who were entirely ignorant of the place where the bodies of these dead persons were lying unburied, since the latter begged the living to procure the tomb of which their apparitions were deprived. He then goes on to tell, in regard to such appearances, several stories, which shock our taste as much as the stories in the Talmud. In Chapter xvi. of his opusculum he has this sort of argument:—

"How can anyone say that Abraham did not know what was passing on the earth, when he knew that men have Moses and the prophets, and that, by obeying these, they would escape punishment; in the other world (Luke xvi. 27)? Abraham knew, moreover, that the rich man in his lifetime had received his 'good things and likewise Lazarus evil things.' . . . I answer that Abraham was ignorant of these matters when the persons mentioned were living in the world, but after their death, by reason of the revelations which Lazarus could have made to him, he became acquainted with these affairs, in order not to belie the words of the prophet, 'Abraham did not know us.' . . . We must, then, recognise the fact that the dead do not know what passes on the earth at the time the things happen, but afterwards they become acquainted with such things by means of those whose death sends to the other world. . . . The angels who preside over the administration of things in this world may also make revelations to the dead."

St. Augustine closes by confessing his uncertainty. In him reason struggles with faith—that is, faith in these stories, which he believed as firmly as Holy Writ.

Is it not interesting to find in theologians, who appear to be at the antipodes of place and thought, of whom some were living in Palestine and Babylonia, far from all centres of general culture, and others in Africa, brought up on classical literature and philosophy, such striking resemblances in the questions

which occupy their thoughts, in the manner of arguing these questions, in the method of interpretation of the facts, and even in the nature of the stories which they bring forward in support of their theses, or which they wish to reconcile with their theories?

One feels a little amused at this sort of thing. To think of "one's taste being shocked" by stories of the knowledge of the living possessed by the dead! That the meaning of the world beyond the grave should be resolved into a question of "taste" would be ludicrous if it were not so utterly feeble.

GLEANINGS FROM THE FOREIGN PRESS.

ASTOUNDING CASE OF OBSESSION.

A Russian review ("*Rousskaia-Starina*") publishes the memoirs of M. Valerien Panaïew, two of whose relatives have greatly distinguished themselves in literature and art. In these reminiscences a most extraordinary circumstance is mentioned as having occurred to another very near relative, and although it may be reckoned by many as almost surpassing belief, it appears to be authentic. It is not, of course, a more wonderful case than that of Nebuchadnezzar, but the latter happened so long ago, and so far away, that, in the language of the Scottish collier, it might be hoped it "*wasna true*." The victim in this case was also an elegant, educated, rich, and distinguished gentleman who became covered with hair after the death of a brother named Volodia, whose gaze was so disagreeable that no one could support it. The victim used to chase his brother out of his presence for that reason. One day after his obsession the parents determined to seize the unfortunate man by force, and have him washed. He escaped from the house and got into a kind of pantry shed, remaining there, on his feet and naked, for a period of twenty years. His position was a most inconvenient one, his body being bent and his arms hanging down, but without touching the ground. His hair grew in a thick mass and descended over his forehead to the floor. His eyes and mouth closed. He did not speak, but lowed. Once in eight days about a score of porringers filled with potato scrapings, &c., were placed before him by his own orders, and this he lapped up, nothing else being eaten during the whole week. He ordered the glass to be removed from the window frames of the pantry, which was not warmed in any way. His old nurse who had brought up the two brothers, saw him daily. She alone understood his lowings. Twelve years after his seizure she died, when he opened his eyes and mouth and spoke, telling them that it was not by his own will he was there, and cried "Volodia! When will you liberate me?" They tried to force him out of the shed in order to take him to Kazan, but although they succeeded in getting him out, he eluded their grasp and got in again. In spite of the extreme cold he did not appear to suffer; and when his relative, M. Panaïew, visited him on two occasions, the conversation turned on literature, social events, and authors of renown, besides some of his old university acquaintances and comrades. His mother and sister read the newspapers to him, and also the reviews and new books. After the death of the former he left the shed for a few days, clothed himself, received the authorities, completed certain necessary formalities, and then returned to the shed for a time. The malediction, bewitching, or hypnotism—whatever it was—lost its force. By-and-by he resumed his normal existence and lived until within the last few years. He was fond of the drama and of music, married subsequently, and was visited by his relative, M. Panaïew, as late as 1883. These particulars are from the version of the story given by the "*Messenger*," of Liège.

[We wonder where this story really originated. Facts and fiction are convertible terms with some of these foreign journals. The "*Messenger*" of Liège is not too particular.—Ed. "LIGHT."]

The same journal quotes the following from the "*Journal des Débats*":—

A HAUNTED HOUSE AT ST. MAUR.

This time it is not to a dirty lodging, or to interested lodging-house keepers, that the ghosts who usually do the honours of old castles have come to disturb the living. They have chosen a recently constructed charming villa, situated at St. Maur, and inhabited by an engineer, M. Lange, and his wife. Two days ago the former was visited by one of his friends, a

M. Mercier. While they were both working well into the night M. Mercier heard a noise in the dining-room about two o'clock in the morning. Was it a delusion? No! M. Lange also heard the sound of footsteps in the same room. The steps sounded like those of several persons hurriedly seeking something to right and left, and were well marked. Without doubt some cracksmen had got into the house. M. Lange awakened his wife and took a revolver, while his friend armed himself with a cavalry sword. The dining-room was besieged in military style (a curious expression for the "Journal des Debats" to employ in describing such a simple matter). The search was useless—the ghosts had gone. The two friends were already congratulating themselves, when, under their very noses, the sounds recommenced, while at the same time noises like scratching on the door were heard. On opening the latter, nothing was visible or audible. The phenomena stopped there, and M. Lange has affirmed that all doors and windows were undoubtedly closed; that he has no animal in the house; and that the sounds were to him quite inexplicable.

EUSAPIA PALLADINO.

The following description of the above famous medium is extracted by the "Revue Spirite" from "Cosmos." She is a robust little woman, about thirty-five years old, and is married, her husband being a carpenter and she herself an ironer. It has been known amongst her friends that from her earliest years she possessed a strange power whose nature no one could comprehend. When she was asked what she thought of it herself, she would reply, "How can I know?" The people about her, being of the uneducated class, laughed at her, and as the exercise of her singular gift fatigued her considerably, she made up her mind that it was not worth while using it. In fact, the mysterious influence inspired her with such an aversion to it that for ten years she declined to make any experiments. It was only at the urgent request of Signor Ercole Chiaia that she consented to employ her enigmatical power again. Signor Chiaia occupies a considerable position in Naples, and his good faith is beyond question. The researches undertaken by the scientific people in Milan have given rise to a good deal of controversy, and they have also excited a certain amount of scepticism. One day a journalist by chance met Eusapia in the street, and asked her to go with him, as his wife was anxious to see her. Madame Palladino consented. At the journalist's house they brought the kitchen table into the drawing-room, and all the members of the family sat around it. It immediately rose from the floor about six inches, and remained suspended in the air for several seconds. This occurred about four o'clock in the afternoon, while the windows were unscreened. Eusapia asked that the blinds might be closed, and that was done. There was still light enough left in the room to enable those present to see Eusapia's figure and permit them to observe her movements. In spite of this, the usual phenomena were produced—movements of furniture, noises, apparitions of hands, &c. The journalist was impressed, and, next day, he took in hand the defence of Eusapia in his paper. He pointed out that she was in a house where she had never been before, and had nothing prepared for her arrival, since she was unexpected. She knew no one. None of those present believed in the power of spirits, and she could have no accomplice. The gentleman was well-known and respected, but public opinion was ill-disposed towards the subject. One journal even declared that it was a disgrace to the town. The Mayor called to inquire. He was present with some men of science at one séance, which was held at the house of Signor Finzi, situated in the Via Monte di Pietà. It took place in the library. The Mayor states that at that time he felt a hand pass over his face. The hand was large, moist, and rough, or hairy, and he adds that it certainly was not the hand of Eusapia Palladino. The same "Revue" has one of the most wonderful rat stories that was ever written or read.

RECORDS OF PRIVATE SEANCES.

FROM NOTES TAKEN AT THE TIME OF EACH SITTING.

No. LXIV.

FROM THE RECORDS OF MRS. S.

November 2nd, 1879.—We had a short séance with the usual circle, Miss B., Miss C., and Mr. P. being also present. We had much rapping and scent. Mr. S. M. saw a figure standing near Charlton. Something was heard to drop on the table. Kabbila rapped for the alphabet; the message was given: "For my charge." We found a cameo placed in front of Charlton. We were then told to break, and on returning to the room a cross was brought for Miss C.

December 21st.—Miss B. and Mr. P. sat with the circle this evening. Much rapping was heard, and scent was brought. Imperator then controlled, and said:—

"Prayer does not reach within the spheres of contemplation, but the higher your aspirations, the more benefit will be received. Prayer should be merely aspiration, the striving after a high ideal by means of the spiritual assistance of the guardians around you. The highest ideal that you can now frame will, as you grow spiritually, be superseded by one higher still. As to anthropomorphism, get rid of it, get rid of it, for it is of the earth earthy. The Christ has recently returned from the spheres of contemplation and he is now specially acting on this world. The times of distress of which he spoke have now come: Behold, I have told you before and so we warn you now. In every domain of your life underlying principles are being sapped, and nothing is too sacred to be called in question. This medium cannot rest on account of the conflicting forces which centre round him. Hope for the future, not for the present, for the end is not yet."

February 22nd, 1880.—This evening Mr. Percival and Miss B. sat with us. After the usual physical manifestations a spirit unknown to the circle communicated by raps and said that his name was "Samuel Arrowsmith." "My people," he said, "have lost a mourning ring in memory of me." No further information was then given, but Imperator controlled and said, speaking of him and his friends:—

"This mental distress acts on him: some of our friends know where the ring is, and this has brought him to the circle. Times have not improved since we last met; a crisis will come which will inaugurate a new order of things. Long ago we told you that attacks would be made on the existing embodiments of order in each country: in Spain, in Germany, in Italy, and still more in Russia. This has been the case, and a still more terrible manifestation of discord is to come. Socialism, Communism, Atheism, Nihilism, different names for the same insidious malady, are on the increase in your world. Possibly these forces may be utilised for good when they have spent their powers, but at present they are wielded by the adversaries, who animate the principles of disorder in order to oppose our work. Not only in all social and political relations, but also in religion, there is no union or harmony. Your politics—that is, the history of your country—as now being made, are strangely disorganised. There is no progress and no development. Disorder and dis-harmony prevail everywhere, and no one will sink his private differences in defence of any common truth. The individual himself is full of perplexity and bewilderment, and there is universal distress and searching of heart. Three years ago we told you of this, and we pointed to the remedy. Jesus said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword." He promulgated a new truth, and in such cases there must be strife, for some will receive it and some not. Your epoch is so material, so earthy, so beset by the machinations of the adversaries, that conflict and distress are inevitable. The spiritual movement has been waning and losing power until it becomes doubtful whether the popular form in which our efforts are known can be maintained. In time to come the hidden and inner form of Spiritualism will take its place before the world, but not yet. Spiritualism will then pass into another phase, but a vast number of people still rest in the lower manifestations and can derive spiritual knowledge from no other source. The old methods of communion must in time give place to new ones. The investigator now deals with forces that are not on a moral plane, and whose powers he cannot fathom. All who now meddle with Spiritualism do it at their own risk, and those who are not guarded imperil their own spirits. No

CHRISTO-THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.—The following meetings will be held, at 4 p.m.:—Tuesday, October 24th: Rev. G. W. Allen, "A discussion as to the future of the Society." Tuesday, November 7th: Mr. J. W. Farquhar, "Inspiration." Tuesday, November 21st: Rev. R. W. Corbet, "Human Growth." Tuesday, December 5th: Mrs. Boole, "An account of 'L'Union Spirite.'" The place of meeting will be 33, Bloomsbury-square, where the society will still be the guest of Mr. and Mrs. R. Mayley. All persons interested in the free discussion of Christian philosophy are invited to attend.—GEORGE W. ALLEN, President.

one is privileged to be in the forefront of the conflict without earning for himself either a blessing or a curse."

Imperator concluded with a solemn prayer that we might be protected from the power of the adversaries, and increase in spiritual knowledge day by day, in order that our eyes might be opened to the manifold dangers encompassing our path.

February 29th. To-day, after we had finished our dinner, and the servants had left the room, raps came on the table, and we were told through the alphabet that the ring belonging to S. Arrowsmith had been brought into the room. After searching, it was found close to me. It was an old-fashioned mourning ring, and bore the following inscription: "Samuel Arrowsmith, obit. August 30th, 1839, æt. 34." The circle, with Mr. Percival, met in the evening, when Imperator spoke as follows:—

"The general aspect of affairs will remain unsettled, until the new epoch supervenes. The transition epoch must be a time of strife and disturbance, and this condition of things may be either alleviated or aggravated by human methods. Individualism—that is, the furthering of private ends and the exaltation of self—cannot fail to aggravate it. Every instrument employed in our work is directed towards a special end, in order that zeal and energy may not be wanting. Look at all great leaders and you will find that they have been men possessed with a burning sense of some wrong against which they contend, or with an earnest desire for some reform, for which they were ever ready to fight. There must be an end in view to make a man strenuous and earnest in opposing evil or contending for good. Colourless men drop into obscurity and we take no count of them. But in the case of men with strong views and strong character the danger is that they may work only for their own ends and so become selfish. Selfishness is the one great centre of spiritual disease. He who contends for himself becomes selfish, while he who contends for truth becomes one of a vast brotherhood, the members of which would sacrifice themselves for the good of the cause for which they live. Individualism may either become centred in self, and thus be narrow and debasing, or expansive and productive of the greatest benefits to humanity. Self must be the centre, but not the circumference, and catholic and universal in his sympathies must be the man who will take the lead in times of trial, proving himself a centre of benefit to humanity.

"It is now about two years since we told you of the dangers through which you are now passing. Spiritualism is on its last trial and will probably pass into another phase. The recent imposture has thrown back our work; it was a fraud on the part of the spirits about the medium; deceiving spirits have made her their tool. So long as such circles are encouraged amongst you the good that we do will, to a certain extent, be thrown away, as such circles are the centres of antagonistic influence. At once, and for ever, such methods of communication with the spirit world should be abandoned. If a spirit ennobles you, and leads you to a higher plane of intellectual, moral, or spiritual development, or elevates your affections, then follow it; but if it drags you down and leads you to that which is earthy, then flee such, for they are of the adversaries, who would burlesque spirit intercourse and bring it into contempt and derision. Should the present method of communion continue, such discredit will attach to Spiritualism as will bring on its adherents a small martyrdom which will not do the mass of them any great harm."

As regards the ring Samuel Arrowsmith brought, it appears that the distress felt by his relatives at the loss of it reacted on him, causing distress and anxiety. It was lying in Great Russell-street, and Mr. Moses, passing by, attracted to himself the spirit near it. Before the ring was brought the particulars concerning it, and the inscription, were correctly communicated to Mr. S. M. The spirit of S. A. seemed unable to give the address of, or information respecting, his relatives.

AUTHORIOGRAPHY.—All things are engaged in writing their history. The planet, the pebble, goes attended by its shadow. The rolling rock leaves its scratches on the mountain, the river its channel in the soil, the animal its bones in the stratum, the fern and leaf their modest epitaph in the coal. The falling drop makes its sculpture in the sand or stone. Not a foot steps into the snow or along the ground but prints in characters more or less lasting a map of its march. Every act of man inscribes itself in the memories of his fellows, and in his own manners and face. The air is full of sounds, the sky of tokens, the ground is all memoranda and signature, and every object of Nature covered over with hints which speak to the intelligent.

THE REV. MINOT J. SAVAGE ON MR. JAY HUDSON.

Mr. Hudson's book, "On the Law of Psychic Phenomena," was noticed in the columns of "Light" some time ago, therefore there is no need again to go over his somewhat dreary speculations. Mr. Savage has in his own reviewed the theory with characteristic candour and clearness. Moreover, Mr. Savage in the same address at Chicago gave a guarded but intelligible adhesion to the Spiritualistic hypothesis. We quote the "Religious Philosophical Journal's" report:—

Mr. Hudson says that man has two minds, one of which he calls objective and the other subjective. The objective deals with the outer world and all the ordinary affairs of life. It is continuous with the normal consciousness. To it belongs the power of inductive reason, and by means of it alone man is a responsible, moral being, in actual relations with the physical world. This mind is not immortal, but, being connected with the brain, dies with the physical body. The subjective mind is a much more wonderful thing. It is the seat of the liminal consciousness. It is potentially immortal. It is mysteriously related to the great world-mind or God, and also to the subjective minds of other people. Presumably it may know anything and all things. Its knowledge is intuitive, direct insight. It does not reason. It is the seat of suggestion, as in hypnotism. While connected with the body, and since it does not reason, but is the victim of any suggestion made to it, anything suggested from without seems to it real and true.

This subjective mind is the source of all so-called psychic messages; and here is to be found the reason why many of them are untrue and do not rise to the height of the great personages supposed to be communicating. Since all seems real to the subjective mind, the "medium" may be sincere and honest in reporting things which are not true; just as any strange fancy seems real to a person in the hypnotic state. It is this subjective mind also that is the agent in all mental cures. It is this which communicates telepathically. This has power to move physical objects, tip and lift tables, rap, play on musical instruments, project phantoms and create substantial ghosts that can be felt and photographed. Here, then, is Mr. Hudson's key that is to unlock all the mysteries of psychic phenomena.

I cannot resist, right here, the temptation of calling attention to one point in this supposed constitution of man, though it is not necessarily a part of my theme. The objective mind is the one which deals with this life and possesses the power of moral action and character. Yet it dies with the brain. A striking result follows from this, which would be ghastly, were it not so near the line of the ludicrous. The mortal mind has the power to damn the immortal by sending it into the next world loaded down with a moral character it had no conscious part in creating.

Indeed, most men go through life with no knowledge that they have anywhere about them so precious a possession as the subjective self (which is the true self) at all.

It does not seem to me that this theory need be longer discussed. To state it is to reveal its fatal defects. In the first place, it is not proved that man has any such two minds, any more than it is proved that he is made up of seven parts, as the Theosophists contend. In both cases, there are pounds of assertion and not a single ounce of proof.

But, in the second place, though it were conceded that the subjective mind did exist, I submit that there is no evidence (in the true sense of the word) that any mental power is equal to the production of the physical class of psychic phenomena.

And, until some proof is offered that there is such a thing as this subjective mind, I will not take your time to follow Mr. Hudson's contention that the subjective mind may communicate with other subjective minds, even to the point of transmitting facts through several generations, until, like an underground river coming to the surface, a piece of information bursts forth to startle the world.

I will not weary you with a discussion of Theosophical speculations by way of explanation of psychic phenomena. So soon as the Theosophist is willing to descend from the clouds and offer us a crumb of mundane evidence, I shall be glad to look at it and see what it is like. But "Castles in Spain" or "India are only of romantic interest.

There are difficulties enough connected with the Spiritualistic theory; and, in this paper, I will not go so far as to say it is scientifically demonstrated. But after eliminating all the fraud, all the self-delusion, all that clairvoyance and telepathy

can explain, there seems to be a residuum of most remarkable phenomena that find their most natural explanation in supposing them to be (what they claim) the work of living beings who were once inhabitants of this earth. Without dogmatizing, then, I incline to accept this tentatively as an hypothesis either to disprove or verify by further investigation.

THE MYSTERIOUS FIRES IN HOLLAND.

The Dutch "Sphinx" gives some interesting particulars of these incomprehensible outbursts. They occurred in the dwelling-house adjoining the brewery of Herr Lambert Van der Velden, in Reuver, near Venloo, a town in the Dutch portion of the province of Limburg. It is well to have these details, because there is a province of Limburg in Belgium, and a town called Limburg in Germany. The incidents now referred to occurred in Holland. On Friday, August 4th this year, a thunder-storm broke over the district, accompanied by much rain. This was about four in the afternoon. About half-past four the nursemaid found some paper burning on the top shelf of a sort of corner cupboard, which, without a back, was set directly against the wall. The door of this cupboard was closed, and it was in the servants' kitchen. Mrs. Van der Velden sent the maid upstairs. In another room above, a flower-basket which hung from a hook in the wall was charred, and the colour of the gilding on the picture frames was changed. In a garret above, immediately after, a large flame burst out, and clothes in baskets caught fire. When these were extinguished, in about a quarter of an hour, a flame burst out again among some faggots in a garret next the brewery. This was also put out without much trouble, but a quarter of an hour later some curtains and blinds in the drawing-room were attacked. The storm had been over for three-quarters of an hour, and in the brewery loft they found the straw under the tiles to right and left of the roof scorched and black at certain distances in two places. These bundles of straw were almost free from the tiles, and could not have been burnt through them. On Saturday about half-past two, when the sun shone brightly, fire broke out afresh in a bundle of wool-flocks and wool in the middle of the garret, and a quarter of an hour later the already mentioned faggots, this time along with some hay adjoining, kindled up in a large flame, through which stables and barrel stores were completely burnt down. In another fifteen minutes some papers and two baskets on a bookrack behind the door of the nursery had their turn, and a quarter of an hour later than that, some papers took fire on a shelf in the scullery. So much for Saturday. On Sunday, at three in the afternoon, the roof of the barn burst out in flames above some unthreshed grain, which was totally destroyed. On Monday, at twelve o'clock, fire broke out in the hangings and curtains of a room, and at three it reached the dresser in the kitchen and developed into flame just as Mr. and Mrs. Van der Velden entered. The brother of the former, happening to come in at the same moment, put out the flame. In the nursery, a box with papers in it was twice caught. Another case filled with panes of glass and straw had already been fired on Friday, and on Saturday morning it was taken from the attic. The messenger had refilled it, brought it back, and it was then placed in a lower room, where it blazed up afresh. In the sitting-room a few papers out of an atlas were burnt; a map which hung against the wall, and a calendar, took fire, and a little later the window curtains. On Tuesday, at nine in the morning, the fire began again with these curtains, and both at once. Ten minutes later the window curtains of another room started, and five minutes after that the cover of a table which stood in a passage on the first floor. Ten minutes subsequent to the last outbreak an old curtain in the attic was seized by fire, and about eleven o'clock the curtains of the sitting-room, which had been drenched with water to extinguish the flames and then hung out in the sun to dry, started to burn again. At the same moment curtains in the kitchen blazed out where the paper in the cupboard first started, and in the evening about six o'clock, in the drawing room, there was destroyed a paper which had previously been pushed under a mirror. Most of the curtains were now burnt, and the fires happily stopped.

The brewery where these incidents occurred is quite near to the church, on the tower of which there is a lightning conductor. The church had been quite recently done up and the spire regilded. It was now black again. A couple of peasants who were in an adjoining field state that on the Friday about three o'clock they saw flashes of fire fall on the storehouse from the tower. One of them said that a horrible smell was perceptible and that the

lightning was not accompanied by thunder. Perhaps the most singularly interesting portion of the narrative is connected with Mrs. Van der Velden's nursemaid. She has since been discharged, but it was subject of marked attention that she was often the first to discover the outbreaks, and although followed and closely watched, she was never caught setting fire to anything. If the flame broke out near her she at once informed her master or mistress, though she never appeared to be agitated or frightened, and it was also remarked that on two or three separate occasions fire broke out in the field in places where she had passed, once among some faggots where she had remained a considerable time with the children, and on a subsequent occasion, in a bundle of straw against the wall of a farmhouse in the vicinity of her dwelling—the farmhouse being burnt. This last event occurred after her discharge, when the phenomena no longer appeared in the brewery. Is it possible that the young woman is a fire medium? It is worthy of notice that on the first days of these outbreaks they occurred at regular intervals of about fifteen minutes.

[This story requires very much more elucidation than we have at present. There is doubtless exaggeration to begin with—there is in all such reports. Behind that there is evidence of a great deal of electrical disturbance, if the report be true—the blackening of the church spire for example. As to what the peasants said, that counts for very little. Spiritualism will gain nothing by such hasty assumptions as that the servant was a fire-medium. It is just possible that the Dutch police may have something to say eventually.—ED. "LIGHT."]

"SPIRIT TEACHINGS."

The first Edition of "Spirit Teachings" being quite out of print, the Council of the London Spiritualist Alliance have decided to issue a

Memorial Edition

as a token of their loving regard for Mr. W. Stainton Moses, the founder of the Alliance, and its President up to the time of his decease.

The Memorial Edition will be as nearly as possible an exact reproduction of the first Edition, but it will also include a portrait of Mr. Stainton Moses, and a

Biography

from the pen of one of his most intimate friends.

In the hope of securing for the Memorial Edition a very large sale, the Council have determined to issue it at the very low charge of

Two and Sixpence per Copy to Subscribers Only

(exclusive of the cost of delivery), which is less than half the price of the original Edition. The Council trust that many friends will thus be induced to subscribe for several copies each, with a view to their judicious distribution as opportunities may arise.

Orders Should be Sent at Once

to the President of the Alliance, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, London, as, after the Subscribers have been supplied, the price will be increased.

Signed on behalf of the Council of the London Spiritualist Alliance,

E. DAWSON ROGERS, *President.*

Subscribers will oblige by withholding remittances until they receive intimation that copies are ready for delivery.

SUNDERLAND SPIRITUAL EVIDENCE SOCIETY, CENTRE HOUSE, SILKSWORTH-ROW. — *October Special Meetings, 1893* (Sunday services at 6.30. Week nights at 8).—Sunday, October 15th: Mr. C. Thompson, Sunderland; Monday, 16th: Mr. R. R. Roston, Newcastle; Wednesday, 18th: Mr. Griffiths, South Shields; Friday, 20th: Mrs. Baldock, South Shields; Sunday, 22nd: Mr. J. J. Carrick, Consett; Monday, 23rd: Mrs. Yeeles, South Shields; Friday, 27th: Mrs. White, Sunderland; Sunday, 29th: Miss Berkshire, South Shields; Monday, 30th: Mrs. Baldock, South Shields.—Unity meeting each Sunday at 3 p.m. Musical evening each Thursday at 8 o'clock.

THE ETERNITY OF CHARACTER.—What does a man take with him when from the extreme verge of life he launches into what lies beyond? It looks as if he took nothing. Death seems to pass a sponge over all that has gone before. Be it the end, or be it a new beginning, it seems a total breaking off from all that life has hitherto consisted in. That is what makes it terrible.

[October 14, 1893.]

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

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post free to any address, is £1.10. per annum, furnished to our office in advance.
Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey, and should invariably be crossed "A/C."
All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and not to the Editor.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

"LIGHT" may also be obtained from E. W. ALLEN, 4, Ave Maria Lane, London, and all booksellers.

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

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

Light:

EDITED BY "M. A., LOND."

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14th, 1893.

TO CONTRIBUTORS. Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editor, 2, Duke-street, Adelphi, London, W.C. 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, London, W.C., and not to the Editor.

RUDYARD KIPLING AND THE OCCULT.

The success of Mr. Rudyard Kipling is unquestioned. His name is already a household word. Whether he talks of the Indian hills or of unhappy Whitechapel, he talks well; and the British soldier has in him a friend more powerful than all the philanthropic well-wishers who seek by the pious methods of ordinary life to help him. There is, however, one side of Mr. Kipling's work which appeals to those who are in touch with the Unseen—and which is not as much appreciated as it ought to be—and that is the knowledge of the Occult which he continually displays for the benefit of an unimaginative world.

This recognition of the Unseen has been shown in previous collections of stories, in the tale of the "Phantom Rickshaw," for instance, but never, perhaps, so strongly as in the last volume which has appeared with Mr. Kipling as author. In "Many Inventions" the Occult is very much to the fore.

What Re-incarnation may be capable of in the hands of the novelist of the future we cannot say, but what use has already been made of it by Mr. Kipling in that delightful tale, "The Finest Story in the World"—one of the "Many Inventions" collection—is patent to everybody. An ordinary bank clerk, a machine which tots up figures for twenty-five shillings a week, is the hero, if hero he may be called. This narrow-shouldered calculator, whose greatest mercantile glory is to go about with a leather pocket-book fastened to him by a steel chain, is smitten with a love of literature, by means of which he hopes to acquire fame and wealth. His turgid effusions are of the usual character, as a rule, but now and again he forgets himself and becomes somehow another man, and then he unconsciously remembers one or more of his past lives. This Charlie Mead has never seen the sea except once at Brighton, and yet his remembrance of it is perfect. He has in his mind the plot of a story in which a galley-slave is the teller. And this is how he describes the result of a sea fight:—

The moving galley's bow was plunking them back through their own oar-holes, and I could hear no end of a shindy in the decks below. Then her nose caught us nearly in the middle, and we tilted sideways, and the fellows in the right-hand galley unhitched their hooks and ropes, and threw things on to our upper deck—arrows, and hot pitch or something that stung, and we went up and up and up on the left side, and the right side dipped, and I twisted my head round and saw the water stand still as it topped the right bulwarks, and then it curled over and crashed down on the whole lot of us on the right side, and I felt it hit my back, and I woke.

This curious description of the sea standing still before the final rush in is just what happens, and, says Rudyard Kipling, speaking of a man who had seen the same thing, but only nearly at the cost of his own life, "Charlie, the bank clerk on twenty-five shillings a week, who had never been out of sight of a made road, knew it all. It was no consolation to me that once in his lives he had been forced to die for his gains. I also must have died scores of times, but behind me, because I could have used my knowledge when the doors were shut." How the recollection left Charlie, and how "the finest story in the world" was eventually written, we leave to our readers to find out.

"The Lost Legion" is another tale in the same collection. It is a story of an Afghan brigand, and the "Lost Legion" was one which had mutinied in that terrible time nearly forty years ago, but which had been deceived by the hillmen of India, who instead of helping them starved and despoiled them. This legion haunted the hills and worked for the British power, and helped invisibly, but not inaudibly, in the capture of the brigand. Says the narrator, speaking of the final capture:—

It was a very neat little affair, neatly carried out, and the men concerned were unofficially thanked for their services. Yet it seems to me that much credit is also due to another regiment, whose name did not appear in the brigade orders, and whose very existence is in danger of being forgotten.

This story of the lost Rissala is a ghost story of the best kind.

Again, another piece in the collection, called "In the Rukh," deals with the Occult. Here, however, we get back to the nature spirits and the powers which dwell among beasts. It is a wild and strange story—a story which may yet be true, for when were the spirits of the forest and the souls of the beasts destroyed?

One cannot but be grateful to Mr. Rudyard Kipling for introducing this occult side of life into his admirable novelettes—not with any straining after effect, as those do who handle their ghosts as if they were always red-hot—but as being part and parcel of our everyday lives; which, indeed, they are, if men would but know it, and if the crust of materiality and all that materiality means did not keep them in a prison to which the *oubliettes* of the Inquisition were a home of perfect light.

LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE.

The fortnightly meetings of the members and friends of the London Spiritualist Alliance will be re-commenced on the evening of Monday, October 23rd, at 7 o'clock, at 2, Duke-street, Adelphi. It is proposed at this the first meeting of the season to invite an expression of opinion on the present and future of Spiritualism in this country, and with that view Mr. J. J. Morse will introduce the question by an address entitled "A Glance Ahead."

THE SPIRITUALISTS' INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDING SOCIETY.
—Information and assistance given to inquirers into Spiritualism. Literature on the subject and list of members will be sent on receipt of stamped envelope by any of the following International Committee:—America, Mrs. M. R. Palmer, 3101, North Broad-street, Philadelphia; Australia, Mr. H. Junor Brown, "The Grand Hotel," Melbourne; France, P. G. Leymarie, 1, Rue Chabanais, Paris; Germany, E. Schlochau, 1, Monbijou-place, Berlin, N.; Holland, F. W. H. Van Straaten, Apeldoorn, Middelham, 682; India, Mr. T. Hatton, State Cotton Mills, Baroda; New Zealand, Mr. Graham, Huntley, Waikato; Norway, B. Torrestonson, Advocate, Christiania; Russia, Etienne Geispitz, Grande Belozerski, No. 7, Lod. 6, St. Petersburg; England, J. Allen, Hon. Sec., 13, Berkley-terrace, White Post-lane, Manor Park, Essex; or, W. C. Robson, French correspondent, 166, Rye Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne.—The Manor Park branch will hold the following meetings at 13, Berkley-terrace, White Post-lane, Manor Park:—Sundays, 11 a.m., for inquirers and students, and the last Sunday in each month, at 7 p.m., reception for inquirers. Also each Friday, at 9 p.m., prompt, for Spiritualists only, the study of Spiritualism. And at 1, Winifred-road, Manor Park, the first Sunday in each month, at 7 p.m., reception for inquirers. Also each Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m., inquirers' meeting.—J. A.

IDEALISM.

In "LIGHT" of September 9th, a correspondent, "C.Y.L.," propounds the following questions: "Does Idealism imply a denial of any objective reality whatever of the seemingly external world, or merely an assertion that it is totally different from its sense-mediated representation in human consciousness—thus allowing our conceptions no other validity than as *idea*?" And: "Wherein does Idealism, as understood to-day, differ from that phase of it against which Kant wrote under the heading 'The Refutation of Idealism,' in the second edition of the 'Critique of Pure Reason'?"

Just 180 years ago, Berkeley, in the "Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous," very pithily met the objection that he allowed for our conceptions of an external world "no other validity than as *idea*." "Can anything be plainer," says Hylas (the opponent), "than that you are for changing all things into ideas?" "You mistake me," is the reply, "I am not for changing things into ideas, but rather ideas into things." (It will be understood that "ideas," in this phraseology, stand for percepts.) Now, although, as will presently be seen, this "*idea*," or percept-being, is by no means Berkeley's last word on the subject, it was for him exhaustive of reality as against any supposition of a material subsistence altogether out of mind. For it was this, and not a transcendental noumenal or "intelligible" world—a world of archetypal ideal reality—which the philosophy of his time conceived as the reality of objects. The idealism of Berkeley stands in opposition to every theory of representative perception which postulates an objective reality of things as distinct from percepts.

By Berkeley, as in all the philosophy of his time, the function of thought in relation to perception was conceived as entirely a *posteriori*. For although, in the "New Theory of Vision" (now "the acknowledged modern theory"*) he demonstrated the empirical-psychological processes which combine for the conception of distance, it is hardly necessary to say that those processes are quite different from a *a priori* functions of pure intelligence in the presentation of an object of sense. It was from an analysis of the object into its elements (not yet distinguished into "formal" and "material"), as it exists for developed sense-consciousness, that the earlier idealism emerged as the proposition that *esse* is *percipi*. As regards the so-called "secondary" qualities, however (colour, sound, taste, odours, &c.), it had already been seen that they, as sensations, belong exclusively to the sensitive subject, and what Berkeley did was to extend the proof to the "primary" qualities, (extension, figure, solidity, &c.), which had been supposed independent of consciousness, and to be the "real" attributes of "things." The ideality of the percept-object was thus established, Berkeley's position being that ideality is the whole truth of things; in other words, that mind is their supporter, or substance; matter, as distinguished from sensible qualities, being the fiction of a false philosophy, not a postulate of common-sense. He claimed to be in agreement with "the vulgar," who hold that the things perceived are the very things that are, and who make no supposition of an unknown and not immediately knowable matter, without the sensible qualities which belong only to sensibility. Equally, too, did he repudiate misconceptions objected to his view, and which (he would say) are implied in the terms of "C. Y. L.'s" questions—"denial of any objective reality," and the qualification of the term, "external world," by the word "seemingly." What common-sense believes concerning the objective reality of things is that they are external to, and independent of, the individual percipient, and that our perception of them is the impression they make upon us. Beyond that, common-sense,

left to itself, makes no assumptions, and asks no questions. Now on the point of "externality," it must be remembered that spatial externality is only predicable as between things which are themselves represented as in space. It is because we so represent ourselves, through our bodies, that the world is perceived as external. In short, as Professor Caird says, speaking of a later development of thought on the subject, "existence in space is not an externality to consciousness, but an externality *for* consciousness."* In other words, an externality which is wholly *within* the field of consciousness, and is thus "for" consciousness, is not an externality which can find a second term of spatial relation in the fact of consciousness itself. Such second term is indeed found in the percipient as an *organism*, because that organism is itself within the field of spatial consciousness, being, as brain or percipient centre of that consciousness, itself the point in relation to which, primarily, other points of space are external. There is, as will presently appear, a most important sense in which Berkeley failed to perceive the significance of objectivity for the conscious subject; but his view is not in contradiction to known externality. The "objective reality" of the world, conceived as out of relation to consciousness, is, of course, and rightly, denied by Berkeley. But equally of course did he, affirming the complete agreement of his philosophy with facts of experience, recognise the non-contingence of the objective world on the individual percipient. He was led immediately from the discovery that objects cannot exist otherwise than in consciousness, to the conclusion that there must be a Mind as permanent and universal as the world. "To me it is evident," he says to his opponent in the "Dialogues," "for the reasons you allow of, that sensible things cannot exist otherwise than in a mind or spirit. Whence I conclude, not that they have no real existence, but that, seeing they depend not on my thought, and have an existence distinct from being perceived by me, *there must be some other mind wherein they exist*. As sure, therefore, as the sensible world really exists, so sure is there an infinite, omnipresent Spirit, who contains and supports it."† It is in this sense that *esse* = *percipi* is to be understood. It is true that we have here something very like a transition to a distinction between phenomena and noumena. For after seeming to waver for a moment between our particular percepts and their archetypes ("either themselves or their archetypes") as permanently subsisting in the Divine Mind, Berkeley becomes explicit: "Mark it well; I do not say, I see things by perceiving that which represents them in the intelligible Substance of God. This I do not understand; but I say the things by me perceived are known by the understanding, and produced by the will of an infinite Spirit."‡ The "Divine Mind" of Berkeley is the hypothetical "intuitive (perceptive) understanding" of Kant; the understanding which is not "regulative" only, but "constitutive." But it is not the equivalent of the Ideal of Reason, as that appears in Kant's *Dialectic*.

We now see, in general, what "Idealism" was understood to mean, at the time when Kant re-conceived the problem of knowledge, and made Epistemology (doctrine or critique of Cognition) the new departure for philosophy. I shall, of course, not consume the brief space at my disposal by an attempt to do more than indicate the main transitional moments in the conception of idealism. And, recurring to the second question of "C.Y.L.," I think the present standpoint of idealistic philosophy, as compared

* Caird: "The Critical Philosophy of Kant." Vol. II., p. 88.

† "Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous." Berkeley's Works, Fraser's Edition, Vol. I., p. 304.

‡ Op. cit., pp. 307-8. According to Berkeley, the existence of things is "actually in the Divine Conception, and potentially, in relation to finite minds, in the Divine Will, the evolutions of nature being the constant expressions of that Will."—"Of the Principles of Human Knowledge," p. 178. (Professor Fraser's note.)

* See Professor Fraser's Preface, Vol. I., of his Edition of Berkeley's Works.

with the earlier, may be succinctly expressed in a single sentence which I take from a recently published essay by Professor Edward Caird.* We have seen that the old formula was *esse = percipi*. The correction of that formula, partially since Kant, and altogether since Hegel, has been: "the *esse* of things is not their *percipi*, but their *intelligi*." In other words, Thought has taken the place of Sense as the reality of the world, and is recognised as constitutive of Sense itself. By Kant, Thought was conceived as constitutive of "experience," that is, of the objective world as related in consciousness; by Hegel as constitutive of reality. I must try briefly to discriminate these two positions, and show how the latter has developed from the former, but for this purpose some general remarks must be premised.

The problem of philosophy is to resolve or explain the dualism of subject and object, intelligence and the world. At first sight, to this enterprise is presented only two alternatives: either to assume the reality of the world, and to bring the subject under the concept of the world as a part of it; or to assume the reality of the subject, and to show the dependence of the world upon that. The first attempt is materialism, the second is the earlier form of idealism. Now, the mistake of materialism, as it is more gross and detectable than that of an immature idealism, seems to give the latter just such a triumph as was expressed by Hume, revolving it into Scepticism, when he said: "It admits of no answer, and produces no conviction." The reality of the world as perceived or conceived is certainly not a reality which can be attributed to it out of relation to consciousness. But the progress of thought consists in overcoming its own one-sidedness. And true though it be that the world presupposes consciousness, it is equally true that consciousness presupposes the world. The unity of the subject is an empty abstraction except in relation to the manifold of the world: identity is not known till it finds itself in difference. The affirmation of the subject (self-consciousness) itself emerges in relation to the object as its "other";† and the true statement of Idealism does not negate this otherness by drawing it originally within the subjective sphere of the self thus known only in relation to it, but lays the stress on its relativity to and for the self. The object is in consciousness; but if we think *only* thus of its relation to the self we have forgotten that its *otherness* for the self is nevertheless just the fact of the relation. "Berkeley," says Professor Caird:—

Reflecting on the relativity of the object to the self, maintained that the *percipi* of things is their *esse*, in the sense that the real and only objects of our consciousness are our own "ideas" or sensations, as states of our own subjectivity. He did not see that a reflexion which would resolve our knowledge into the affections of an individual subjectivity, is in contradiction with itself. For the subject which is conscious of its idea as its own, and refers them to objects, is not the individual sensitive subject as such, but an ego which, as it is conscious of itself only in distinction from, and in relation to, objects, cannot reject the consciousness of objects as unreal. If the object be reduced to a state of the subject, the subject ceases *ipso facto* to be an ego; and a self which knows nothing but its own states is an absurdity, a cross between a sensitive subject which does not know but merely feels, and a self-conscious subject which can be conscious of itself only as it is conscious of objects. If Berkeley had realised this, he would have seen that the true meaning of the reflexion that objects exist only for a subject is, not that objects are reducible to the sensations through which we know them, but that we know no objects except those which are relative to a self, which therefore require to be contemplated in that relation in order that their true nature may be seen. But this implies, not that the objective consciousness must be reduced to the merely subjective, but that we must retract the

abstraction in which we regard it as merely objective, and correct errors into which we fall in so regarding it. Of course, at the same time, we must equally retract the abstraction in which we regard the subject as having a pure inward life of its own, or a consciousness of its ideas as mere states of itself apart from their reference to objects.* We may describe the error of Berkeley (says the same author further on) as essentially this, that he confuses the true Idealism, i.e., the refutation of Materialism by the proof that matter as an object is relative to the conscious self, with the so-called Idealism which is really Sensationalism, and which is as inconsistent with the reality of spirit as of matter.

The ordinary consciousness, with its ready-made distinction of Ego and Non-Ego, regards each in a false abstraction, as independent of the other. Intelligence demands a unifying concept, and this demand is at first interpreted as requiring the reduction or subjection of one of the contrasted terms to the other. But this is to do violence to the testimony of consciousness itself, and further reflection discovers it to be as fatal to the one antithesis as to the other, to the consciousness of the Ego, as such, as to the objectivity of the Non-Ego. Thought can only reconcile opposites through the recognition that their opposition is mutual relativity. To understand this relativity is really to conceive the underlying identity of Reason and the world, and the process by which the former comes to self-consciousness as the truth of the latter. The dualism of subject and object becomes intelligible by the light of the distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness, and its final resolution is only another expression for the perfect realisation of spirit as fully adequate to the world, for a knowledge comprehending the world, in which conscious reason no longer finds an alien element, but a universe without any allogical residuum—its own explicit word and revelation. Thus the opposition of the world to the Ego signifies nothing but the partiality of a self-consciousness which it at the same time mediates and furthers. Objectivity confronts the Reason already explicit in us with the Reason that is implicit without us. To overcome the world conceived as opposition is to find ourselves, as intelligence, in it, to raise the relativity of the object to the subject from the form of opposition to the form of expression.

All ignorance of the object (says Professor Caird) is ignorance of the self, all development of consciousness is also a development of self-consciousness. An object that we may, but do not, know has for its counterpart a potentiality in us of perceptions which we have not realised, a "faculty which we have never used." The consciousness of defect in our knowledge of the world is a consciousness of disunion in ourselves; or, what is the same thing, it is a consciousness of union with, and at the same time of separation from, a perfect intelligence for which the process of development‡ is completed.

And, again, (to quote further from this author, to whose penetrative and luminous expositions students of philosophy are deeply indebted):—

The final interpretation of the world must be idealistic or speculative; it must correct, not only the materialism which springs out of our natural abstraction from the subject, but also the dualism which treats subject and object as co-equal factors, by showing that the correlativity of the object and subject is a correlativity for the subject. Thus, it must "raise consciousness to the form of self-consciousness," and show outer experience to be an element in inner experience; or, what is the same thing in other words, it must explain the world as the self-manifestation of a spiritual principle, which, therefore, must be a manifestation not only to, but in, spiritual or self-conscious beings. §

Let us now glance at the stage which Idealism reached

* Caird: "The Critical Philosophy of Kant." Vol. I., p. 420.

† P. 644, note.

‡ The process conceived logically, or *sub specie eternitatis*, in which there is no temporal separation of the moments—the Divine Self-Consciousness.—C. C. M.

§ Caird: "The Critical Philosophy of Kant." Vol. I., pp. 423, 424, 425.

* Caird: "Essays on Literature and Philosophy"—"Metaphysic," p. 487. (Glasgow: Maclehose. 1892.)

† "In Hegel's language, that which presents itself as other than mind is *its* other—an other which is not another."—Caird: "Essays," Vol. II., p. 525, "Metaphysic."

in Kant, and, then at its subsequent development. Kant distinguished his own idealism as *formal*, from that of Berkeley, which he called *material*. By formal idealism he meant that all objects are perceived by us under necessary *a priori* forms of sense and understanding (time, space, and the categories or pure conceptions), which are, however, "determined" for sense in relation to a "given" matter or material content. It must be well borne in mind that this "given" is nothing for consciousness till it has undergone the formal application to it of the *a priori* synthetic activity of the subject, by which it results in the "object" of perception. Kant, indeed, speaks of it as an original affection of sensibility, thus seeming to imply a sensation-consciousness prior to all objectivity, as also to all self-consciousness, which, as he shows, arises first as a reflexion of consciousness on its own unity in the synthesis of the object. This was an incurable inconsistency, consequent on Kant's insistence on the distinction of formal function and material element as final or insoluble. What he succeeded in proving was the presence of the concept in the percept, an original activity of thought in constituting the elements of experience. For it is not only that all objects, all the material manifold externally related in space, have a unity only in relation to the unity of the subject which finds itself as one and the same in relation to them; that statement, while it negatives the possibility of the object, as we can at all imagine it, existing out of consciousness, is still insufficient to show its possibility, as we perceive it, in consciousness. The mere unity of apperception—relation to the unity of the self—though a necessary presupposition for the determination of the object, is not alone adequate to such determination. This unity, to be brought into difference as objective, must have itself an internal principle of determination that the object may be *known*, as it is known, in and as the very fact of perception. For the object, as object, and prior to every empirical classification, is already quantified, qualified, and related. It is already brought under general concepts or forms of intelligence;—it has been "thought." The following is a clear summary statement of Kant's position:—

It was Kant who first—though with a certain limitation of aim—brought this idea of the relativity of thought and being to the consciousness of the modern world. In the "Critique of Pure Reason," thought, indeed, is not set up as an absolute *primum*, in relation to which all existence must be conceived, but it is set up as the *primum* of experience, and so of all existences which are objects of our knowledge. Experience is for Kant essentially relative to the unity of the self; it exists through the necessary subsumption of the forms and matter of sense under the categories, as, on the other hand, the consciousness of self is recognised as essentially dependent on this process. On this view, the *a priori* and *a posteriori* factors of experience do not really exist apart as two separate portions of knowledge. If they are severed, each loses all its meaning. Perceptions in themselves are void; categories in themselves are empty. We do not look outwards for one kind of truth and inwards for another, nor do we even, by an external process, bring facts given as a contingent under principles recognised as necessary; but the *a priori* is the condition under which alone the *a posteriori* exists for us. Even if it be allowed that the facts of inner and outer experience contain a contingent element or matter, given under the conditions of time and space, yet neither time nor space nor the facts of experience conditioned by them exist for us, except as elements of an experience which is organised according to the categories. This is the essential truth which Kant had to express. . . . The lesson of the "Critique" may be gathered up into two points. In the first place, it is a refutation of the ordinary view of experience, as something immediately given for thought and not constituted by it. In the second place, it is a demonstration of the merely phenomenal character of the objects of experience, *i.e.*, the demonstration that the objects of experience, even as determined by science, are not things in themselves. Both these results require to be kept clearly in view, if we would understand the movement of thought excited by Kant. On the one hand,

Kant had to teach that what is ordinarily regarded as real, the world of experience, is transcendently ideal—*i.e.*, is determined as real by *a priori* forms of thought. On the other hand, he had to teach that the world so determined is empirically and not transcendently real—*i.e.*, its reality is merely phenomenal. With the former lesson he met the man of science, and compelled him to renounce his materialistic explanation of the world, as a thing which exists in independence of the mind that knows it. The world we know is a world which exists only as it exists for us, for the thinking subject; hence the thinking subject, the ego, cannot be taken as an object like other objects, an object the phenomena of which are to be explained like other phenomena by their place in the connexion of experience. Having, however, thus repelled scientific materialism by the proof that the reality of experience is ideal, Kant refuses to proceed to the complete identification of reality with ideality, and meets the claims of the metaphysician with the assertion that the reality of experience is merely phenomenal. Hence he rejects any idealism that would involve the negation of things in themselves beyond phenomena, or the identification of the objects of experience with these things. The reality we know is a reality which exists only for us as conscious subjects, but this, though it is the only reality we can know, is not the absolute reality.*

Thus dualism survives in Kant, but not as the old dualism of subject and object, and in a form which itself suggests the development necessary completely to resolve it. Let us again listen to Professor Caird for an account of this transitional germ in Kant. After remarking that the truth in Kant "is marred in his statement of it by the persistent influence of the abstract division between contingent matter given from without and necessary principles supplied from within, a division essentially inconsistent with the attempt to show that the contingent matter is necessarily subsumed under these principles, and, indeed, exists for us only as it is so subsumed," he proceeds:—

But Kant himself puts into our hands the means of correcting his own inadequacy, when he reduces the inaccessible "thing in itself" (which he at first speaks of as affecting our sensibility, and so giving rise to the contingent matter of experience) to a noumenon (*νοούμενον*) which is projected by reason itself. The *Dialectic* exhibits the idea of thought as not only constituting finite experience, but also reaching beyond it, though as yet only in a negative way. The mind is, on this view, so far unlimited that it knows its own limits; it is conscious of the defects of its experience, of the contingency of its sensible matter, and the emptiness and finitude of its categories; and, by reason of this consciousness, it is always seeking in experience an ideal which it is impossible to realise there. Thought measures experience by its own nature, and finds experience wanting. It demands a kind of unity or identity in its objects which it is unable to find in the actual objects presented to it. It is this demand of reason which lifts man above a mere animal existence, and forces him by aid of the categories to determine the matter of sense as a world of objects; yet, as this finite world of experience can never satisfy the demand of reason, the consciousness of it is immediately combined with the consciousness of its limited and phenomenal character. The student of the "Critique of Pure Reason" cannot but recognise the strange balance between the real and the phenomenal in which it ends, allowing to man the consciousness of each so far as to enable him to see the defects of the other—so that by aid of the pure identity of reason he can criticise and condemn the "blindness" or unresolved difference of experience, and by means of the concreteness and complexity of experience he can condemn the "empty" identity of reason.

It is possible that a reader unacquainted with the "Critique of Pure Reason" may fail to understand the full scope and significance of this opposition between the ideal of reason and what we call reality. We are wont to think of this opposition rather in its higher or distinctively spiritual aspect, in relation to the social and moral problems, than as the ultimate embarrassment of *all* science or conception of the objective world. It is due to this partiality of our apprehension of the opposition in question that it is possible so to invert its true terms as to speak of an experi-

* Caird: "Essays," Vol. II., "Metaphysic."

once inadequate to its ideal as the "real." It is therefore necessary to understand that the demand, or "ideal," of reason is definable, not as any perfectibility which, for all we positively know, may not be in the nature of things, but as a *complete determination of the thing itself*, without which it is not really known at all. Thus, for instance, a real science of the world requires a thorough application of the principles of causality and relation. But we at once see that to this process we can set no limit in a possible temporal experience; we can find no absolute beginning or end, only an infinite regress and progress of causal conditions, and likewise an infinite extension of reciprocal conditions. Thus the world is not *res completa*, and cannot be known in the experience we call "real." If, on the other hand, the true real is the Reason which imposes its own logical demand as an "ideal," it follows that the complete determination of the world is the completion of the thought-process itself, in a self-consciousness of the world, identifying its own concreteness with the unity of Reason, and knowing itself now as Spirit for which no element or residuum of externality remains. All imperfect determination, whereby an alogical "other," or "matter" opposed to spirit, remains, is incompleteness of the thought-process, whose completion is consciousness raised totally and exhaustively to the form of self-consciousness. The essence of present-day Idealism may be described as the doctrine of knowledge as a self-identification of the principle of knowledge, which is Reason, with its own process: a reflexion or return of that process upon itself, laden with the wealth of concrete articulation gained in its own external movement of differentiation and explicit relation. This return upon itself, as spirit or personality, is the progressive recognition of its own unity in difference, all externality being that difference as yet unidentified or unatoned. But what we are now concerned with is the transition of philosophy from the conception of this unassimilated crudity as "given" by a "thing-in-itself" heterogeneous to consciousness, to a conception of it easily capable of development into the conception of the unsatisfied demand of Reason itself. So we will let Professor Caird resume his account of this interesting logical moment in Kant:—

The nature of this opposition, between phenomena and things in themselves, seems to change as we advance from the *Analytic*, where the existence of such things is presupposed, to the *Dialectic*, where the grounds of that presupposition are examined. At first the opposition seems to be between what is present in consciousness and what is absolutely beyond consciousness. The matter of experience is regarded as given externally in the affections of the sensitive subject,—affections caused by an unknown thing in itself, of which, however, they can tell us nothing. On the other hand, the form of experience, the categories and principles of judgment which turn these affections into objects of knowledge, are not pure expressions of the real nature, the pure identity, of the subject in itself, but only products of the identity of the self in relation to the sensibility and its forms of time and space. Hence, on both sides we must regard experience as merely phenomenal, alike in relation to the noumenal object and in relation to the noumenal subject, which lurk behind the veil and send forth into experience, on the one side, affections which become objects through their determination by the unity of thought, and, on the other side, an identity of thought which becomes self-conscious in relation to the objects so determined by itself.

Kant, however, having thus answered the question of the possibility of experience by reference to two things in themselves which are out of experience, is obliged to ask himself how the *consciousness* of these two things in themselves, and the criticism of experience in relation to them, is possible. And here, obviously, the opposition can no longer be conceived as an opposition between that which is and that which is not in consciousness. For the things in themselves must be present to consciousness in some fashion, in order that they may be contrasted with the phenomena. If, therefore, phenomena are now regarded as unreal, it must be because we have an *idea* of

reality to which the reality of experience does not fully correspond. In the *Analytic* Kant had been speaking as if the real consisted in something which is not present to the conscious subject at all, though we, by analysis of his experience, can refer to it as the cause of that which is so present. Now, in the *Dialectic*, he has to account for the fact that the conscious subject himself is able to transcend his experience, and to contrast the objects of it as phenomenal with things in themselves.

Now it is obvious that such an opposition is possible only so far as the thought, which constitutes experience, is at the same time conscious of itself in opposition to the experience it constitutes. The reason why experience is condemned as phenomenal, is, therefore, not because it is that which exists for thought as opposed to that which does not exist for thought, but because it imperfectly corresponds to the determination of thought in itself. In other words, it is condemned as unreal, not because it is ideal, but because it is *imperfectly* ideal. And the absolute reality is represented, not as that which exists without relation to thought, but as that which is identical with the thought for which it is. In the *Dialectic*, therefore, the noumenon is substituted for the thing in itself, and the noumenon is, as Kant tells us, the object as it exists for an intuitive or perceptive understanding, *i.e.*, an understanding which does not synthetically combine the given matter of sense into objects by means of categories, but whose thought is one with the existence of the objects it knows. It is the idea of such a pure identity of knowing and being, as suggested by thought itself, which leads us to regard our actual empirical knowledge as imperfect, and its objects as not, in an absolute sense, *real* objects. The noumena are not, therefore, unknown causes by whose action and reaction conscious experience is produced; they represent a unity of thought with itself to which it finds experience inadequate.*

The above must suffice, that quotation may not exceed allowable limits, for Kant's share in the development. One other passage shall be added as the best expression I can find, in brief, of the pure realistic Idealism which inevitably followed:—

The great step in logical theory which was taken by the idealistic philosophy of the post-Kantian period, was simply to dissipate the confusion which had prevailed so long between the bare or formal identity, which is but the beginning of thought and knowledge, and that concrete unity of differences, which is its highest idea and end. It was, in other words, to correct and complete the two imperfect conceptions of thought, as analytical, and as externally synthetical, by the conception of it as self-determining, to show that it is a unity which manifests itself in difference and opposition, yet through all the antagonism into which it enters, is really developing and revealing its unity with itself. This new movement might, in one point of view, be described as the addition of a third logic to the logic of analysis and the logic of inductive synthesis, which were already in existence. But it was really more than this: for the new logic was not merely an external addition to the old logics, but it also put a new meaning into these logics, by bringing to light the principles that were involved in them. At the same time it broke down the division that had been supposed to exist between logic and metaphysics, between the form or method of thought and its matter. It showed that thought itself contains a matter from which it cannot be separated, and that it is only by reason of this matter that it is able to ask intelligent questions of nature, and to get from nature intelligible answers.†

Not the least interesting part of the essay I have so largely quoted is that in which Professor Caird exhibits the relation of the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies to this idealism. And it seems to me evident that future philosophy will tend more and more to conceive the problem of reality in a development of it. At all events it may be predicted with confidence that there will be no ultimate retreat upon an insoluble dualism, and that every reaction in this direction will serve only to make clearer the conditions on which it can be finally overcome.‡

C. C. M.

* Caird: "Essays." Vol. II., pp. 405, 406; 409, 410, 411, 412.

† Pp. 498, 499.

‡ Readers of "LIGHT" who cultivate philosophy will be interested in an important work, just now published, by a young but accomplished metaphysician known in the columns of this paper—Mr. E. Douglas Fawcett. Without describing the purport of "The Riddle of the Universe," beyond the intimation that it is in opposition to the Hegelian idealism of Reason as the *prius* of the world, it may be said that the qualifications of study and thought brought to its production are of a very high order.

THE FOUNDERS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

Mr. William Emmette Coleman has made some serious charges against the founders of the Theosophical Society in a paper read at the Chicago Congress. Mr. Coleman says that conclusive proofs of every assertion he makes are in his possession, and that they will be embodied in a work which he is now preparing for publication. There are several columns of accusation in the "Religio-Philosophical Journal," and it will be for those whom it concerns to prove the falseness of Mr. Coleman's assertions. We feel bound to give one or two extracts from the paper read at Chicago, with no desire except that of eliciting the truth. It must always be remembered that Mr. Coleman promises proofs. Says Mr. Coleman:—

Early in 1875 we find Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky in Philadelphia, assuming to investigate the so-called Spiritualistic phenomena manifested in the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Holmes. Certain alleged materialisations of John and Katie King, through the Holmeses, had a short time before been denounced as fraudulent by Robert Dale Owen; and the confederate who had personated Katie King had made a confession of her guilt. Colonel Olcott published in 1875 a narrative of the investigations of himself and Madame Blavatsky, and they declared that the phenomena were all genuine, and that the exposure of the Holmeses was due to a conspiracy against them. That the whole of the manifestations through the Holmeses were fraudulent is beyond reasonable doubt. They have been many times caught in the act of trickery; and, being detected in such not long after the publication of Olcott's narrative, Madame Blavatsky, having accomplished her purpose with them, namely, that of deluding Colonel Olcott into the belief of the possession of remarkable psychic power by her (Madame Blavatsky), publicly repudiated further connection with them.

Madame Blavatsky had claimed to be herself a medium for the same John King utilised by the Holmeses, and Olcott has told us of various psychic phenomena seen by him claiming to emanate from John King, and performed through Madame Blavatsky. It is evident that Madame Blavatsky and the Holmeses were in collusion in the production of spurious phenomena palmed off on Olcott as genuine. R. B. Westbrook, LL.D., one of the original officers of the Theosophical Society, stated in the "Religio-Philosophical Journal," Chicago, September 14th, 1889, that Mrs. Holmes had admitted as much, and had stated that Madame Blavatsky proposed to her a partnership in the "materialisation show business," with Colonel Olcott as manager, claiming that she had already so "psychologised him that he did not know his head from his heels." Early in 1875 Madame Blavatsky sent to General F. J. Lippitt a picture, which she said had been painted for the General by the spirit John King himself. In "Mind and Matter," Philadelphia, November 27th, 1880, was published conclusive evidence, found in Madame Blavatsky's room in Philadelphia, that she had herself painted this picture, except certain flowers, &c., which were already on the satin when she procured it. Madame Blavatsky is known to have had fair skill as a painter. Further, Mrs. Hannah M. Wolff, of Washington, D. C., in a published account of her experience with Madame Blavatsky in 1874, has stated that, Madame Blavatsky having claimed that certain pictures were painted by spiritual power direct, she was watched by three journalists residing in the same house, and they saw Madame Blavatsky get up in the night and paint them herself.

Another story is very extraordinary, and we trust its contradiction will be complete and conclusive. The doctor spoken of is Dr. Westbrook:—

A woman, strangely attired and veiled, came into the doctor's house, during a meeting there at which Rev. W. R. Alger, Olcott, and H. P. Blavatsky were present, and handed the latter a letter purporting to come from the "Brothers"—the messenger being presumed to be an elementary. A few months afterwards Dr. Westbrook discovered that the presumed elementary was an Irish servant girl, to whom Madame Blavatsky had promised to pay five dollars for the personation of the messenger of the "Brothers." Having failed to get her pay, she confessed the fraud.

We await with anxiety Mr. Coleman's promised book, and after that the defence of those he accuses.

SAINTS AND MEDIUMS.

By C. A. PARRY, B.A.

I.

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS.

A few years ago a book was published with the title, "Vie de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie, par Jules Mary." The "Life" itself does not call for notice, being sufficiently puerile both in matter and style; but it is preceded by a remarkable introduction, evidently by another pen, in which the views of an enlightened Catholic as to the nature and signification of these strange and exceptional lives are stated with admirable clearness.

As this introduction will serve very well as a preface and summary of what I have to say on this subject, I here translate the material parts of it, premising that the author is evidently a zealous Catholic, and would, therefore, be horrified at the application of his opinions to so damnable a heresy as Spiritualism; and that the orthodoxy of the book is guaranteed by the *imprimatur* of the diocese of Tournai.

After laying down the doubtful statement that asceticism, as a means for the acquisition of supernormal faculties, was little practised under the "old dispensation," the writer proceeds:—

"With Christianity, however, a new character was impressed on the religious life. The phenomena of this new existence, in which certain individuals are led to mystic communication with the invisible world, bear the impress of the wounds of the Eternal Son in a manner which fills the ordinary Christian with surprise and trouble of mind. It is by a painful crucifixion of the natural man, in his soul and body, carried to an extraordinary degree of perfection, that the soul is introduced into this miraculous condition. Imprisoned in its fleshly habitation, the spirit cannot be admitted to communication with Jesus Christ, for ever united with His Father, and with the invisible world, save by recovering a certain degree of that self-domination which Adam lost by his fall. The physical nature must be subjected by the rigorous repetition of those numerous and difficult actions by which the animal part is rendered the slave of the spiritual, the will and the affections estranged from all created things, to be fixed on God alone. The natural taste is neglected, thwarted, tormented until, tired of soliciting satisfaction, it ceases to intermingle with the independent action of the soul. The appetite is also deprived of its ordinary pleasures with regard to the quantity of food. By means of fasts, gradually increasing in severity, new modes of physical existence supervene; what was originally impossible becomes a second nature, and the emaciated frame, forgetting almost its first necessities, obeys as it were spontaneously the orders of the victorious mind. The hours of sleep are reduced by a judicious control, until that mysterious sentence which constrains us to pass one-third of our lives in an immobility that deprives us of self-consciousness, is in part surmounted. The soul, habituated to incessant conscious action, is awake and lives, while ordinary Christians are asleep, and, so to speak, dead. The submitting to other practices that are repellant to the body co-operates in the progress of purification and renders the mind capable of disdaining its natural wants in a way which to many Catholics seems almost incredible and to sceptics absolutely impossible. The physical life goes on under conditions which would be ruinous for a constitution not upheld by the miraculous power of the Almighty; weak men and women accomplish works of charity, of heroic self-sacrifice, before which the most robust and energetic would recoil terrified. The senses are literally tyrannised over, despised, trampled underfoot, insulted. Sight, smell, hearing, touch and taste learn to exercise themselves on objects which naturally repel them. They learn to obey the will without any sign of revolt. Matter is bent before spirit; the soul is mistress of the body; while the perceptions acquire an exquisite sensibility and the mind becomes possessed of absolutely new faculties; the flesh submits itself, almost without sensibility, to its condition of slavery, and hardly murmurs at the daily death it is forced to undergo.

"The process is the same in all that concerns the affections and passions of the mind itself. All that the heart desires, outside of God, is refused to it. However innocent, however praiseworthy, with ordinary Christians, may be the yielding to certain sentiments, the pursuit of certain ends, for these favoured beings nature is constrained in all its parts. Property

of every kind, estates, houses, books, pictures, gardens, husband or wife, children, friends, all undergo the same terrible sentence. God establishes Himself in the soul not only as supreme but as sole inhabitant. All that remains to be done in this world is done as a duty, often as a very difficult duty. Love for the souls that Christ has redeemed is the only human sentiment that is left free; and in whatever way the feelings of natural affection and friendship mix with this Christian love, they are watched and restrained with pitiless severity, to the end that the heart comes at last to love nothing but in Jesus Christ.

Henceforward the physical nature, thus subjected, learns to obey with docility the sanctified will; the history of the Catholic Church relates a long series of cases in which the soul has been led to a direct communication with God, the angels, and the demons, more or less by the medium of the senses, thus spiritualised and raised to a new office. The ineffable glories of the life of Christ are renewed in those who have thus borne His cross: the death of the body is the life of the soul. The phenomena of this miraculous state are equally varied and surprising. There is scarcely a law of our natural being which is not frequently suspended. We have an instance in what is called the *odour of sanctity*, a celestial perfume which exhales from a saint under conditions in which this delicious aroma could not come from natural causes, or even after death, when the natural odour would be most repulsive. During life or after death, in health or amid disgusting infirmities, this odour, of an unearthly sweetness, emanates from the body and communicates itself sometimes to objects that the saint touches.

Or a strange supernatural heat, independent of atmospheric conditions, spreads over all the body. Not seldom, corruption has no power over the sacred body, and, without any process of embalming, it escapes disintegration for whole centuries, wears the marks of life in death, and does not fall to dust on exposure to the air as happens in cases of natural preservation. Add the supernatural flexibility and lightness with which a living body is sometimes endowed by the Divine power, the physical accompaniment of ecstasy—the elevation of the whole body which rises into the air and rests suspended for a considerable time.

In another category of miraculous powers, the Christian saints become capable of recognising, by their natural senses, the presence or the true nature of purely spiritual objects. For instance, a mere touch sometimes reveals to them the moral condition of a person. Similarly the sense of smell discovers the condition of the soul, while the ear is open to celestial sounds and voices, and the Almighty speaks to the conscience in a language which is demonstrated by incontestable proof to be a real communication from Heaven to the illuminated understanding.

Thus, too, time and space may be annihilated. Saint Pius V., bodily at Rome, was witness of the naval victory of the Christians over the Turks at Lepanto; Saint Joseph of Cupertino used to read letters that were being at the time written to him; Saint Dominic foresaw the war of the Albigeois and the death of Philip of Aragon; Saint Ignatius foresaw his successor in the Duke of Gandia.

A mysterious faculty of the same sort makes its possessor capable of discerning the presence of relics or other sacred objects, especially the adorable Eucharist, of seeing Jesus Christ in a glorified human form, instead of the ordinary appearances of bread and wine. In some cases the Host is thrown, without material contact, into the mouth of the saint while he kneels at the foot of the altar to communicate.

I must not dwell on miracles which are not exclusively Christian, such as the gift of healing, whether by the will and touch of the saint or by his relics after death. I confine myself to what are exclusively the privileges of the Christian. Such, for example, is that most imposing manifestation of the perpetual death of the Son of God, in which the actual wounds and sufferings of Christ are visibly renewed by a miraculous operation on the bodies of certain elect persons. The most terrible gift of the great God is generally preceded by some supernatural circumstance, beginning to sketch out, as it were, the visible representation of the scene of Calvary which is about to be placed before the eyes of man. Sometimes it is a sort of bloody sweat; sometimes a visible impression of the cross on the shoulders. Then follows what is called stigmatisation, or a renovation of the actual wounds of the Crucified One, accompanied with the bleeding traces of the crown of thorns on the

patient's head, ordinarily one after the other, until the frightful commemoration is complete, the skin and the flesh are torn on the forehead and around the head, in the hands, the feet, and the side; an effusion of blood issues, sometimes falling slowly and by drops, sometimes, as on Fridays, in a more abundant course, accompanied by the pains of the death struggle and with the exception of the most terrible moment of the spiritual struggle with inward consolations of ravishing sweetness. The wounds penetrate deeply the flesh, and go even through the hands and feet.

The state of ecstasy is another of the most astonishing elements of the miraculous life of the saints. Under the divine influence, the physical constitution experiences a change which is in many respects analogous to that supposed, truly or falsely, to result from magnetism or in somnambulism. Several characteristics, however, distinguish the Christian ecstasy from the state produced by purely physical or perhaps Satanic causes. Without entering into detail, suffice it to say that the results of the true ecstasy are in the strictest conformity with the teachings of Christian revelation, and with the perfections and the rules of the moral world.

In this state the soul becomes, as it were, independent of the body, or uses the physical senses in absolute subordination to its own inspirations. It sees visions, such as those related in the Old Testament; is introduced into the court of Heaven; contemplates in the glory, the saints, the Mother of God, Christ Himself, and converses with them. Or perhaps the whole story of the Passion is represented before its spiritualised sight, the Gospel history is unfolded to it, with all the little real details omitted in the Gospels. In certain instances, the body is raised from the ground, and remains thus for some time in the presence of a crowd of spectators. In other cases, the soul during the ecstasy is the medium of communication between God Almighty and the persons then present, and the voice of the saint repeats the revelations to those for whom they are intended. Or again, a flame, which has nothing of earthly, shining round the head or the whole person of the ecstatic, like the tongues of fire at Pentecost, attests the presence of the Invisible One, and symbolises the message sent from His throne to men.

A vision, or purely intellectual revelation, is another of the works of the Great Spirit in His saints. It was by revelations of this sort that the truths of the Holy Scripture were generally communicated to those who have transmitted them to us. God has His own marks, which, though mysterious, are not less certain, whereby He enables the mind of him whom He favours to distinguish a revelation from a mere prodigy of the imagination, the Divine Voice from the suggestions of Satan. Many Christian saints have had the privilege of contemplating God Himself, in a certain sense, in His essence; plunging the regard into abysses such as the Mystery of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Real Presence, or into the true nature of sin, with a clearness of vision and a depth of comprehension which it is not in the power of human knowledge to express.

In short, all we read of in the Bible with regard to visible or tangible revelations between man and angelic or diabolic spirits continued under Christianity. The reality of the ministry of angels and the assaults of the Evil One is believed by every Catholic; and in some instances the saints have even recognised the presence of their friends or enemies, rendered invisible by death, just like the presence and actions of living men. The Saviour Himself has appeared to some saints in a human form, perhaps in that of the most despised and suffering outcast; to others their guardian angels or good spirits have appeared, sometimes as men, sometimes in a manifestly supernatural form. Examples of all these phenomena will occur to those familiar with the lives of the saints."

"OUR FATHER'S CHURCH."—Some of our readers will be glad to be reminded that services will be held on Sunday next, at 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., at the Cavendish Rooms, Mortimer-street (near Oxford Circus), when the Rev. W. Birks will speak, in the morning on "A Misunderstood Beatitude," and in the evening on "What and where is Hell?"

POETRY.—Poetry reveals to us the loveliness of Nature, brings back the freshness of youthful feeling, revives the relish of simple pleasures, keeps unquenched the enthusiasm which warmed the springtime of our being, refines youthful love, strengthens our interest in human nature by vivid delineations of its tenderest and loftiest feelings, and through the brightness of its prophetic visions helps faith to lay hold on the future life.—CHANNING.

CASES OF SPONTANEOUS PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

Having recently met with several cases of curious spontaneous psychical phenomena, obtained generally at first hand, and always of undoubted authenticity, I think a short account of them may probably interest the readers of "LIGHT," and perhaps induce others to bring forward similar cases, which, in the interest of psychical science, should surely never be allowed, for lack of a little time and trouble, to fall into oblivion.

The following account was given me a short time since by my eldest daughter, and afterwards detailed in writing, from her diary:—

On Monday, April 10th, at 1.30 a.m. of the present year, her uncle, a much respected solicitor and the general referee of the family, passed away suddenly. He had for some time been in failing health, but she had no idea of any danger, nor was she in any way anxious about him. The sad news was at once sent her by post, and at the time of her curious experience the letter was on its way to her. On Monday night she was kept awake by the constant howling of a dog belonging to a friend who was staying in the house, and between twelve and one o'clock called the latter to go out into a neighbour's garden and quiet him. (These particulars show that the experience was no dream.) During the whole time her friend was thus occupied, and for some time after, she continually heard what seemed to be the bell of the neighbouring church (about two minutes' walk from the house) tolling the funeral knell. The sound was quite natural and distinct, only muffled as if passing through closed windows. The phenomenon thus occurred about twenty-three hours after the decease, and early on Tuesday morning the mournful intelligence of her uncle's death reached her.

The two following clairvoyant and clairaudient dreams tend to show, like others which I have met with, that the above faculties do not always need the stimulus of impending calamity to call them into exercise:—

A short time since an aunt of mine gave me the following. She lives in a beautiful spot "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife," and, therefore, perhaps, peculiarly calculated to develop and foster that higher sense of which we now hear so much. She has in her house a young man-servant of about twenty, remarkably thoughtful and steady, and singularly devoted to the gardens.

I do not know the exact date of the dreams, but they must have occurred quite recently.

For some time my aunt had been annoyed by continual depredations on her kitchen garden, but notwithstanding the watchfulness of "Richard," as the young man was named, no clue to the thief could be discovered. One morning very early he dreamt that one of the villagers said to him, "If you get up now you will catch the thief." He immediately arose, went into a tool-house in the garden, and watched. Presently he saw a movement in the laurels; a man emerged, and commenced helping himself to the vegetables; he was at once caught, my aunt was called, and the culprit was brought before her window, and was afterwards summoned before the magistrates and duly punished. On another occasion Richard dreamt that he saw a man trying to enter the fruit garden by a door in the wall. This time, whether on account of the hour, or not waking immediately, he did not rise until his usual time, when on going to the place he found that the wood of the door had been *freshly cut*, and the would-be depredator only prevented from entering by the fact that the wooden bar which secured the door was nailed on the inside.

The three following cases were given me by an elderly lady whom I knew in Italy, and who, at the time, had been a widow for some years. She regarded psychical phenomena of the kind as of quite ordinary occurrence, and therefore did not look upon her experiences as anything very remarkable. I wrote out the account, and she kindly attested and signed it, but strongly objected to her name being published. It ran thus:—

"Some time before my husband's death he said he thought he might be permitted to come to me in any trouble. An undertaker in the town, having a peculiar respect for him, always said that, in case of his death, it would greatly gratify him to be allowed to conduct the funeral himself; and in consequence of this, the arrangements were placed in his hands, and he prepared the interior of the coffin with sweet-scented pungent shavings to obviate any unpleasant odour.

"Immediately after the funeral, which took place on a Tuesday, I left the house for the residence of my son, and on the following Friday evening was in a fearfully depressed and dis-

consolate state, and feeling utterly unfit for any society determined to go to my room. About two o'clock a.m., I was roused, I cannot tell how, and struck a light, hearing at the same time the roll of carriages returning from a ball in the neighbourhood. After these ceased there was a lull, and a peculiar atmosphere of peace pervaded the room, while something, light as a feather, swept across my face, and the air was filled with the peculiar odour of the scented woods of my husband's coffin, while my mind, recently so depressed and wretched, passed into a state of unspeakable calm.

"Again—I was in the habit of going to my husband's grave at least once, and sometimes twice, during the week. The cemetery being at some distance, I had to go by rail, and afterwards by tram. At the junction of the latter there was a deal of traffic, not only owing to the crossing of the various tramways, but also from the concourse of carriages, and I had to cross this busy road to gain my tram. On doing so, I heard many voices shouting, but did not imagine that I had anything to do with the excitement, when I felt the familiar action of my husband's hand laid on my shoulder, guiding me over the rails into a place of safety, the front of the car rubbing against my dress, and leaving a deal of dust on the latter, which the people around kindly removed with their handkerchiefs, while congratulating me on my escape from a serious accident, or in all probability a sudden death. During the whole of the time I had not the slightest fear, nor the least idea of the danger from which I had been preserved.

"Another time, about nine or ten months after my husband's death, a gentleman called, asking my son to take shares in some land. He consulted me, and I agreed at once to take them, considering it an excellent speculation. I went to bed quite contented and happy with regard to the business. During the night I was awoken by my husband's whisper 'Don't take the shares.' I acted on the advice, and without explaining the reason, told my son I should decline having anything to do with the business. The sequel proved that I had acted wisely in accepting the warning, as it turned out a most ruinous speculation, in which millions were lost and many families reduced to poverty."

ELIZA LUTLEY BOUCHER.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

[The Editor is not responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents, and sometimes publishes what he does not agree with for the purpose of presenting views that may elicit discussion.]

"Free-Will and the Heresy of Separateness."

SIR,—In an article, which appeared in "LIGHT" on the 30th ult., entitled "Free Will and the Heresy of Separateness," the author seeks to prove that in teaching "that conjunction with the higher principles of consciousness may be effected by the lower" Theosophy is in contradiction "with the other portions of its teaching which condemn the heresy of separateness and maintain the illusion of personal existence." This contradiction is, however, more apparent than real, as I hope to prove to the readers of "LIGHT" by showing the true nature of the illusive personality.

Theosophy teaches that man possesses both a personality and an individuality; the former being represented by the physical body with its sensations and thoughts, the latter by that sense of identity which we are all conscious of possessing, quite irrespective of our personal existence as a Mr. Smith or a Mr. Brown, and which we say notifies the presence in us of an Ego.

The sense of personality which gives connection and coherence to that ever-changing agglomeration of physical particles which build up our physical body is due to the reflection the Ego casts upon the mirror of physical consciousness. A clear idea of the relation which this subjective self bears to its objective self may be obtained by the simple experiment of looking in a mirror. This is the only way by which a man may learn to know his own personal appearance, and in the same way the Ego can only realise its own personal existence by studying its own reflection as mirrored in the activities of its physical life. In the looking-glass, it is my own appearance reflected back which gives me the knowledge of what I am like; nevertheless I am the reality, while that other *me* seen in the mirror is an illusion, which, as long as my attention is fixed upon it, seems to be my real self. So with the Ego. Its likeness, when cast upon the physical body which, so to say, envelops it, may absorb its complete attention, so that the recog-

nition of self (the reality and individual) is lost entirely in the contemplation of self (the illusion and personality).

How is this mirror formed? We hold that the physical body is made up of minute items of cosmic consciousness or tiny lives, which, collected round the Ego, form a conscious mirror in which the individuality of the Ego (its permanent identity) is reflected. Thus, while the reflecting medium or physical body is no illusion, the appearance its component particles assume of identity, and of thus being in their aggregate the real Ego, is entirely illusive.

How, then, can this personality really affect the Ego if it has no actual existence? Simply because, as a reflection, it illumines the reflected one with self-knowledge. Thus the reaction of the physical consciousness as personality on the Ego or individual entity is productive of a distinct effect, measurable in the case of each human being as a definite amount of distinctive individuality, which represents the stock in trade of the Ego during one earth-life.

The action of Re-incarnation should, when normal, increase this self knowledge of the Ego until eventually the consciousness of the physical body is capable of reflecting to the full the latent perfection of the individual spirit. This progressive improvement in the capacity of the physical reflector to reproduce objectively a more and more complex and perfect representation of the unit-self constitutes, in practice, a reaching up of the Lower Man to the Higher Man. In other words, man aspires to be a god.

How is the act of reflection brought about? It is by the action of Will. The Ego is an individualisation of the Infinite Cosmic Will, and therefore it must ever manifest as a perfectly free Will. Looking at the Will as a current of power, this is the same as saying that this current must always manifest its solidarity. But when incarnated it encounters the limitations of matter in the "tiny lives" surrounding it, of which I have already spoken as building up the physical form, and endows them with its unity of purpose, connecting them up into one personality, representing its own distinctive oneness or individuality; but at the same time the limitations of this personality differentiate it into fatalities, or various activities which, reflected back from the consciousness of matter to the spiritual consciousness of the Ego, produce, as medium for their manifestation, Intellect. The "improvement of the capacity of the physical reflector for the reproduction of a more and more complex representation of the unit self," to quote from what I have already said, is tantamount to a greater differentiation of the Will of the Ego, and the production of a subtler intellect as medium for the manifestation of the power of self-knowledge. And in saying, therefore, that the Personal or Lower Man may develop his Will Power, we mean that he may, by reaching up to the Divinity within him, so perfect the medium for manifesting the Will of his Ego that eventually this latter is able to manifest its solidarity, and the heresy of separateness comes to a natural end. On the other hand, if the Ego is so blinded by its objective vision as to lose all perception of its true relation to the external or illusive self, then the Will is circumscribed by personal motives, and the intellect is less and less fitted to act as a medium for the manifestation of universality or Divine Intelligence.

THOS. WILLIAMS, F.T.S.

A Notion of Theosophy.

SIR,—It seems that your correspondent "Karma" is very angry with me, but I cannot tell why. He says that some one, Mr. Judge to wit, has been talking "malicious nonsense," saying that Spiritualists "worship the dead," and he quarrels with me in the current number of "LIGHT" for not adopting and defending that assertion. Why should I? and why should "Karma" owe me a grudge and seek to put me "out of court" for not further lacerating his already harrowed feelings by repeating the charge?

I do not know of my own knowledge whether any, many, all, or none of the Spiritualists "worship the dead." I do not even know that Mr. Judge said they do, except by inference from your correspondent's letter. Why, then, should I be punished for not intervening in a matter on which I have no knowledge, and why should "Karma" be aggrieved by my reticence?

"Let J.C.S." cries your correspondent, waxing fervent in another passage, "come to the point and own up"—to talking malicious nonsense. But that last is what he has just been complaining of my *not* doing. With every desire to be obliging, I cannot "own up" to a thing which, because I don't know

whether it is or is not true, I avoided saying or even suggesting; and, with submission, I cannot be "ruled out of court" before I have entered an appearance.

But "Karma" further complains that I dealt with "my assertions" and "side issues." Be it so. I am not responsible. He introduced them, not I. His former letter is my only text. And how was I to tell that the matter to which he devotes the first ninety lines of his letter was "side issues," and that a little paragraph of six lines slipped in towards the end contained the only "point" we were permitted to discuss?

Well, then, again, we are not, of course, to take your correspondent too seriously when, for rhetorical purposes, he affects an ignorance of the meaning of the term "congruous," in which the first dictionary to hand would enlighten him.

What I tried to convey in my last letter was the idea that the Universal Karmic Law (not God) of Compensation and Justice metes out in the long run punishments and rewards that bear a definite relation to their antecedent offences and merits respectively. That is what I meant by congruous punishment. There is in divine, but not always in human, justice a relation of fitness between the crime and its punishment, the merit and its recompense: a relation as of cause and effect.

Now, that is an opinion which some of us Theosophists hold. It is a warrantable inference by analogy from the most striking and recent generalisations of science. Moreover, it is the teaching of the Gospels and of Paul; it is the teaching—with characteristic limitations—of the Mosaic law; it is the teaching of the Vedas, and indeed of all great religions. It appeals to our reason and to our intuitions, and therefore we accept it, at least tentatively, and express our conviction of its truth. Surely we are well within our right, as "Karma" would be well within his right in rejecting it, if he chose. But he does not reject it. The very crown of his perversity is reached when he gives as rational and acceptable what is in fact a fairish résumé of our views on this subject, and then declares that "this, however, is an absolutely different thing from—" what?—why, a figment of his imagination which he develops, which he foists upon us, purposely making it as absurd and repellent as possible, but which no Theosophist ever held or could hold. This is ingenious, no doubt, but with an ingenuity of which, one would hope, your correspondent cannot be very proud when he reflects upon the device in his calmer moments. J.C.S., F.T.S.

Spirit Guides and Theosophy.

SIR,—If Mr. Green will refer to the first letter to which he replied he will find the Theosophical position he describes (the overlooking of which has caused him to think that I forgot) already clearly defined there, viz., "That the medium's own Ego may rise and unite in a magnetic relation with a disembodied spirit in Devachan, and for a brief space blend with that of the spirit in the latter's sphere."

But Mr. Green limits the attainment of this communion to an effort from the external to the internal states of Being, or to the consciousness of the medium rising to the state of that of the "high intelligence," in spiritual planes; while the experience of spiritualists would lead to the conclusion, granting that spiritual communion premises identity of state between the recipient and the communicant, that such communion may also occur in the converse direction to the only one admitted by him, or from the internal to the external; that is, by a communicant in internal states descending to and communing with a medium (not necessarily entranced) in whom an identic state of consciousness had been unfolded.

Of course, descent and ascent are only terms which apply to external appearances, and do not apply to pure spiritual states; but they must be used here to illustrate the relation between similar aspects of Being, existing in the incarnate state of man on the one hand, and in the discarnate state of spiritual planes, or Devachan, on the other.

That Theosophy should thus limit the attainment of communion to the one direction, from the external to the interior; to the condition that the medium is sufficiently spiritual to transcend the astro-kamic state, and commune in the purely spiritual or Devachanic state, is a logical necessity of other of its teachings, as Theosophy says that when the discarnate spirit-entity indraws from the astro-kamic plane, it sheds and leaves behind it all astro-kamic elements. It therefore ceases to command any possible relation with this external or incarnate state, the intervening link being cut off. It is evident, therefore, that any communion between entities in such a position

and incarnate entities can only occur (in Theosophy) by the Ego of the medium, who possesses an astral vehicle, transcending that to the spirit missing link, and rising to the plane of the spirit; as the spirit is disconnected from earth, and cannot descend thereto, except by a re-incarnation, when it again takes on kamic-astral elements which relate it, *de novo*, to earth states.

The experiences in connection with spirit-guides would appear to imply that spirits of "high intelligence" do not necessarily become disconnected from incarnate life states when entering Devachan or the soul plane. It would appear that they retain a relation, distilled and transmuted according to alchemy, but a relation, with incarnate states, by which they may descend and commune with human entities in whom identic states of consciousness have been unfolded, and who can consequently reciprocate.

This difference between the Theosophical and the alchemic positions is most important. It explains the possibility of relation between human beings and great angels, yet shows that all relations with spirits are limited by, and to, the state of consciousness which is unfolded in the human recipient. It is therefore evident that if most spirit communications are of astral character and origin, it is because their higher principles have not evolved in the recipients. No higher note can be rung, can be vibrated, in the scale of their Being. Yet where the soul principle has begun to evolve in man, it also may be made to respond, and alchemy shows that it may be acted upon by spirits from the soul plane; and that these are not cut off from all possible relation with earth, as is taught by Theosophy.

As regards the last class of spirits which might constitute spirit-guides, that Mr. Green refers to, viz.: "Those cases where the deceased, not having yet entered Devachan, returns to earth, and holds communion in the well-known ways," allow me to point out that these are, according to Theosophy, denizens of the astral-kamic passion sphere—shells, spooks, &c., &c.—and therefore come under that wholesale condemnatory classification which the "Religio-Philosophical Journal" and "LIGHT" objected to, as not being in accord with experience of spirit-guides. It is therefore apparent that the complaint of the "Religio-Philosophical Journal" and "LIGHT" is justified, and that spirit-guides, according to Theosophy, must necessarily emanate from the astral sphere of passion and desire, which teaching does not concord with the experience of Spiritualists. Mr. Green's letters have been admirable in spirit and intention, and he will no doubt agree with me that to elicit a clear conception of the true position, as far as is attainable, is of more vital concern than the definitions of any one school in particular. The comparison of the teachings of various schools is of use in this respect, as the position of one may sometimes throw light upon and supplement those of another.

With the last paragraph of Mr. Green's letter, I am, I am glad to say, in complete accord, hence the value of the study of the subjective principles of man, cannot be sufficiently insisted upon. Till we understand the identity pervading man and the Universe, the microcosm and the macrocosm, and relating the one to the other, we shall not understand psychical laws or phenomena.

IN UTRUMQUE PARATUS.

The Occult Influences of Metals.

SIR,—In the "Life of Sir Richard Burton" by his wife, from which two weeks ago you gave an extract of great interest to Spiritualists, there is, in the second volume, reference to another phase of occult mystery, to which I beg to draw attention, viz., Sir Richard's belief that "everybody"—to quote the exact words of the book—"had some particular metal which influences them, and also colour. His metal was silver, and applied to his pains cured him; he would put florins on his eyes if they ached from over-reading or study. His theory was that every person had some metal which affected his illness, and after frequent trial he found his. He had the same theory about colours; his was Royal Cramoisie, or blood red, which soothed him."

Now, this belief is not new to anyone at all acquainted with occult literature, but it is interesting to find the theory supported by the independent testimony of so practical and scientific a thinker as Sir Richard Burton. The theory is one which has as yet been by no means well threshed out, and if you can kindly find space for this letter, it may elicit interesting expressions of opinion on the subject from some of your readers. One further remark only I wish to make: silver is the metal said to be in affinity with the moon; it is also supposed by students of Astrology and Palmistry that the moon influen-

cing a Nativity gives a taste for travelling. Is it merely a remarkable coincidence or something more that the Lunar metal was that with which this great traveller felt some mysterious occult affinity? His preference for a certain colour is not enlarged upon. Perhaps some of the readers of "LIGHT" can give some experiences on that point also.

F. P. LAYE.

"C.C.M." and Re-incarnation.

SIR,—"C.C.M." seems to think that the absence of replies to his answers to my objections is a sign of agreement with those answers. But there are other reasons for not replying specifically. The most important is that I did not consider some of the answers were such as to require any notice from me, and I preferred to leave my objections as they stood, with "C.C.M.'s" answers thereto.

Instead of finding it difficult to meet the arguments for Re-incarnation from an Idealist point of view, I feel, on the contrary, that the theory of Re-incarnation is quite incompatible with Idealism. But what is even more important, it is incompatible with a rational view of man's evolution and all the analogies derived from life itself.

Taking these incompatibilities in the order I have given, Idealism regards all "this Physical World" and "Nature, as perceived by us" simply as so many ideas or sense-picturings, but what the reality is behind these we do not know and have no means of knowing. We may surmise that it is spirit and deem it the universal reality behind all phenomena; or we may regard this inner reality as an effect of spirit. Whatever view we take, we are driven to the conclusion that flesh is an illusion of our present sense condition—and that from an Idealist point of view there has never been an incarnation, and, of course, there can never be any re-incarnation. Quite early in this controversy I put forward this argument, but "C.C.M." took no notice of it, and therefore, to use his own words, "I may assume that he has no exception to take to it."

Then, as regards man's evolution and the analogies of our life here. He evolves by means of natural growth and of experiences acquired during life, and *each of these* gives him a wider range of vision, moral and intellectual, and a greater force of character. There are great diversities, but this is the normal effect. Now, Re-incarnationists coolly maintain that all that is to remain to the individual after a life of effort and aspiration is merely a certain moral and intellectual tendency, which they call Karma. I agree, of course, that this tendency is an effect of the experiences of life in most cases, but I cannot understand how it is reconcileable with any analogy that man should have to encounter over again the illusive experiences of childhood, youth, and middle age, which he, even in his present condition and in his better moments, has been able to transcend. When I go to sleep once in twenty-four hours or thereabouts, I do not wake to find that while I was asleep I have been put back several stages of the progress I have already made. No! I go on from the point attained *not only in tendency and character*, but with a full knowledge of the experiences and ideas I was possessed of the day before, and not requiring to struggle and strive over the problems of life that I have already solved. To do so would be a pure waste of effort, and unworthy of the Supreme Wisdom (however we may name it) that is the source of that evolution which we see going on in nature and ourselves.

A great many of the statements of "C. C. M." in his last and previous letters are given as though they had been proven. In one case he says that all occultists agree, &c. Now, I am afraid I should be bold enough to dispute what they were all agreed upon if they were practically agreed upon anything, which I doubt. You will find no class of thinkers who differ more than occultists. And it is only reasonable it should be so. The more we investigate unusual phenomena of mind or matter, the more room there is for divergence of view. The unknown is a trackless desert where each takes his own solitary way.

Then, his denial that in a fleshly state a man must have a consciousness of that state seems to me a most astounding assertion. If "C. C. M." at death is to go into a condition of rest and then come back here and have a body of flesh without the consciousness that is able to perceive *that flesh*, either in himself or in the people around him, what can be the use of coming back at all, seeing he cannot have any experiences of life, and even the aspect of nature would be different to him?

There is considerable confusion in "C. C. M.'s" last letter as to the term "state of consciousness." No Spiritualist that

I am aware of ever thinks of death as ushering man into an advanced moral and intellectual condition. The change is not a "radical change of interior state," neither, of course, is it "a periodical abeyance." It is simply a new mode of perception which is evolved from within. Whether a man is an ignoble dotard or a noble philanthropist, he must gravitate into a new state of consciousness at death; that is, into a new way of sensing things; and this arises from the condition of growth which is present in him, and has nothing to do with goodness or badness of moral character. I do not know whether the state of being immediately after death is regarded as a conscious state by "C. C. M." If not, then we cannot, *there, while resting unconscious, experience the results of the last life in "this Physical World."* If, however, it is a different "state of consciousness," is it higher, lower, or the same? If the same, then the object of death is not apparent, and seems to be quite useless. If higher, then we have to believe, if we are Re-incarnationists, that we return to a lower at re-birth. If lower, then progress is not the result of experience, or the natural law of growth, but can only be an arbitrary arrangement imposed by some external authority. Neither the first nor the last of these propositions stands the test of reason, but the other is in harmony with the law of growth. I do not think there is any practical divergence between my view as to the absence of consciousness of time in an advanced state of being—of course I mean time as now sensed by us. We know and can imagine no other. I cannot help feeling that the question under discussion is confused and made very obscure by a great many of the arguments adduced by "C.C.M." The question is, are there any analogies in this present life that point to the necessity of re-birth into a fleshly state? "C.C.M." says there are, and points to the periodical activity and rest in man and nature. I maintain that giving these their due force as analogies does not lead to any conclusion favourable to the doctrine of Re-incarnation. Man may, for aught I know, go on as he has done, waking and sleeping in some way, in the next immediate stage of existence after death, but that this next stage is *all* a rest, in which he is unconscious of the waking life he has led here immediately before, is a most arbitrary and unreasonable conclusion, unjustifiable by any fair analogy from our present condition or surroundings. I should not like to hurt the feelings of any honest Re-incarnationist who believes that he remembers previous physical conditions, in which he was born over and over again; but I regret I cannot accept such evidence as proof even of the feeblest kind. My own view is, that we arrived at our present mode of consciousness from a lower, and that at death we are ushered into a more advanced state, but that any of these modes of perception are the fit theatre for moral regeneration and intellectual progress: and that failure to make use of opportunity causes pain and remorse, leading to higher aspirations, and more determined efforts to attain moral and intellectual culture, with its beneficent result, a life of self-denying well-doing. In the next stage of being, that immediately after death, it is not unconsciousness or sleep that after an ill-spent life the soul craves for. It is the earnest desire to make amends for acts and thoughts which its then higher perceptions reveal as self-destructive, although they appeared in moments of passion and selfishness as wise and prudent.

One word more regarding "C.C.M.'s" statement "that we cannot separate the mode of manifestation from the nature of the experience." I can only say that this does not agree with my experience in person, or with what I know of the departed. Although I may see a brick differently from "C.C.M." and although the effect of a violent collision with this brick may be different in his case and mine, still both our experiences lead us to avoid such collisions. So all persons, in whatever mode of consciousness or manifestation they may be, can profit by the same experiences, although they may perceive them differently. Somehow I think "C.C.M." is such a very good man that he loses sight altogether of modes of manifestation and states of consciousness, and that he ardently desires that we may live over and over again till we get into his blessed condition. It is kind and charitable of him, but for myself I am content to wait, to hope, and, in some humble way, to aspire.

R. DONALDSON.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"SPIRIT TEACHINGS."—Remittances received with thanks from Mrs. C. J., Mr. J. H. K., Mr. J. K., Mr. W. T. R. and Mr. J. R.; but we shall be glad if subscribers will be kind enough to defer payment until they receive the intimation that the book is ready.

SOCIETY WORK.

THE STRATFORD SOCIETY OF SPIRITUALISTS, WORKING HALL, WEST HAM-LANE, STRATFORD, E.—Speaker for Sunday next, Mr. C. Hardingham; subject, "The Attraction of RAINBOW, Hon. Sec.

311, CAMBERWELL NEW-ROAD.—A special general meeting of this society has been called to discuss the proposed basis and rules, and to consider plans for future work. Wednesday, inquirers' meeting at 8.15 p.m. Sunday, 11.30 a.m. Spiritual gathering at 7 p.m.—C. M. PATE, Sec.

14, ORCHARD-ROAD, ARKEW-ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH, W. On Sunday last a good meeting was held to welcome Mr. C. Hardingham, whose guides delivered an able discourse on the "Basis of Immortality," followed by very successful psychometry, all being recognised. Sunday next, at 7 p.m., the above rooms by Mrs. Mason, on Thursday, October 22nd, Mrs. Spring. A special séance will be given at 8 p.m., on behalf of Mrs. Spring, the well-known medium, who is in great need of help. Tickets 1s., may be obtained of Mr. Mason.—J. H. B., Hon. Sec.

23, DEVONSHIRE-ROAD, FOREST HILL.—Harvest Thanksgiving.—This festival, held on Sunday last, is the first of the kind instituted among the London Spiritualists, and it is to be hoped many will follow the example. The rooms were crowded to excess, and we are glad to say not only many of our friends came, but some from kindred societies from most parts of London. An excellent tea was provided at 5.30 for those of the friends who arrived before service, and by 7 o'clock the tastefully decorated meeting place was thronged. It presented a charming appearance. Mrs. Bliss and Miss Young occupied the platform and interesting addresses were also given by Mr. Bertram and other friends. Excellent music followed, some sacred duets being charmingly rendered by Mrs. Lucy Collins and Mrs. Gunn. Sunday next, at 7 p.m., Dr. Reynolds. Thursday, open circle.—J. B.

PECKHAM RYE.—On Sunday last, Mr. R. J. Lees, by special request, took as the subject of his lecture "Is there a God?" Dealing first with the Biblical aspect of the question, he held that the writers of the different books which form the Bible did not anywhere attempt to prove the existence of God, but all through assumed the existence of the Supreme Being. Mr. Lees very lucidly traced the evolution of the different teachings in the Bible as to the character of God, from the early idea of Him, as walking and talking in the Garden of Eden, to the highest development taught by Jesus as "Our Father." Passing on to consider the main question of his lecture, he took the scientific basis of the nature of man, showing very clearly the physiological changes constantly going on in the physical frame, the mental portion with its memory remaining permanent, while not one atom of the body but passed away many times during an average length of life. Arguing from this permanent quality of the mind, the evidences of design all through the universe, and the law of cause and effect, he drew his conclusion that some power which was the base and cause of all, and which contained all the potentialities of manifested nature within itself, was behind all, and this power, or force, was what he believed to be God. At the conclusion of his lecture he asked his audience to subscribe towards the relief of the miners' wives and children: the amount received was £1 10s.—J. C.

SPIRITUAL HALL, 86, HIGH-STREET, MARYLEBONE, W.—On Sunday morning, Mr. W. Glendenning, of Liverpool, kindly took the chair, and related some of his many experiences in Spiritualism. The address was very interesting, showing the great amount of patience he had taken in proving the reality of Spiritualistic phenomena, and how carefully he had examined the pros and cons of the whole subject before becoming the ardent Spiritualist that he is. Mrs. Green gave eight clairvoyant descriptions, all of which were recognised. In the evening Mrs. Green delivered a trance address, dealing in a simple and earnest manner with some of the central principles of Spiritualism. There was little that was new in the discourse, but the teachings set forth were another instance of the consistent and coherent character of spirit utterances on the great problems of existence. One point only may be referred to here, viz., the contention of the speaker that it is the man himself that persists after the great change—the man, with every faculty and attribute that he ever possessed, as a spirit, and not a mere "immortal part," or a number of permanent principles. This contention is significant, as forming one of the dividing lines between legitimate Spiritualism and the philosophy of the Himalayan Mountains. The proceedings terminated with clairvoyant delineations of the deceased friends of various members of the audience, which were interesting in virtue of their singularly minute and vivid character. Eight out of eleven of these descriptions were recognised by the persons to whom they were given, and who were all, we believe, total strangers to the medium, herself a stranger to London. On Sunday next a tea and quarterly meeting will be held, Mr. T. Everitt (president) in the chair. Tickets, 9d. each, to be obtained of Mrs. Everitt, Lilian Villa, Holder's Hill, Hendon, N.W., Mr. W. T. Cooper, 82, East-street, Baker-street, W., or any member of the committee, and of the secretaries at the Hall.—D. G.