

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

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

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe

No. 344.—VOL. VII. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1887. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS

Notes by the Way	353	What is Spiritualism?	356
The <i>Banner of Light</i> on the Preliminary Report of the Seybert Commission	355	The Story of the Dead Wife	358
Mr. Coleman still Denies the Charge of Misrepresentation ..	356	Two Blossoms	359
		Strong Points of Spiritualism ..	359
		The Metempsychosis	363
		A Gem from Dr. Holmes	363

NOTES BY THE WAY.

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

There is some little inconvenience in criticising remarks of mine that appeared in this journal in the pages of another journal, which very few of my readers are acquainted with. *The Journal of the Society for Psychical Research* does not circulate among the readers of "LIGHT," and it was by accident and through the courtesy of a personal friend that I became aware that the July number contains some criticisms, perfectly courteous in tone, from Mrs. Sidgwick, on some Notes of mine published in "LIGHT" on June 18th. No doubt from inadvertence, I have not up to the moment of writing received a copy of the *Journal* containing this letter. I have, however, perused it with interest. It is, as is all that Mrs. Sidgwick writes, critical and wholly fair in spirit according to the point of view from which the writer approaches the subject. I never read such a piece of criticism without wondering what would be the tone of comment adopted by the writer if she, or any of the little knot of investigators with whom she is associated, had been as fortunate in their experiments as I and some of my friends have been in ours. I can but regret that it has not been so. But Mrs. Sidgwick's reasons why Mr. Davey so persistently refuses to "perform" for the benefit of Spiritualists, who do at least know what Spiritualistic phenomena are, possess only a transient interest. Whatever reasons may or may not influence Mr. Davey, the fact remains, he will not allow us to make any comparison of his tricks with the genuine article. And that is really all that is important in the matter.

In the same number, Mr. C. C. Massey replies at length to Mr. R. Hodgson's criticisms in the last number of the *Proceedings* of the Society for Psychical Research, of an account of a séance contributed by him to "LIGHT," and corroborated by another observer, the Hon. Roden Noel. Mr. Massey treats Mr. Hodgson at elaborate length, and has no difficulty in tearing to shreds the tissue of hypotheses which Mr. Hodgson has weaved in order to obscure a simple fact. Perhaps eight closely printed pages is more than Mr. Hodgson's curious speculation deserved; but if the answer was to be made it is not easy to conceive a more complete one than this. And now Mr. Hodgson is in the United States, and we are left with the uncomfortable feeling that he may revive the whole discussion some time in the autumn. Let us hope not. These hair-splittings and nice differences and distinctions are infinitely tedious and profitless. No human being who has once witnessed real mediumistic phenomena can be turned from his knowledge by these idle speculations. No evidence that we can produce is apparently sufficient to influence the minds of

our critics. Then let us each turn our attention to more worthy work. We, at least, have more profitable work ready to our hands in extending the bounds of our own knowledge, and in accumulating facts which future generations will assuredly know how to appreciate.

The *Daily Telegraph* of July 25th contained a leading article on the report of the Seybert Commission which many of my correspondents find amusing. From it we learn that in this country "Spirit-rapping is at a hopeless discount." The "innocent Spiritualist"—there are such!—is represented by "what could scarcely be a more pregnant example than the writer of a book recently published in America, called *Spirit Workers in the Home Circle*." Alas! thus is history written. I had thought that my friend, Mr. Morell Theobald, published his book quite recently in London. Evidently the writer has not taken the trouble to refer to the title-page of a book to which, however, he nevertheless devotes the chief part of his article. He goes on to mention one "Alan Kasdeck,"—He would say, if he only knew, Allan Kardec,—whose *Spirit World* has since his death in 1853 gone through no fewer than thirteen editions, and who "was succeeded in the editorship of the *Paris Spiritual Review* by one Laymarie." The whole affair is very funny, and may be regarded, if I may adopt the writer's own terms, as a "pregnant example" of the nonsense that men can write when they are forced to make brick without straw,—to fill a column about a subject of which they know nothing. Even poor Mr. Seybert's name is misspelt Sybert, and in short more forcible evidence of ignorance and carelessness has never been produced even in the silly season. A perhaps more reprehensible fault in taste is one that I hardly like to refer to. Mr. Theobald had been so unfortunate as to lose three infant children. He had been so fortunate as to come into communication with them, and in that belief was consoled for his loss. It is not, to say the least of it, good manners or good taste to write of this as "being brought into communication with the departed bantlings." The pious belief of bereaved parents is at least entitled to respect.

I have received from Grayton, Wairarapa, New Zealand, the first number of a new Spiritualist paper called *More Light*. We shall soon have *Light* enough, at least in name, among our journals. The present venture is in the form of a quarto of four pages, and is modestly priced at one penny, or a shilling a year. The opening address to readers is hearty, and I trust that the venture will succeed. There is, I believe, no Spiritualist paper in that part of New Zealand.

We have heard a good deal of the power of hypnotism to check morbid craving for intoxicating drink. If the subjoined extract from the *Pall Mall Gazette* is founded on fact not more dressed than the statements in that sensational journal often are, it would seem that we have here an instance of the beneficial use of mesmerism.

"A story which, if true, is worthy of note, comes from Soissons. It is affirmed that about a fortnight ago a young man

was mesmerised by one of his friends in the presence of several persons. After some of the usual experiments with the magnetiser the operator said, 'I forbid you to drink wine during the next fortnight.' The patient was then woke up by the magnetiser blowing in his face, and though he is no longer in his presence it is affirmed that he cannot carry a glass of wine to his lips. If the glass is filled with beer, water, or anything else, his arm will obey him and take it to his mouth, but if it contains wine his muscles are paralysed."

Mr. Page Hopps quotes in the *Truthseeker* the conclusion of a discourse by the Rev. Minot Savage published in the transactions of the National Congress of Unitarian and other Christian Churches. I have before referred to this sermon, but there are certain passages in it that seem worthy of citation. After saying that hypnotism, clairvoyance, clairaudience, and telepathy are established facts, Mr. Savage proceeds:—

"Now, no one of these facts, nor all of them combined, goes far enough to prove the central claim of modern Spiritualism. But this apparent semi-independence of the body does at least make the question a rational one as to whether the soul is not an entity capable of getting along without the present physical body. And, while we are on the borderland of stupendous facts like these, I confess I find it hard to be patient with the conceited and flippant ignorance that waives them aside with a supercilious air, while it gravely potters over a fish's fin or a dug-up vertebra of the tail of some extinct mastoden, calling one science and the other only superstition."

"Connected with modern Spiritualism there is, beyond question, an immense amount of deliberate fraud. Many people have found that they can get a living in this way easier than by working for it. Then there is much of honest self-delusion, much honest misinterpretation of facts. Certain mysterious things do occur; and they are straightway supposed to mean what they may not mean at all. But all the bad logic of the world is not to be found here. It sometimes gets out of the séance room, and climbs even into the chair of the philosophic or scientific professor. So let us not be too severe on the bad logic of those who have had no special training.

"But when all the fraud, all the delusion, all the misinterpretation, have been brushed on one side, there remains a respectable—nay, even a striking and startling—body of fact that as yet has no place in our recognised theories of the world and of man. Whatever their explanation, they are at least worth explaining. And, whether they prove or disprove Spiritualism, they cannot fail to throw important light on many problems touching the nature of man. The so-called explanations that I have seen, such as those of Drs. Beard and Carpenter and those of many others, are so inadequate to account for facts of my own experience that, by natural reaction, they almost incline one to grasp the opinions they combat, for the sake of having something a little more solid to hold by.

"That physical objects are sometimes moved in a way that no muscular pressure, conscious or unconscious, can account for, I know. That information is sometimes imparted that was never in the possession of either of the sitters I also know. It is true that these cases, in my own experience, are not yet common enough to preclude the possibility of their being accidentally correct; though the circumstances have been such as to make me regard this as a strained and improbable explanation. To have information given me that it was impossible the medium could know, this has been a very common experience. To call it mind-reading is easy; but what is mind-reading? One insoluble mystery is hardly a satisfactory explanation for another. Automatic writing, when the medium was unconscious of what he was writing, and this of a most remarkable character, is another common experience. These are little facts, you may say. But so was the fact that a piece of amber, under certain circumstances, would attract a straw. Science knows no little facts; and any fact, until it is explained, must be either a constant challenge or a standing reproach to any science worthy of the name.

"If not in the present age, then in some more fortunate one, I believe the question both can and will be settled. And I cannot understand how anyone should treat the matter as of slight importance. Thoreau's remark, 'One world at a time,' has often been quoted as being the end of all wisdom on the subject. But I cannot so regard it, I do not think, as some

do, that morality is dependent on it. But I do think that one's belief here may so change his life-emphasis as to put a new meaning into his whole career. If I know I am to die in two years, I shall certainly lay my life out on a different scale from that which would be appropriate if I could confidently look forward to forty years more life; and, in spite of George Eliot's *Choir Invisible*, it seems to me that the enthusiasm which works only for a certain indefinite future here on earth, while all the time it is believed that the whole thing is finally to end in smoke, is, to say the least, a little forced and unnatural. And, among common people, not sublimely unselfish, it will not be strange if they care more for present satisfaction than they do for some unimaginable benefit to some unknown people, that, perhaps, is to be attained in a thousand years.

"But, if all men could know that death is only an incident, and that life is to continue, for good or ill, right on; and if they could know that, under the working of the law of cause and effect, they are making that future life day by day; that its condition is to be determined thus, not by creed or belief, or ritual or worship, as such, but by character,—is it not plain that this would become the mightiest of all possible motives? If it can be attained, here is a power able to lift and transform the world."

I need not say how cordially I agree with that last emphatic sentence. I hope it may be heeded.

Mr. James Nisbet and Co., 21, Berners-street, W., send me a small penny tractate, *The Dread of Something after Death*, which seems to be a chapter from the second edition of *Man's Departure and the Invisible World*. Price 2s. 6d. Amongst other passages, the following remarkable soliloquy is quoted from *The Dream of Gerontius*, that most impressive of Cardinal Newman's poems:—

"I can no more; for now it comes; again—
That sense of ruin, which is worse than pain;
That masterful negation and collapse
Of all that makes the man; as though I bent
Over the dizzy brink
Of some sheer infinite descent;
Or worse, as though
Down, down, for ever, I was falling through
The solid framework of created things,
And needs must sink and sink
Into the vast abyss; and crueller still
A fierce and restless fright begins to fill
The mansion of my soul; and worse and worse,
Some bodily form of ill
Floats on the wind, with many a loathsome curse
Tainting the hallowed air, and laughs and flaps
Its hideous wings,
And makes me wild with horror and dismay."

"M.A. (Oxon.)"

PHILOSTRATUS (Book v., chap. 24) relates the following story of Apollonius of Tyana:—"Before Apollonius arrived at Alexandria, the inhabitants loved him and longed for his presence as one friend for another. Those of Upper Egypt, who were much given to the study of divine matters, made vows for him to visit them. As there was much intercourse between Greece and Egypt, the fame of Apollonius had gone before him. . . . When he disembarked at Alexandria and took the road in to the town, all looked on him as a god, and all made way for him in the narrow streets. . . . As he advanced, accompanied by all the chief men of the country, he met twelve robbers who were being led to death. Apollonius looked at them and said: 'All of them are not guilty; here is one who is falsely accused.' Then, turning to the executioners who were leading them, he said: 'Slacken your pace, go slowly to the place of execution and put this man to death after the others, for he is not guilty.' . . . He spoke exceedingly slowly which was contrary to his usual habit. The reason for this conduct was soon known, for hardly had eight of the heads fallen when a horseman arrived at full speed and cried 'Do not touch Phanion.' Then he explained that he was not guilty of the robbery, but had accused himself to escape torture, and that the others had acknowledged his innocence under torture. It is not necessary to speak of the enthusiasm and applause that this fact excited amongst the Egyptians, who were already full of admiration of Apollonius.—*La Spiritisme dans l'Antiquité et dans les Temps Modernes*. Par Dr. Wahu.

THE "BANNER OF LIGHT" ON THE PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE SEYBERT COMMISSION.

We have already presented to our readers a criticism on this abortive report from the pen of Hudson Tuttle. We now give from another source a criticism of another kind. We are moved to do this lest any seeming injustice should be done to Mr. Seybert's intentions. He evidently desired that something should be done which has not been done; and it was his wish, as categorically stated, that Mr. Hazard should see his intentions carried out. Reserving our own criticism till the recess is over and time permits a proper treatment (unless, indeed, we have more leisure than we anticipate at this busy season), we are content for the present to put before our readers the views of the two chief American papers. Being on the spot they have the advantage of special knowledge. For ourselves, at the moment, we are not concerned to offer more than a passing opinion. We know enough of the state of Spiritualism in America to say that no proper testing of representative mediums was attempted. We look in vain for any knowledge on the part of the investigators which would enable them to grapple with the serious problems of a very complex subject. We detect a flippant tone which is incompatible with a sincere appreciation of the matter in hand. And we regard this report as, in its way, the staggering efforts of a child learning to walk, which we should hope will be more straight and less tumble-down as the child grows older. But our faith in investigation by commission is of the slightest.

This is the material part of the *Banner's* views:—

The Seybert Commission's Preliminary Report.

YOUNG STUDENT PHYSICIAN (to Charity Patient)—"I—I think you must have a—a—some kind of a fever; but our class has only gone as far as convulsions. I'll come in again in a week."—*Harper's Bazar*.

Since the volume recently given to the public by the Seybert Commission is not its final report, but simply a preliminary one, we are not justified in accepting its conclusions as the verdict of that body upon the subject of Modern Spiritualism. Nevertheless, many will accept it as such; and those who seek to prejudice the public mind against Spiritualism will specially exert themselves to impress all whom they can influence with the false idea that it is not only the end of the Commission but the end of Spiritualism. For this reason it calls for further notice at our hands than we have already given it.

At the opening of this report the Commission says:—

"We deemed ourselves fortunate at the outset in having as a counsellor the late Mr. Thomas R. Hazard, a personal friend of Mr. Seybert, and widely known throughout the land as an uncompromising Spiritualist."

In the *Philadelphia North American* of May 18th, 1885, Mr. Hazard states for what reason and under what conditions he accepted the position above mentioned. He says:—

"Mr. Seybert had repeatedly solicited me to become his representative and assist in the proposed investigation, which request I always declined for reasons given, until a few days before his decease, when I was called upon by a special messenger from Mr. Seybert asking me to come to his home and meet Dr. William Pepper, the Provost of the University. Shortly after my arrival at his house, Mr. Seybert earnestly renewed his request, which I finally consented to comply with, with the full, distinct understanding that I should be permitted to prescribe the methods to be pursued in the investigation, designate the mediums to be consulted, and reject the attendance of any person or persons whose presence I deemed might conflict with the harmony and good order of the spirit circles."

However "fortunate" the Commission may have considered itself in having Mr. Hazard as a counsellor, it did not choose to accept his counsel, as we will proceed to show.

In stating the condition upon which the gift of sixty thousand dollars was accepted by the University of Pennsylvania, they fail to include words that are of much importance in their connection. From Mr. Hazard's statement we learn that for some weeks previous to his decease Mr. Seybert was in the practice of consulting him regarding his establishment of the "Adams Seybert Chair," both before and after the arrangements were completed, and the sixty thousand dollars offered by letter was or is to be paid over to the trustees of the University, only upon the condition that the incumbent of the said chair "either individually or in conjunction with a com-

mission of the University Faculty, shall make a thorough and impartial investigation of all systems of morals, religion or philosophy which assume to represent the truth, and particularly of Modern Spiritualism."

The italicised words in the above are omitted in the condition named in the report. This may seem a small matter, as it would naturally be presumed by all honest-minded persons that gentlemen holding the positions of those on the Commission would be "thorough and impartial" in their investigations. Yet how far they were or could be *thorough* may be inferred from their own recently published statement that they are "men whose days are already filled with duties which cannot be laid aside." With what degree of thoroughness can we suppose men whose time is already *filled* with duties perform additional duties? As to their impartiality, let us see: It was understood that Mr. Hazard, being duly qualified by his long study of and experience with spirit phenomena and their prerequisites, should be permitted to reject the attendance of any person or persons whose presence he deemed might conflict with the harmony and good order of the spirit circles. If in availing itself of the "fortunate" fact that it had Mr. Hazard for a counsellor, they had accepted his counsel on this matter, the Commission would have had an experience during its investigations more satisfactory to its chairman, more enlightening to themselves, and more in conformity with that of tens of thousands of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Hazard was determined at the outset to be true to the trust reposed in him by his friend Seybert, who on the day previous to his decease, earnestly interceded with him to do all in his power toward having the proposed investigation fairly conducted. He therefore studied the mental proclivities of the gentlemen at that time composing the Commission, namely, Dr. William Pepper, Dr. Joseph Leidy, Dr. George A. Koenig, Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson, Dr. H. H. Furness, and Prof. George S. Fullerton; and in May, 1885, used the following forcible language as a summing up of his best judgment concerning them:—

"Without aiming to detract in the slightest degree from the unblemished moral character that attaches to each and every individual of the Faculty, including the Commission, in public esteem, nor to the high social and literary standing they occupy in society, I must say, that through some strange infatuation, obliquity of judgment, or perversity of intellect, the Trustees of the University have placed on the Commission for the investigation of Modern Spiritualism, a majority of its members whose education, habit of thought and prejudices so singularly disqualify them from making a thorough and impartial investigation of the subject, which the Trustees of the University are obligated both by contract and in honour to do, that had the object had in view been to belittle and bring into discredit, hatred and general contempt the cause that I know the late Henry Seybert held nearest his heart, and loved more than all else in the world beside, the Trustees could scarcely have selected more suitable instruments for the object intended from all the denizens of Philadelphia than are the gentlemen who constitute a majority of the Seybert Commission. And this I repeat, not from any causes that affect their moral, social or literary standing in society, but simply because of their prejudice against the cause of Spiritualism."

He therefore counselled the Trustees to strike from the Commission Messrs. Fullerton, Thompson and Koenig. This request of Mr. Hazard was, strictly speaking, the command of one in authority in accordance with a verbal agreement with Mr. Seybert, in presence of Mr. Pepper, as we have previously shown.

Following this, Mr. Hazard gave a part of the evidence he had in support of the statement he had made. He cited Prof. Geo. S. Fullerton as having said in a lecture delivered by him March 3rd, 1885, at Cambridge, before the Harvard University Club:—

"It is possible that the way mediums tell a person's history is by the process of thought-transference, for every person who is thus told of these things goes to the medium thinking of the same points about which the medium talks. . . . When a man has a cold he hears a buzzing noise in his ears, and an insane person constantly hears sounds which never occur. Perhaps, then, disease of mind or ear, or some strong emotion, may be the cause of a large number of spiritual phenomena."

This, bear in mind, was Mr. Fullerton's expressed opinion—it reads more like a guess than an opinion—after having served twenty months on the Seybert Commission.

Dr. Geo. A. Koenig was by Mr. Hazard quoted as saying to a representative of the *Philadelphia Press*, about one year after his appointment on the Commission:—

"I must frankly admit that I am prepared to deny the truth

of Spiritualism as it is now popularly understood. It is my belief that all of the so-called mediums are humbugs without exception. I have never seen Slade perform any of his tricks, but from the published descriptions I have set him down as an impostor, the cleverest one of the lot. I do not think that the Commission view with much favour the examination of so-called spirit-mediums. The wisest men are apt to be deceived. One man in an hour can invent more tricks than a wise man can solve in a year."

The position of Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson, Mr. Hazard judged of by the following, which, he learned from what he considered to be a reliable source, appeared as an expression of his views in *Penn's Monthly*, February, 1880 :—

"Even if Spiritualism be all that its champions claim for it, it has no importance for any one who holds the Christian faith. . . . The consideration and discussion of the subject is tampering with notions and condescending to discussions with which no Christian believer has any business."

So far as we have information no notice was taken of Mr. Hazard's appeal—certainly no action was had, for the members above quoted remain on the Commission to this day, and their names are appended to this Preliminary Report; Prof. Fullerton, in fact, was and now is the secretary; one hundred and twenty of the one hundred and fifty pages of the volume before us are written by him, and exhibit that excessive lack of spiritual perception and knowledge of occult, and we might also say natural laws, which led him to inform an audience of Harvard students that "when a man has a cold he hears a buzzing noise in his ears"; that "an insane person constantly hears sounds which never occur," and suggest to them that spiritual phenomena may proceed from such causes!

We consider that the Seybert Commission's failure to follow the counsel of Mr. Hazard, as it was plainly their duty to do, is the key to the entire failure of all their subsequent efforts. The paucity of phenomenal results, in any degree approaching what might be looked for, even by a sceptic, which this book records, is certainly remarkable. It is a report of what was not done, rather than of what was. In the memoranda of proceedings at each session, as given by Prof. Fullerton, there is plainly seen a studied effort to give prominence to everything that a superficial mind might deem proof of trickery on the part of the medium, and to conceal all that might be evidence of the truth of his claims. Dr. Furness, in the exuberance of his mirthful disposition, appears not to have taken any serious view of the matter; to him it was mere pastime; and though he appears to have done more than all the others of the Commission in the way of experiments as a member, and as an individual for his own gratification, he was constantly approaching the mediums with what might be called, and what possibly might be, under some circumstances, an innocent form of deception, and then, receiving the same in return, he concludes that all the mediums are tricksters, all the phenomena the result of their trickery, and Spiritualism the delusion *par excellence* of the nineteenth century!

It is mentioned that when certain members of the Commission were present all phenomena ceased. This substantiates the correctness of Mr. Hazard's position; and there is no one who has had an experience with mediums sufficient to render his opinion of any value, who will not endorse it. The spirits knew what elements they had to deal with; they endeavoured to eliminate those that rendered their experiments nugatory; they failed to do this through the ignorance, wilfulness or prejudice of the Commission, and the experiments failed; so the Commission, very "wise in its own conceit," decided that all was fraud.

"The influences affecting phenomena," says Epes Sargent in his excellent work, *The Scientific Basis of Spiritualism*, "are extremely subtle and imperfectly known. But I have repeatedly learned this from practical study and experience: The unuttered thoughts, the will, the *animus*, of persons promiscuously present at a sitting for phenomena, have an effect upon their character and facility of production, which is none the less potent because occult and incredible to the unprepared mind. I have known a medium—whose honesty was never questioned, and in whose presence the most indubitable phenomena would readily occur under the severest test-conditions—to be medially paralysed by the presence of two or three persons, each bringing perhaps an adverse spiritual environment, all vehemently opposed to the success of the experiment, and not only intent on the detection of fraud, but earnestly hoping to find it."

CORRESPONDENCE.

[It is desirable that letters to the Editor should be signed by the writers. In any case name and address must be confidentially given. It is essential that letters should not occupy more than half a column of space, as a rule. Letters extending over more than a column are likely to be delayed. In exceptional cases correspondents are urgently requested to be as brief as is consistent with clearness.]

What is Spiritualism?

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—“I am, I suppose, a Spiritualist.” Mr. Enmore Jones said this of himself in a letter headed as above in the last issue of "LIGHT," and it seems to me and other readers here of your journal that the phrase contains the key-note of his remarks. He *supposes*; he does not appear to *know*. But, strange to say, while doubtful as to his own spiritual state, he is convinced of the condition of mind with regard to Spiritualism of the people generally who claim this country as their home. "Spiritualism, as a rule, throughout the Empire, is in bad repute." For the sake of information and truth, it is a pity that your correspondent did not furnish proof of this statement. Of "as a rule," we must take the common acceptance; and, doing so, the statement is as erroneous as it would be if, for the word "Spiritualism," was substituted "Christianity," "Roman Catholicism," "Infidelity," "Materialism," "Agnosticism," or any other designation of belief or unbelief. Here, when the undergraduates are "up," there is side by side among intellectual and educated men more scepticism and faith with regard to conscious existence after physical death than are to be found in most towns in England. Yet, unless difference of opinion simply constitutes bad repute, neither speculation nor knowledge is here "as a rule" held in that; while Spiritualism is the subject of calm, deliberate and earnest conversation and debate among Spiritualists, who do not "suppose" but know that they are such, Christians, Trinitarians and Unitarians, and sceptics of many shades. I speak from personal experience and could cite testimony in support; and no one can gainsay that Cambridge is a creditable sample of our centres of intellectual activity. I converse on the subject of Spiritualism with followers of Christ—men and women educated and partially so—with Agnostics, Materialists, and kindred persons—some of them accomplished scholars and eminent professional gentlemen; and I find that among these, instead of Spiritualism being in bad repute it is rapidly growing in esteem. "M. A. (Oxon's)" writings in "LIGHT" are carefully perused by very many of them; *Twixt Two Worlds* has been through numerous "rooms," Jackson Davis, Page Hopps, Zöllner, &c., are respected names; in short, your correspondent's view of the manner in which Spiritualism is regarded has no foundation here, and others as well as I are not aware that it has any elsewhere. Here we want the truth; elsewhere, it seems, the same is demanded.

Equally in error is he respecting a desire among Spiritualists for a dogma. Dogma is the plague of truth; so we, Spiritualists and Materialists, here have found. Dogma estranges; and investigation unfettered by creed can alone make manifest that which it is the object of Spiritualism to reveal.

With your editorial note to Mr. Jones's letter, readers of "LIGHT" here agree.

JAMES GRANT.

Cambridge.

July 31st, 1887.

Mr. Coleman Still Denies the Charge of Misrepresentation.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—“R. H.” says, in "LIGHT" of June 18th, that he has failed to find my name in the list of members of the Pali Text Society. This is tantamount to saying that I am probably guilty of falsehood in asserting my membership thereof. I am unable to understand how "R. H." could truthfully make such a statement, as in lines 5 and 6, p. 78, of the *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1885, in the list of members (subscribers of five guineas), my name and address are given in full as No. 15. My membership dates back to the inaugural year of the Society, 1882, and I was proposed as a member by one of America's leading Sanskritists, Professor C. R. Lanman, of Harvard University. What excuse has "R. H." for his reckless imputation to me of untruth, when the facts were right before his eyes? It is to be hoped that he has the honesty and manliness to make the *amende honorable* for his unjust insinuations.

"R. H." instances my remarks concerning Shiloam as a case

of seeming misrepresentation of Mr. Gerald Massey, and refers to the failure of certain parties to reply to his challenge there anent. The parties challenged have declined to pay any attention to Mr. Gerald Massey's criticisms and ridicule, as they consider that neither his later published works nor his personal denunciations of themselves are of sufficient importance to warrant their taking any public notice of them. They refuse to be drawn into any public controversy with that gentleman.

However, I some time since prepared a reply to Mr. Gerald Massey's "Retort," fully refuting this and other alleged misrepresentations therein attributed to me, and I am now awaiting its publication. If Mr. Massey or "R. H." will induce the publisher of the journal in which this "Retort" appeared (who is an extreme partisan of Mr. Massey's views),—if either of them will induce him to publish my reply to the charges, I shall be very thankful; otherwise it will be impossible for my refutation to meet the eye of the major portion of the readers of the "Retort." And as I am unacquainted with the names of the readers of the pamphlet containing it, it is impracticable for me to reach its misguided perusers. The great difficulty experienced by me as regards the publication of a refutation of the false charges is apparent. I am only too anxious to avail myself of any opportunity to meet and refute them one and all.

The truth anent the *Shiloam* matter is this: In sustentation of his theory that the stories in John's Gospel concerning the Samaritan woman at the well, the Pool of Bethesda, and the Pool of Siloam, were all derived from myths concerning the Pool of Peace in the Egyptian Funeral Ritual, Mr. Gerald Massey identified with each other the Hebrew word *Salem* (*Shalem*), meaning "peace," and the word Siloam, or, as he called it in spurious Hebrew, *Shiloam*. In reply I showed that *Siloam* was a Greek word, and that the Hebrew name of the Pool of Siloam was *Shiloach*, meaning "sent" instead of "peace," as alleged. Also that there was no such Hebrew word as *Shiloam*, it being manufactured by Mr. Massey to force a parallel. In reply Mr. Massey said Fuerst, p. 1388, col. 2, has the word *Shiloam*, meaning "well" in health, and that on p. 1376, col. 1, it is found, meaning "peace," and that it is used for the Prince of Peace in Isaiah ix. 6. Being sure that this statement was erroneous, and having a copy of Fuerst's *Hebrew Lexicon* in my library, I at once referred to the pages named, and (as I was confident) the citations were found to be virtually spurious. The word *Shiloam* does not appear on either of these pages. It is the very common Hebrew word, *Shalom*, "peace," that is mentioned in both cases, and also in Isaiah ix. 6. This word has no connection with *Shiloach*, the Hebrew form of the Greek *Siloam*. Of course *Shalom*, peace, is cognate or identical with *Shalem*, peace; as the former is a derivative of the latter, and practically they are variant forms of the same word. Neither has aught to do with the Greek *Siloam* or the Hebrew *Shiloach*, the pool at Jerusalem.

Mr. Massey continues thus: "Fuerst further says *Shiloach* is cognate with *Shloam*." Fuerst does not so assert. On p. 1376, col. 1, in naming the different fanciful theories held concerning the meaning of the word *Shiloh* in Gen. xlix. 10, in the phrase sometimes translated "until Shiloh come," and interpreted as of Messianic import, Fuerst states that some take *Shiloh* as equivalent to *Shalvah*, and cognate in sense with *Shalom*, meaning peace. Note that Mr. Massey changed the spelling of each Hebrew word. The common word *Shiloh* he altered to *Shiloach*, so as to identify it with *Shiloach*, the name of Siloam's pool; and the common word *Shalom*, peace, he changed to *Shloam*, so as to identify it with *Shiloam*, a spurious Hebrew word, and thereby prove me guilty of falsehood as alleged. Moreover, Fuerst, in common with Hebraists generally, disapproves the theory that *Shiloh* is cognate with *Shalom*, and he indorses the non-Messianic interpretation. The statement that Fuerst says that the two are cognate is therefore inaccurate and misleading.

Again Mr. Massey says: "I know that *Shloam* may be pointed *Shaloam*." He does not know this; first, because there is no such word as *Shloam*, and secondly, because it is never pointed *Shaloam*. It is pointed *Shalom*, not *Shaloam*. It is seen that there are here four spurious Hebrew words, none of which can be found in Fuerst; namely, the original fabrication *Shiloam*, *Shiloah*, *Shloam*, and *Shaloam*. The words named in Fuerst are genuine Hebrew ones,—*Shiloach* ("sent"), *Shalom* ("peace"), *Shiloh* ("resting-place,"—the name of the well-known city, and, incorrectly, thought to be a name of the Messiah). Mr. Massey falsely asserts that I know nothing of Hebrew except the names of the letters. It would seem, from

his misspelling of every Hebrew word, that either he is ignorant of even the letters, including the Masoretic points, or else he purposely alters their orthography.

These are the exact facts, just as found in Fuerst; and as an act of justice to myself I desire that my readers should consult Fuerst for themselves, in order that they may see how slanderously I have been misrepresented for daring to publish the honest truth in this matter. Every statement alleging misrepresentation, or impugning my veracity and scholarship, in the "Retort," can be as easily and thoroughly refuted as is the *Shiloam* misrepresentation above. Will "R. H." have the honesty to acknowledge his error, and make the *amende honorable* also in this case for his unjust imputation of inveracity?

"R. H." also misrepresents me in alleging that I claim to be on an intellectual par with Mr. Massey. On the contrary, I have always acknowledged his superiority to me as a *littérateur*. My remarks had reference to *scholarship* in certain directions, not to intellectual or literary attainments. Does not "R. H." know the difference between intellectuality and scholarship? But as regards scholarship even, I said nothing relative to an equality between Mr. Massey and myself. All that I said was that, in view of the endorsement of my accuracy and scholarship by a number of the leading scholars of the world, I had "some obvious claims," and was entitled to as much consideration as was Mr. Massey.

"R. H.'s" disparaging remarks about my literary work and ability, in contrast with those of Mr. Massey, are irrelevant. Though I have not published four ponderous volumes of so fanciful and grotesque a character as to be ridiculed by the scholarship of the world; though I have not perpetrated any huge "monumental joke" upon the literary world, nor produced any works declared by competent authority to be worthy of Bedlam,—yet I have, during the last dozen years, published a number of scientific essays in philology, mythology, biology, Hinduism, archæology, comparative theology, history, &c., sufficient to fill several volumes, all of which have been well spoken of by the highest authorities in the several branches treated.

I would remind "R. H." that unseemly trifling, malevolent sneering, reckless insinuations, misapplied sarcasm, and feeble attempts to be funny at the expense of justice are sorry substitutes for legitimate argument and sober fact. I confine myself to substantial, indisputable facts, ignoring farcical frivolity, irrelevant, misleading, and slanderous. To ridicule and sneer at eminent scholars and learned societies, including one of the latter of which he is himself a member, is, to say the least, in very bad taste. The Egyptologist whom "R. H." makes light of, with his sneering remarks about "comprehensionism," is one whom England most highly prizes and honours for faithful devotion to truth and science.

WM. EMMETTE COLEMAN.

San Francisco, California, U.S.A.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

C. W. H.—Thank you; not quite up to our mark.

The Truthseeker, a monthly review, edited by John Page Hopps, contains original lectures, essays, and reviews, on subjects of present and permanent interest. Threepence. By post, from the publishers or editor, 3s. 6d. a year; two copies, 6s. a year, post free. Published by Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden, London; and 20, South Frederick-street, Edinburgh. All booksellers. During the year 1887, there will appear a new work by the editor, entitled: "Thus saith the Lord": an unconventional inquiry into the origin, structure, contents, and authority of the Old Testament. (Seven lectures.) *The Truthseeker*, for June contains a study by the editor, on "The Resurrection of Jesus."

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUALISTS' INSTITUTE, WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—Mr. W. Walker spoke on Sunday last to fair audiences, the evening address, subject, "The Light of the Spirit upon Evolution," being especially good. Our annual outing will be held on Wednesday, August 17th, to Cheam Park. Spiritual meetings will be held during the day. Further particulars may be obtained from the Secretary. Next Sunday morning we are to have an "In Memoriam" service on the passing to higher life of one of our little Lyceum scholars.—W. E. LONG, 9, Pasley-road, Walworth.

SUBSCRIBERS RESIDENT ON THE CONTINENT will greatly oblige if, when they send remittances through the Post-office, they will kindly forward to us, at the same time, a notice that they have done so. We frequently receive "orders" through the Post-office without any intimation as to whom they come from, and do not know, therefore, to whose account to credit them.

OFFICE OF "LIGHT,"
16, CRAVEN STREET,
CHARING CROSS, W.C.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Annual Subscription for "LIGHT," post free to any address within the United Kingdom, or to places comprised within the Postal Union, including all parts of Europe, the United States, and British North America, is 10s. 10d. per annum, forwarded to our office *in advance*.
The Annual Subscription, post free, to South America, South Africa, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, is 13s. *prepaid*.
The Annual Subscription to India, Ceylon, China, Japan, is 15s. 2d. *prepaid*.
All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be addressed to "The Manager" and not to the Editor.
Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to Mr. B. D. Godfrey and should invariably be crossed "_____ & Co."

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

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

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

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

NOTICE.

I am on the eve of leaving London, and take this opportunity of begging that any books which I may have lent to friends may be returned as soon as may be to my home address, 21, Birchington-road, N.W. I expect to hand over the charge of "LIGHT" to my co-editor after this issue, and to him should all communications respecting the journal be addressed by name until the middle of September, as I shall be out of reach of ordinary postal communication. It will be kind if letters, except on urgent private matters, be not addressed to me during the time I have specified.—M. A. (OXON.).

Light :

Edited by "M.A. (OXON.);" and E. DAWSON ROGERS.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 6th, 1887.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.—Communications intended to be printed should be addressed to the Editors. 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.

THE STORY OF THE DEAD WIFE.

Murray's Magazine (April, 1887) contains an article with the above title by Andrew Lang, some notice of which we have long desired to present in these pages. Pressure of work and not a little pressure on space have hitherto prevented.

Mr. Lang notes at the outset of his paper the absence of any sense of surprise in waking moments or in dreams when we seem to recognise a departed friend; "when the most surprising of all inconceivable things appears to have occurred, when Death gives up the dead. . . We are so made, or we inherit such instincts, that only by an effort do we believe in death at all." We agree with Mr. Lang that this is a fact of "deep significance." It is a law of our being: and it is because of that recognition, dumb and instinctive as it often is, of this essential law of our being that Materialism has so little permanent hold on men, and that most of us are by instinct Spiritualists. It is because we are spirits temporarily conditioned in this world and correlated with it by the possession of a physical body that men are for ever trying to escape from Materialism. There are some perverted minds, no doubt, which are enraged by any mention of spirit or soul, but they are the small exception to a broad rule. And even their objections, if closely analysed, will be found to lie chiefly against the methods by which it is sought to prove the existence of spirit, or against the claims made on their blind faith by those who arrogate to themselves the position of interpreters of revealed truth. The clap-trap which has, it must be admitted, crept into Spiritualism disgusts such minds equally with the cant that has cast its slime over theology. Spiritualism can demonstrate the great truth of man's survival after physical death. So long as it confines itself to that it is on strong ground; but many of those who have spoken and written most in its name have been betrayed

into loose talk of the angel-world (of which we know next to nothing by the very nature of things) and of a proven immortality (which, again in the nature of things, we cannot demonstrate). We can picture to ourselves by the imagination and by the use of analogies what they who return can find no words to describe: and we can establish, in some cases, a presumption that the spirit in man, which has survived the great change at least once, will persist unto immortality. That is much, very much: and it is no little gain to be able to point in support of the conclusions to which our evidence tends to this general "absence of any surprise when Death gives up its dead," which we have on the excellent authority of Mr. Lang.

"The myths and legends of the lower peoples show that they think the distance very short, and the partition very thin, between our world and the world of death." Savages, who have returned from the world of spirit (which we would suggest as a better expression than "the world of death,") have told, Mr. Lang says, "long stories about their visit to that mysterious bourne whence they were permitted to return. Their reports are extremely strange, and all over the world bear each other" (shall we not say, "one another," Mr. Lang?) "out very well." This is strong testimony: better than that respecting a New Caledonian chief who died, and brought back from the under-world what Mr. Lang thinks he remembers to have had described as "a knife of some material strange to the people of the country." We do not think that any chief would be likely to get a knife of any material in the spirit-world. The story smacks of the belief of those savage tribes who bury with the body of their dead chiefs such articles of warfare and utility as they fancy he may want in his new place of abode.

"We all, whether of rude or cultivated races, half consciously hold that Death is not so strong but that Love may, on occasion, be stronger. This faith is set forth, every here and there all the world over, by stories and songs declaring how Love for a season has vanquished Death." That is very good Spiritualism; and the truth contained in the statement is illustrated again by the experience of a vast number of persons. In his "Transcorporeal Action of Spirit" (published in *Human Nature* many years since), "M.A. (Oxon.);" illustrated by many narratives this overmastering power of Love as a cause of drawing departed spirits back to earth. The records of the Society for Psychical Research will doubtless (especially in the next volume) be found rich in evidence of the same character. So that we have here a second instance in which the experimental evidence of Spiritualists affirms and illustrates a general instinct of humanity.

Passing by such legends as that of Orpheus and Eurydice, there is one very curious Bavarian story of the return of a dead wife to her sorrowing husband on the conditions that their matrimony, dissolved in death, should be again solemnised, and that he should abstain from his usual profane swearing. She "bare him several children, but was ever pensive and of a pale complexion." Divers years after, the gentleman forgot himself and "bitterly cursed his servants, when his wife, withdrawing into another room, was never more heard of: *her apparel, without her body, standing upright, as if an apparition!*"

We conclude with one singularly beautiful legend of the Iroquois Indians, which we must give in bare outline. A hunter and his wife lived in the forest far from the rest of the tribe. The woman died, and the husband was inconsolable. He was so lonesome that he made a wooden doll, and dressed it in his wife's clothes. This he put in front of the fireplace, and felt better. A year passed, and he never ceased to mourn. One evening, on his return from hunting, he found his wigwam swept, and food prepared. He watched from outside, and saw a woman moving about. He opened the door, and found his wife sitting in her chair. The doll was gone. She said: "The Great Spirit felt sorry

for you, so he let me come back, but you must not touch me till we have seen all of our people. If you do you will kill me." So they lived very happily for a year, and then the man proposed that they should go to their tribe, and fulfil the condition. Within a day's journey they halted in a snowstorm, and lay down to sleep, but the man's desire to take his wife once more in his arms overcame his caution. She warned him, but he caught her to him, and lo! he was holding the wooden doll!

It is easy to read the moral in all these stories. There is invariably some condition attached, and the neglect to observe it breaks the charm. The odd thing is that all in Mr. Lang's mind seem mixed up: equally probable and equally improbable. To the Spiritualist the true—*semper, ubique, et at omnibus* believed—is easily separated from the myth. Mr. Lang tells us finally that there is no means of accounting for the ubiquity of these and like legends. One of the early Jesuit missionaries in Canada found the Red Indian form of the myth of Pandora among a tribe which had only just made the acquaintance of Europeans. The fact is that these legends are not borrowed, but are of native growth, expressing in varied but similar form the instincts and hopes of humanity.

TWO BLOSSOMS.

I planted a flower in my garden,
A bright little blossom of gold,
And shed on it smiles of sunshine,
And sheltered it from the cold.

The tiny buds clust'ring round it
Were called gladness and youth and mirth,
And nought that is tinged with sadness
Near it should ever have birth.

And I tended it ev'ry morning,
And bestowed on it jealous care,
That nought save the mildest zephyrs
Should blow o'er my blossom fair.

I planted a flower in my garden,
A poor little worthless weed;
A weed that grows in abundance,
Broadcast o'er the earth its seed.

The bleak winds of winter blew o'er it
And wasted its beauty away:
The wise world looking upon it,
—"A weed!" they all did say.

And the rain that fell upon it
Was the tears from saddened eyes:
And the only zephyrs that kissed it
Were my low desponding sighs.

But in years when my youth was over,
And the dream of my life was fled,
The delicate flower was faded,
The blossom of gold was dead,

Away in a heavenly garden,
One eve as I wandered there,
The fairest of flowers did greet me,
And this was my blossom of Care.

CAROLINE CORNER.

SPIRITUALISM, says the *Toronto Mail*, is not unknown among the Canadian Indians. In the *Rapport sur les Missions du Diocèse de Québec* for 1855, Rev. Father Arnaud, the distinguished Labrador missionary, who is still living at Betsiamis, relates that the Montagnais medicine men, who are noted for their skill, sit cross-legged in a wigwam during their séances, and, "apparently by sheer force of their will, start the wigwam in motion, the wigwam replying by its movements, *i.e.*, by bounds or raps, to questions put to it." They are also, he says, expert "magnetisers." The wise man was probably right when he said there was nothing new under the sun.

STRONG POINTS OF SPIRITUALISM.

The following address is the complement of the "Weak Points of Spiritualism" which we have already laid before our readers. The two together form, in our opinion, an able and instructive presentation of the subject treated of.

Strong Points of Spiritualism.

A LECTURE DELIVERED MAY 29TH, 1887, BEFORE THE SECULAR UNION OF CHICAGO BY JAMES ABBOTT.

Abridged from The Religio-Philosophical Journal.

I have presented to you "The Weak Points of Spiritualism." I now wish to present its strong points, for I think the subject is worthy of consideration; perhaps not so much so, as whether man descended from a monkey; but perhaps worthy of as much consideration as the debate on the habits of a lobster, which some years ago occupied a scientific convention at Hartford. And I must express my dissent from the opinion of those who, like Emerson, say the subject does not interest them; but rather it is to be shunned like the secrets of the butcher and undertaker. If there are any facts in the realm of nature which affect our being, I deem it the duty of inquiring minds to investigate them, whether the pursuit is attended with pain or pleasure; whether polite society nods approvingly or not; and notwithstanding some men of learning have tried to establish that such facts do not exist at all.

1. The first point I note is, that Spiritualism is based on the observation of actual, existing phenomena. The most stubborn thing about Spiritualism for the materialist to deal with is its facts. You may reason *à priori* that they have not existed, and that they will not exist; but what will you do with the ever-accumulating testimony of competent witnesses who testify they do exist? For, after all, this is a question, not of reasoning but of evidence. By no process of reasoning can you conclude that certain events have or have not happened. It is like trying to demonstrate by Euclid that Columbus did or did not discover America.

I take it to be no small gain to the world if we could have a religion founded on verifiable data, to supplant faith, which may be expansive enough to embrace anything. The light of faith may be compared to the light of knowledge, as artificial light to the sunlight. The former attracts those eyes not yet fitted for the sunlight. The bat and moth fly toward the flame, while the eagle soars toward the heavens. What the world needs is demonstration. Perhaps it is best a large amount of evidence is demanded, so we may build on sure foundations. But if I have witnessed evidence which to me is satisfactory, no amount of reasoning can persuade me the evidence does not exist. If I know that evidence exists, your ridicule of me will not change the fact, nor obliterate my memory of it. Further; you cannot know what I do, or do not, know. If you have failed to find what I say I have found, the question is whether the weight of evidence is sufficient to establish the allegation. I think La Place lays down the correct rule in such cases. He says, "Any case, however apparently incredible, if it is recurrent, is as much entitled to a fair valuation under the laws of induction, as if it had been more probable beforehand."

Let me define Spiritualism as a belief in a future life, and that such life is demonstrable to the senses. What amount of evidence is necessary to establish the proposition? I maintain, if one should see an apparition, it would be proof of the existence of a spirit. Of course, such vision must be free from the possibility of deception; and it must also appear that it is not a delusion of any character. Under the necessary conditions I think the proof would be complete. I lay a clean slate before me, and on that slate appears writing without visible contact; if, further, that writing is in the hand of one we call dead, signed by his name, and conveying intelligence known only to the person supposed to write it and the witness of the writing, I think the proof sufficient; the same as the reception by you of a letter from an absent friend, whose handwriting you know, would be *prima facie* proof that that friend wrote it. The most common phenomenon, perhaps, is clairvoyance. It is true, one may be able to outline the past accurately; and see, not everything, but some things of the future clearly, which subsequent events may confirm, without it necessarily following that the power to do so is spiritual, although no other rational explanation has been given of the phenomenon. But clairvoyance may be carried to an extent which will amount to demonstration.

For instance, a total stranger gives you not only a correct history of the past, as well as foretelling the future; but sees forms near you, describing them so accurately that you recognise them as those you had once known here on earth; tells you what they say, which you connect with the actual life of the alleged author of them; and further, this phenomenon is repeated many times. I do not see any aberration of intellect in saying there is some proof of immortality. Or suppose when sitting at a table we called over the alphabet, and when certain letters were reached a knock would be heard or the table move; suppose that on writing out the letters so indicated, we found words spelled and sentences formed, giving clear expression to thoughts, and evidence of their coming from some one deceased, would it not be evidence tending to prove what Spiritualism alleges?

There are other corroborative phenomena, such as trance speaking, the playing of a musical instrument in plain view without physical contact, or the moving of articles in obedience to the request of any one present. Perhaps to you they would be no evidence whatever, but explain them if you can on any other ground than that of one intelligence working through the organism of something else. Accepting the theory of Spiritualism as true, these facts are entirely consistent with the operation of unchangeable laws. These, in brief, are part of the phenomena evidencing continuity of existence. If taken altogether they are not sufficient, pray tell what amount of evidence would be. I confess I am as thoroughly satisfied as to their reality, as I can be of anything whatsoever. What I want of my materialistic friends is, not a denial of my veracity or sanity, but something which explains the phenomena. They cannot be the work of the blind forces of nature, because they manifest intelligence, which must come from conscious, thinking beings. If they display intelligence is it not pertinent to ask that intelligence what or who it is? The question has been asked, and the answer has been uniformly the same; which I consider no small evidence that the moving cause of such things is what it declares itself to be; to wit, disembodied spirits. When you have a witness on the stand who states his name, residence, and occupation, you rarely question the statement. Here in these phenomena is an intelligence which likewise states its name, residence, and occupation. You do not believe a word of it.

Now, science, while admitting parts of this evidence as the fact, and denying other parts, has offered no satisfactory explanation of any of it. The position taken by Carpenter, Beard, Hammond and others, that no amount of testimony can establish an occurrence so extraordinary, is entirely unscientific. For the experience of our senses regulated by our reason must govern in all affairs of life. If we are to reject the evidence of one set of facts, because it does not agree with our theories, and say that another set of facts is proven which does agree, will somebody please tell me where to draw the line? A man assuming to be scientific, who says he knows all the laws of nature so intimately that such phenomena as independent slate-writing cannot occur without overstepping the boundaries of scientific recognition, is himself labouring under a delusion more serious than any he affects to deplore.

The objection that you cannot understand it, is no objection at all. Who understands the force of gravitation? Yet we are *conscious* of its existence. Who ever saw an atom? Yet we believe material is ultimately resolvable into atoms. Where are the proofs of evolution? Does not the theory rest on reasoning from scattered facts to general conclusion? Yet we accept the theory as true on not one tithe the evidence Spiritualism can furnish. You will therefore pardon me for differing with you, when you call me an idiot for accepting a theory which explains completely and satisfactorily that which you do not and cannot explain.

2. Now, if I had seen and heard what I considered proof, but knew no one else who had, I might hesitate before believing. Although the verity of one apparition proved would be sufficient to establish the proposition, and a single substantiated instance of clairvoyance would be sufficient to establish spirit intercourse, I do not find myself alone in the knowledge of these facts. It has been said that Spiritualism is but a moment in the despair of faith, as the attempt of the Alexandrian Platonists to substitute the vision of trances for the conclusions of the intellect has been called the despair of reason. One acquainted with the subject would not make that statement, for

Spiritualism presents evidence widespread and of varying character. The belief is now more firmly held among the educated classes than it has been for two centuries. Thousands of clear-headed observers can be found in Europe and America, including literary men, lawyers, physicians, men of science, merchants, not a few secularists, philosophical sceptics and pure materialists, who have become converts through the overwhelming logic of the phenomena. But neither science nor philosophy has made a single convert from its ranks. It has thriven in spite of abuse and persecution, ridicule and argument; and will do so whether great names endorse it or not. There are at present fifteen journals devoted to the cause in the United States; an equal number printed in the Spanish language, and several in each country of Europe. It is no longer true to say, as did Sir Walter Scott half a century ago, that "the increasing civilisation of all well constituted countries has blotted out the belief in apparitions." The belief has largely increased during the last forty years; and more in this country than any other. Their number can be counted by the million in America. The *Chicago Times* says:—

"Quietly, with no Messiah to head it, no Mahomet to lead its van, it has pushed its powers to the extremes of the earth. Once a believer always a believer, is its chief article of faith. It knows no backsliders. It adds thousands to its ranks every year, and never loses recruits until they are taken away by death. It has devotees not generally known to be such, who are satisfied with the revelations they have received individually, without blazoning them to all creation, and who have no anxiety to convince the incredulous. Indeed the majority of Spiritualists appear quite unconcerned regarding benighted outsiders. They are rarely found in the missionary business, and seem to be oblivious of the pity so lavishly bestowed upon them by adherents of other religions and those of no religion at all."

This belief has a firm hold in modern Greece, as well as the Highlands of Scotland, in Australia as well as among the inhabitants of Polynesia, in Russia, Servia, Egypt, and China. The Zulu produces trances in which he sees his fellow warriors slain in battle. The North American Indians testify to the same facts, and hold the same faith. The only people, so far as I am able to ascertain, who lack this belief are the New Hollanders; which may be proof that they are a distinct creation, like the *ornithorhynchus paradoxus*.

Lee Can, a learned Mandarin, in 1861 testified that the phenomena which so astonished this country at that time, known as spirit rappings, were every day occurrences in his country, their history extending back as far as the records of the country itself.

The following words coming from the late Judge Edmunds, of New York, do not indicate that he was either a fool or a knave: "I have been a firm believer in the idea, that the spirits of the dead do hold communion with us. I have been sorely tried. I have been excluded from associations which once made life pleasant. I have felt in the society which I once hoped to adorn, that I was an object marked for avoidance, if not for abhorrence. With the subject so dear to me tainted with man's folly and fraud, destined to see fools run mad with it, and rogues perverting it to nefarious purposes, and beholding how the world, for whom this glorious truth comes, reviles it, I have never for a moment faltered. It is no merit that I have persisted. Belief was not, as it never is, a matter of volition. But the evidence was so conclusive that it compelled conviction." Let me also quote Victor Hugo on the same subject: "To abandon these spiritual phenomena to credulity, is to commit treason against human reason. Nevertheless, we see them always rejected, and always reappearing. They date not their advent from yesterday."

Reviewing this array of men, who have been among the distinguished of the world, declaring not their belief in the spiritual existence, but their knowledge of the evidence establishing it, I am constrained to say with Prof. Draper, of New York, that "The application of exact science to physiology is bringing into the region of physical demonstration the existence and immortality of the soul." And considering all these men have so testified, shall we adopt as our rule, that the negative testimony of a thousand or a million who have not witnessed these things, ought to outweigh the positive testimony of a less number who have? Such a rule is contrary to all our ideas of the weight to be given evidence.

I am aware certain scientists have denied these facts as well as this philosophy. But do you not know that whenever

scientists have denied on *à priori* grounds the facts of investigators, they have always been wrong? In California and Australia they were not the geologists who could find gold; but the plain, simple men, who dug after it. So now, it is not always the scientific minds who are the pathfinders in original investigation. Quite often have the most important discoveries been brought to notice by unlearned men.

3. I find further, that not alone in this age are there multitudes of sane witnesses corroborating my own experience, but that the testimony is extended through all ages, in all lands. In India it runs through the Vedas and Upanishads, as well as those literatures of which the Indian was the parent. Grecian literature is full of it. Among the Mongols of Tartary in the thirteenth century it was a common thing. The Scandinavians maintained the same from earliest times. So firm a hold had the Druids on a future life, that they would loan money, on condition it be repaid in the next world; not in the same coin, but its equivalent. Hardly good security on which to negotiate a Chicago loan. The belief belongs to the philosophy of savages, as well as *savans*. It is safe to assert, there have been no peoples who did not believe their dead ancestors appeared to them; and the earliest implements for lighting fires are not more identical than these beliefs. Herodotus mentions seventy instances of what he considers well authenticated instances of spiritual phenomena; and Livy fifty. Among the Romans we have Strabo, Tacitus, Virgil, Ovid, Cicero and Juvenal bearing witness; Cæsar was warned of the Ides of March. I would also cite Confucius, Anaxagoras, Hesiod, Pindor, Aristotle, Pythagoras and Plutarch who founded their belief in immortality on actual phenomena.

Socrates, accredited the wisest man of Greece, argued the soul's immortality from the oft recurring facts of his own experience. And when he states that he was constantly attended by his *dæmons*, or familiar spirits, materialists have racked their brains trying to reconcile his statement with their theory. To deny his learning or veracity would be useless. However, as his statements do not agree with the materialist's theory, they must be explained some way, or rejected entirely.

These phenomena attracted the attention of Joseph Glanvil in the seventeenth century; and of John Wesley in the eighteenth. I hope you will not question the pure life and lofty morality of Swedenborg, who declared that it had been given him to converse with nearly all the dead whom he had known in life. Mozart said he composed his finest symphonies by simply writing down the notes he heard. Heard from whom? From a lot of atoms rubbing their shins together and producing the notes? When Mexico was discovered, the natives had been foretold by their seers that a ship should come from the east, bearing white men who would destroy them. So powerful a hold had this prediction on the people that they made but feeble resistance to the Spanish invaders. Witchcraft was but an anticipation of Spiritualism; resulting most disastrously, owing to the ignorance of the world concerning its nature.

Before this Spiritualistic development in America, we had distinguished men in Germany asserting the same thing—such men as Kerner, Eschenmayer, Kant, Schiller, and Goethe; and Lavater in Switzerland. Oberlin affirmed in 1824 that he was visited continuously by his deceased wife. Clairvoyance excited the curiosity of Dr. Johnson. Scott says, "If force of evidence could authorise us to believe facts inconsistent with the general laws of nature, enough might be produced in favour of the existence of second sight"—or clairvoyance. He overlooks the fact, that it might exist in strict accordance with the laws of nature. Blackstone and Shakespeare express the same belief; also Lord Bacon and Addison. The latter says: "We have multitudes of spectators on all our actions when we think ourselves most alone." I have time to name only one other.

Joan of Arc was born in 1411. She was burned for a witch. Historians have ransacked their brains in endeavouring to explain the marvels she wrought. Here a person comes forward and offers to perform a great work, and does it. That person is entitled to credence. The greater the achievement compared with the visible means, the greater ought to be the credence reposed in the performer. Joan professed to be directed by Heavenly messengers, visible, and repeatedly appearing to her for the purpose of saving her country from invaders, when all else had failed. The simple country girl announced her mission to the king, and accomplished that mission. She did everything she undertook, and attempted nothing more. She drove the English from Orleans, and crowned the king at Rheims. That was her promised mission. It was done, and she desired to

return to her former life. But the court refused to listen; ordered her to do this and that. She said it was impossible, for she no longer heard the Heavenly voices, nor saw more than any other person. They forced upon her what she declared was unauthorised. She failed, and suffered death.

If we deny the intelligence and veracity of this cloud of witnesses, we should be prepared to reject human testimony altogether. True, we should accept no opinions based on the opinions of others, no matter how distinguished they may be. I am not now accepting the opinions of any I have named. What I call attention to is, their testimony as corroborating that which I myself know. To those who hold the opposite I would say, that it is no more probable these witnesses were mistaken in the evidence of their senses, than that you may be in your opinions.

4. The spiritual philosophy accounts for the miraculous in history on a perfectly natural basis. Scattered all along through the annals of the world from earliest times we meet these accounts of alleged apparitions, communications from the dead, and other phenomena known as spiritual. They are stated along side by side with other events, by those whose veracity there is no occasion to question; and my opponents are driven to the necessity of either accepting these ancient occurrences as special dispensations of Providence, or of rejecting all these events as unfounded fictions, and convict those who testified to them as untruthful. The latter position is unreasonable, because I do not see why we should reject one part of a witness's testimony while accepting another, for instance, Socrates. While giving him the credit which must be given him, a large part of his statements must be cast aside on the materialistic theory. When he declares with his philosophic earnestness that he communed with his familiar spirits, his statements are entitled to the same credit as when he complained that Xantippe failed to get his breakfast ready before he went down to business, or to have the washing hung out before dinner. By accepting the spiritual theory these obscure matters are made clear, and we are able to account for things (which in many instances, no doubt, have been greatly exaggerated) without assuming a violation of the laws of nature, which have been and must be unchangeable; at the same time, not having to stultify ourselves in refusing credit to those to whom credit must be given. No other theory offers any adequate explanation of the world's history. This universality of belief in a future existence results from a universality of phenomena, which are no more coincidences than the falling of unsupported bodies to the ground. For I do not believe any large amount of cumulative evidence of disinterested and sensible men has been, or ever will be, obtained for that which is an absolute and entire delusion. Men will hold to forms of belief after reason for so doing has ceased; but I do not believe the world can be universally deluded or mistaken as to the verity of oft-repeated occurrences. I am not willing to follow any belief because great men have subscribed to it, but I am willing to believe their statements of facts, when I have no reason to question their honesty, and when their statements tally with my own experience.

Further, if you admit that these phenomena actually occurred in early times among uneducated peoples, is it not easy to trace the steps by which through ignorance and superstition they grew into a settled belief, and then a formal religion, to hold sway over the fears of man, extending from the untutored savage to the refined heathenism of Greece and Rome? Is there any other hypothesis which offers a reasonable explanation of the ubiquitousness of this belief in a future life?

5. Spiritualism is the only religion founded on reason. Although resting on evidences demonstrating the continuity of life, thus being scientific, it asks you to believe nothing which your good sense does not approve, thus being rational. Coleridge says: "A religion must consist of ideas and facts both. Not of ideas alone without facts, for then it would be mere philosophy. Nor of facts alone, without ideas of which those facts are the symbols, or out of which they arrive, or upon which they are grounded; for then it would be mere history," but a combination and consideration of both. Coleridge's definition in this case is filled.

Spiritualism is eclectic. It asks of no new idea, "Who are your sponsors?" but "What is your claim, come from whatsoever quarter you may?" It recognises some good in all the world's systems of belief. It is democratic, throwing open its portals to all, bidding them enter to gather up what truths they

may, with no priest for our intercessor, no hierarchy to dictate what we shall think and do. It says to all "Seek and ye shall find." It does not claim to be a finality; but that its teachings, like all other truths, are only approximate, extending only so far as our knowledge up to date leads us, leaving us to press on for more light.

Is there anything inherently disagreeable or unreasonable in the thought that we shall live again? The only dispute is whether the evidence warrants that conclusion. If you, who think not, would assume for the nonce that the fact is established, you would find this philosophy meets your greatest expectations. It teaches an ennobling gospel of human progress. It depicts a rational hereafter of progress in knowledge and growth in perfection—a future of usefulness; not of idle, dreamy inactivity. It supplies the best incentives here, by teaching that the soul must remedy hereafter the result of present sin; that transgression of known laws entails disease and punishment, the burden of which is laid on the back of the offender, to be borne by him alone. It holds out no fear of death, for it is but the portal to a wider sphere of activity. It proclaims that we think and act in the sight of many witnesses. It looks for no relief from the penalties of sin through the mysterious suffering of another. It teaches no vicarious advantage. It proves that as we sow we reap, that man is preparing his condition here, and is thus his own punisher and his own rewarder. It recognises the unbounded and universal presence of law. Its phenomena occur in conformity therewith. It, therefore, discards all belief in the miraculous and exceptional, as well as the infallibility of anything except natural law which changes not.

For myself I can say that, from phenomena coming within my own personal observation, I am convinced in such manner as to make doubt impossible, that life extends beyond the grave. Had I not this knowledge, I should believe it to be so, from the concurrent testimony of others worthy of belief. And further, were there no testimony at all, from its philosophy I should think it reasonable that a world of spirits, if it existed, was practically such as Spiritualism alleges.

6. Another point in favour of Spiritualism is the good things it has done for the world. I will note some of them. It has helped to correct gross and debasing views of Deity. It has shaken the foundations of a belief in total depravity, and given man hope in his power to elevate himself, as well as be elevated by others. It has largely assisted in annihilating a personal devil, and in extinguishing the flames of hell. It has corrected the views held regarding vicarious atonement, whereby men have been taught they can live a life of sin and sensuality, and at its close avail themselves of the virtue of the death of another, and enter the next life purified, thus offering a premium on vice. It has liberated the human mind from the thralldom of old beliefs and dogmas. It teaches that sin is not so much an offence against God as against the sinner; that both good and evil actions are causes which produce effects, regardless of any opinion we may hold. It teaches the brotherhood of man; that charity is the greatest of virtues, and selfishness the greatest of sins; that we should be less ready to condemn and more ready to aid; that we should always be found on the side of mercy and good works; that beliefs amount to nothing, but actions to everything. It has transformed the monster of death into an angel of life, a welcome friend. It inculcates a religion of the body as well as of the soul; and, when intelligently viewed, is eminently fitted to make one a better man in all his relations.

7. Another reason I have for believing in a future existence is the indestructibility of all things. Science teaches that nothing is ever destroyed. A building may burn. It disappears from view, but every particle exists in some other form; and by no process can it be annihilated. Likewise with force. The conservation of energy is now accepted as true. The power generated by the torrent pouring over Niagara is just enough to raise the water back whence it came, could that power be properly conserved. A key laid on a white sheet of paper in the sunlight and then laid away for months, if taken out again and laid on a heated metal surface will reproduce the spectre of the key, while Draper says a shadow never falls upon a wall without leaving there a permanent trace.

Leibnitz maintains the essence of all being, whether mind or matter, is force. The universe is made up of ultimate atoms, similar in essence, yet possessing certain powers. The changes which the monad experiences are the successive evolutions of its own latent powers. Each is in itself an indestructible essence, and the material world, even in its inorganic parts, is animated

throughout. Matter is an expression of force, and force a mode of action, of that which exists and is alone persistent. Material forms are not abiding. An organism is a temporary form, from which there is a continual efflux of particles. Like the flame of a lamp, it is ceaselessly fed, as it is ceaselessly wastes away. It is that which underlies all phenomenal existence which is persistent. Matter of itself is incapable of action. It must be acted upon. This energy, underlying and fashioning all forms, remains the same to-day as yesterday. Matter passes from mould to mould, retaining no identity. Yet, as far as our knowledge goes, nothing really dies. It is only transformed. Our experience cannot account for the innate principles, which we are conscious dwell within us. On the contrary, innate principles are required to account for the treasures of experience. Whence come those intuitions? There is in us something besides flesh and bone and tissue. There is a living principle. Reasoning from analogy, is it probable that this living principle is any more destructible than the blind and unconscious energies of nature?

Admitting there is within this unseen principle, which is also unknown, except as manifested through the material, may we not agree that the spiritual is the unseen, and to our senses intangible? This unseen force constitutes our interior personality. That which is within is the source of all outward action, receiving from without all impressions. It constitutes the *I* or *me*. We are all conscious of this unseen self. When we speak of seeing, or hearing, or tasting, or smelling, or feeling, we refer to one who possesses all these senses, existing behind the organs of outward manifestation. My eyes do not see, I see through my eyes. My hands do not feel, I feel with my hands. My brain does not think, I think with my brain. The one who possesses all these senses is unseen. I never have seen you, nor you me; only the manifestations of each other. The person who dwells in the form before me has never to material senses been perceptible. We have never come directly in contact with him, but only in the outer form. Each of us, then, in our real self answers to the idea of spirit. We are intangible. Further, each of us betrays purpose and desire, intelligence and thought. These we cannot attribute to tangible matter, for flesh cannot think. We necessarily refer all such action to the unseen. This organisation interior to the physical, possessing each of the senses and all the intellectual and emotional powers we see expressed through the exterior form, is what I call spirit. So I argue that the idea that man is the possessor of a spirit which dies not, whatever changes its outer covering may undergo, is not unreasonable or opposed to the soundest philosophy. Again, there are infinite numbers of creatures below us, all unconscious of our existence. So there may be multitudes of intelligences superior to us, whose presence we sense not. The telescope has revealed worlds above us, and the microscope worlds swarming with life beneath us. Our unaided senses never perceived them. Then why hesitate to admit the possibility of a world existing around us, which we may not have discerned? Is it probable that this vast expanse of our atmosphere is a trackless void, when all below us is a buzzing hive, and even the stars are aglow with musical harmony? Of the one hundred rays emanating from the sun less than one-third are visible. The other two-thirds exist and act around us in a real, although invisible, manner. They are warm without being luminous. Yet in the unfoldment of vegetation, they produce, according to Camille Flammarion, the distinguished French astronomer, every chemical action. They attract the flowers to the sunny side, and elevate the vapour from water into the atmosphere, silently exercising a tremendous power. These rays we do not perceive, because some are too slow and others too active for our vision. We can only see them between certain limits.

Physical science therefore teaches that we live in the midst of a world invisible to us; and I maintain it is not impossible that an order of beings may exist in our universe, perhaps close to us, with an order of sensation absolutely different from ours.

8. If we can once firmly grasp the idea of immortality, I count as of some value the consolation and assurance such hope offers.

For what is life to man, with all his hopes and fears, if the fleeting moment be the end of all? Every day his efforts are rendered fruitless. He gathers thorns where he had hoped for figs, and his fondest aspirations melt into thin air. If this present stage of being is the only one, then life is but an enigma, cruel and inexplicable. If it is true that man, the crowning glory

of visible creature, is doomed to annihilation, lying down with blighted hopes, with keen memories of mistakes and failures, with a deepening sense that the travail of life is in vain, then indeed is mankind left without hope.

And the reverse? The certainty of the continuity of life lights up the dark picture. Through the dismal swamp of materialism comes the assurance that those we mourn as lost still live. In its light, the shattered plans of to-day bear fruit to-morrow. The possibilities of existence are revealed, and humanity takes courage at the thought that its endeavours are not in vain; that the thorns now obstructing its pathway may be transformed into the flowers of paradise.

Two theories, then, respecting the ultimate of human life present themselves. Each attempts to answer the question which for ages has been the cry of the world—"If a man die, shall he live again?" These two theories are Spiritualism and Materialism. By the former is meant that view of the world which teaches that the thinking principle in man is immortal: by the latter, the opposite doctrine. These two views are diametrically opposed to each other. The antagonism between them is absolute. It is not possible to choose a middle course. The truth cannot lie between the two.

THE METEMPSYCHOSIS.

I know my own creation was divine.
 Strewn on the breezy continents I see
 The veined shells and burnished scales which once
 Enclosed my being—husks that I had.
 I brood on all the shapes I must attain
 Before I reach the perfect, which is God.
 For I am of the mountains and the sea,
 The deserts and the caverns in the earth,
 The catacombs and fragments of old worlds.
 I was a spirit on the mountain tops,
 A perfume in the valleys, a nomadic wind
 Roaming the universe, a tireless voice.
 I was ere Romulus and Remus were;
 I was ere Nineveh and Babylon.
 I was and am and evermore shall be
 Progressing, never reaching to the end.
 A hundred years I trembled in the grass
 The delicate trefoil that muffled warm
 A slope on Ida; for a hundred years
 Moved in the purple gyre of those dark flowers
 The Grecian women strew upon the dead.
 Under the earth in fragment glooms I dwelt,
 Then in the veins and sinews of a pine
 On a lone isle, where from the Cyclades
 A mighty wind like a leviathan
 Ploughed through the brine and from those solitudes
 Sent silence frightened.
 A century was as a single day.
 What is a day to an immortal soul?
 A breath, no more. And yet I hold one hour
 Beyond all price,—that hour when from the sky
 A bird, I circled nearer to the earth
 Nearer and nearer till I brushed my wings
 Against the pointed chestnuts, where a stream
 Leapt headlong down a precipice; and there
 Gathering wild flowers in the cool ravine
 Wandered a woman more divinely shaped
 Than any of the creatures of the air.
 I charmed her thought. I sang and gave her dreams,
 Then nestled in her bosom. There I slept
 From morn to noon, while in her eyes a thought
 Grew sweet and sweeter, deepening like the dawn.
 One autumn night I gave a quick low cry
 As infants do: we weep when we are born,
 Not when we die: and thus came I here
 To walk the earth and wear the form of man,
 To suffer bravely as becomes my state,
 One step, one grade, one cycle nearer God.

T. B. ALDRICH. From *The Path*.

"LIGHT."—All orders for papers and for advertisements, and all remittances, should be sent to "The Manager of 'LIGHT,' 16, Craven-street, Charing Cross, W.C.;" and not to the editors. Cheques and P.O. Orders should be crossed "—— and Co." All communications intended to be printed should be addressed to "The Editor." Compliance with these directions will facilitate a satisfactory keeping of the accounts.

A QEM FROM DR. HOLMES.

One incident of our excursion to Stonehenge had a significance for me which renders it memorable in my personal experience. As we drove over the barren plain, one of the party suddenly exclaimed, "Look! Look! See the lark rising!" I looked up with the rest. There was the bright blue sky, but not a speck upon it which my eyes could distinguish. Again, one called out, "Hark! Hark! Hear him singing!" I listened, but not a sound reached my ear. Was it strange that I felt a momentary pang? *Those that look out at the windows are darkened, and all the daughters of music are brought low.* Was I never to see or hear the soaring songster at Heaven's gate—unless—unless—if our mild humanised theology promises truly, I may perhaps hereafter listen to him singing far down beneath me? For in whatever world I may find myself, I hope I shall always love our poor little spheroid, so long my home, which some kind angel may point out to me as a gilded globule swimming in the sunlight far away. After walking the streets of pure gold in the new Jerusalem, might one not like a short vacation, to visit the well-remembered green fields and flowery meadow? I had a very sweet emotion of self-pity, which took the sting out of my painful discovery that the orchestra of my pleasing life-entertainment was unstringing its instruments, and its lights were being extinguished—that the show was almost over. All this I kept to myself, of course, except so far as I whispered it to the unseen presence which we all feel in sympathy with us, and which, as it seemed to my fancy, was looking into my eyes, and through them into my soul, with the tender, tearful smile of a mother who for the first time gently presses back the longing lips of her as yet unweaned infant.—"One Hundred Days in Europe," *Atlantic Magazine* for July.

MODERN CONVULSIONISTS.

The *British Medical Journal* gives some details of the curious outbreak of convulsionist mania, analogous to those which occurred from time to time during the Middle Ages, reported to have shown itself at Agosta, in the province of Rome:—

"For some weeks past the country people have been labouring under the delusion that the district is under the immediate government of the Evil One, and before retiring to rest they carefully place on the threshold the broom and the salt, which are credited with the power of keeping off evil spirits. Many of the younger women have epileptiform attacks, during which they utter piercing shrieks and are violently convulsed. So serious had the condition of things become, that the syndic of Agosta found it necessary to inform the prefect, who sent detachments of soldiers into the district in order to calm the apprehensions of the inhabitants. The contrast between this strictly physical way of dealing with the disease, and the more imposing but less effectual religious ceremonies formerly employed must be interesting to historical students. As a natural consequence of this condition of mental perturbation the country is overrun with quacks who claim to possess the only infallible remedy for the seizures. One of these nostrums, the vendor of which was making a rich harvest from its sale, was found on analysis to consist of earth, snuff, and borax. Three medical men who were commissioned to investigate the cause and nature of this extraordinary affection came to the conclusion that it was an epidemic of hysteria. They examined a number of the sufferers, mostly young women, some of whom were alleged to have vomited nails, horseshoes, and other equally indigestible substances, while others barked like dogs. Several of them were removed to Rome for treatment in the hospitals there, and measures have been taken to check the spread of the mischief. In a milder degree, this contagious form of hysteria is not infrequent, especially in places where ignorance and superstition favour manifestations of nervous disorder. The worst excesses of popular outbreaks, like the French Revolution, have been attributed to similar influences, and with every appearance of justice."—*St. James's Gazette*.

THE secret of success is constancy to purpose.
 WE complain that our life is short, and yet we throw away much of it, and are weary of many of its parts.
 LITTLE by little fortunes are accumulated; little by little knowledge is gained; little by little character is achieved.

TESTIMONY TO PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

The following is a list of eminent persons who, after personal investigation, have satisfied themselves of the reality of some of the phenomena generally known as Psychical or Spiritualistic.

N.B.—An asterisk is prefixed to those who have exchanged belief for knowledge.

SCIENCE.—The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, F.R.S., President R.A.S.; W. Crookes, Fellow and Gold Medallist of the Royal Society; C. Varley, F.R.S., C.E.; A. R. Wallace, the eminent Naturalist; W. F. Barrett, F.R.S.E., Professor of Physics in the Royal College of Science, Dublin; Dr. Lockhart Robertson; *Dr. J. Elliotson, F.R.S., some time President of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London; *Professor de Morgan, sometime President of the Mathematical Society of London; *Dr. Wm. Gregory, F.R.S.E., sometime Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh; *Dr. Ashburner *Mr. Rutter; *Dr. Herbert Mayo, F.R.S., &c., &c.

*Professor F. Zöllner, of Leipzig, author of *Transcendental Physics*, &c.; Professors G. T. Fechner, Scheibner, and J. H. Fichte, of Leipzig; Professor W. E. Weber, of Göttingen; Professor Hoffman, of Würzburg; *Professor Perty, of Berne; Professors Wagner and *Butlerof, of Petersburg; *Professors Hare and Mapes, of U.S.A.; Dr. Robert Friese, of Breslau; M. Camille Flammarion, Astronomer, &c., &c.

LITERATURE.—The Earl of Dunraven; T. A. Trollope; S. C. Hall; Gerald Massey; Sir R. Burton; *Professor Cassal, LL.D.; *Lord Brougham; *Lord Lytton; *Lord Lyndhurst; *Archbishop Whately; *Dr. R. Chambers, F.R.S.E.; *W. M. Thackeray; *Nassau Senior; *George Thompson; *W. Howitt; *Serjeant Cox; *Mrs. Browning; Hon. Roden Noel, &c. &c.

Bishop Clarke, Rhode Island, U.S.A.; Darius Lyman, U.S.A.; Professor W. Denton; Professor Alex. Wilder; Professor Hiram Corson; Professor George Bush; and twenty-four Judges and ex-Judges of the U.S. Courts; *Victor Hugo; Baron and Baroness Von Vay; *W. Lloyd Garrison, U.S.A.; *Hon. R. Dale Owen, U.S.A.; *Hon. J. W. Edmonds, U.S.A.; *Epes Sargent; *Baron du Potet; *Count A. de Gasparin; *Baron L. de Guldenstibbe, &c., &c.

SOCIAL POSITION.—H. I. H. Nicholas, Duke of Leuchtenberg; H. S. H. the Prince of Solms; H. S. H. Prince Albrecht of Solms; *H. S. H. Prince Emile of Sayn Wittgenstein; Hon. Alexander Aksakof, Imperial Councillor of Russia; the Countess of Caithness and Duchesse de Pomar; the Hon. J. L. O'Sullivan, sometime Minister of U.S.A. at the Court of Lisbon; M. Favre-Clavairoz, late Consul-General of France at Trieste; the late Emperors of *Russia and *France; Presidents *Thiers and *Lincoln, &c., &c.

WHAT IS SAID OF PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

J. H. FICHTE, THE GERMAN PHILOSOPHER AND AUTHOR.—“Notwithstanding my age (83) and my exemption from the controversies of the day, I feel it my duty to bear testimony to the great fact of Spiritualism. No one should keep silent.”

PROFESSOR DE MORGAN, PRESIDENT OF THE MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.—“I am perfectly convinced that I have both seen and heard, in a manner which should make unbelief impossible, things called spiritual, which cannot be taken by a rational being to be capable of explanation by imposture, coincidence, or mistake. So far I feel the ground firm under me.”

DR. ROBERT CHAMBERS.—“I have for many years known that these phenomena are real, as distinguished from impostures; and it is not of yesterday that I concluded they were calculated to explain much that has been doubtful in the past; and when fully accepted, revolutionise the whole frame of human opinion on many important matters.”—*Extract from a Letter to A. Russel Wallace.*

PROFESSOR HARE, EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.—“Far from abating my confidence in the inferences respecting the agencies of the spirits of deceased mortals, in the manifestations of which I have given an account in my work, I have, within the last nine months” (this was written in 1858), “had more striking evidences of that agency than those given in the work in question.”

PROFESSOR CHALLIS, THE LATE PLUMERIAN PROFESSOR OF ASTRONOMY AT CAMBRIDGE.—“I have been unable to resist the large amount of testimony to such facts, which has come from many independent sources, and from a vast number of witnesses. . . . In short, the testimony has been so abundant and contemporaneous, that either the facts must be admitted to be such as are reported, or the possibility of certifying facts by human testimony must be given up.”—*Clerical Journal*, June, 1862.

PROFESSORS TORNEBOM AND EDLAND, THE SWEDISH PHYSICISTS.—“Only those deny the reality of spirit phenomena who have never examined them, but profound study alone can explain them. We do not know where we may be led by the discovery of the cause of these, as it seems, trivial occurrences, or to what new spheres of Nature's kingdom they may open the way; but that they will bring forward important results is already made clear to us by the revelations of natural history in all ages.”—*Aftonblad* (Stockholm), October 30th, 1879.

PROFESSOR GREGORY, F.R.S.E.—“The essential question is this. What are the proofs of the agency of departed spirits? Although I cannot say that I yet feel the sure and firm conviction on this point which I feel on some others, I am bound to say that the higher phenomena, recorded by so many truthful and honourable men, appear to me to render the spiritual hypothesis almost certain. . . . I believe that if I could myself see the higher phenomena alluded to I should be satisfied, as are all those who have had the best means of judging the truth of the spiritual theory.”

LORD BROUGHAM.—“There is but one question I would ask the author, Is the Spiritualism of this work foreign to our materialistic, manufacturing age? No; for amidst the varieties of mind which divers circumstances produce are found those who cultivate man's highest faculties; to these the author addresses himself. But even in the most cloudless skies of scepticism I see a rain-cloud, if it be no bigger than a man's hand; it is modern Spiritualism.”—*Preface by Lord Brougham to "The Book of Nature."* By C. O. Groom Napier, F.C.S.

THE LONDON DIALLECTICAL COMMITTEE reported: “1. That sounds of a very varied character, apparently proceeding from articles of furniture, the floor and walls of the room—the vibrations accompanying which sounds are often distinctly perceptible to the touch—occur, without being produced by muscular action or mechanical contrivance. 1. That movements of heavy bodies take place without mechanical

contrivance of any kind, or adequate exertion of muscular force by those present, and frequently without contact or connection with any person. 3. That these sounds and movements often occur at the time and in the manner asked for by persons present, and, by means of a simple code of signals, answer questions and spell out coherent communications.”

CROMWELL F. VARLEY, F.R.S.—“Twenty-five years ago I was a hard-headed unbeliever. . . . Spiritual phenomena, however, suddenly and quite unexpectedly, were soon after developed in my own family. . . . This led me to inquire and to try numerous experiments in such a way as to preclude, as much as circumstances would permit, the possibility of trickery and self-deception.” He then details various phases of the phenomena which had come within the range of his personal experience, and continues: “Other and numerous phenomena have occurred, proving the existence (a) of forces unknown to science; (b) the power of instantly reading my thoughts; (c) the presence of some intelligence or intelligences controlling those powers. . . . That the phenomena occur there is overwhelming evidence, and it is too late to deny their existence.”

CAMILLE FLAMMARION, THE FRENCH ASTRONOMER, AND MEMBER OF THE ACADEMIE FRANCAISE.—“I do not hesitate to affirm my conviction, based on personal examination of the subject, that any scientific man who declares the phenomena denominated ‘magnetic,’ ‘sommambule,’ ‘mediumic,’ and others not yet explained by science to be ‘impossible,’ is one who speaks without knowing what he is talking about; and also any man accustomed, by his professional avocations, to scientific observation—provided that his mind be not biased by pre-conceived opinions, nor his mental vision blinded by that opposite kind of illusion, unhappily too common in the learned world, which consists in imagining that the laws of Nature are already known to us, and that everything which appears to overstep the limit of our present formulas is impossible—may acquire a radical and absolute certainty of the reality of the facts alluded to.”

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, F.G.S.—“My position, therefore, is that the phenomena of Spiritualism in their entirety do not require further confirmation. They are proved, quite as well as any facts are proved in other sciences, and it is not denial or quibbling that can disprove any of them, but only fresh facts and accurate deductions from those facts. When the opponents of Spiritualism can give a record of their researches approaching in duration and completeness to those of its advocates; and when they can discover and show in detail, either how the phenomena are produced or how the many sane and able men here referred to have been deluded into a coincident belief that they have witnessed them; and when they can prove the correctness of their theory by producing a like belief in a body of equally sane and able unbelievers—then, and not till then, will it be necessary for Spiritualists to produce fresh confirmation of facts which are, and always have been, sufficiently real and indisputable to satisfy any honest and persevering inquirer.”—*Miracles and Modern Spiritualism.*

DR. LOCKHART ROBERTSON.—“The writer” (i.e., Dr. L. Robertson) “can now no more doubt the physical manifestations of so-called Spiritualism than he would any other fact, as, for example, the fall of the apple to the ground, of which his senses informed him. As stated above, there was no place or chance of any legerdemain, or fraud, in these physical manifestations. He is aware, even from recent experience, of the impossibility of convincing anyone, by a mere narrative of events apparently so out of harmony with all our knowledge of the laws which govern the physical world, and he places these facts on record rather as an act of justice due to those whose similar statements he had elsewhere doubted and denied, than with either the desire or hope of convincing others. Yet he cannot doubt the ultimate recognition of facts of the truth of which he is so thoroughly convinced. Admit these physical manifestations, and a strange and wide world of research is opened to our inquiry. This field is new to the materialist mind of the last two centuries, which even in the writings of divines of the English Church, doubts and denies all spiritual manifestations and agencies, be they good or evil.”—From a letter by Dr. Lockhart Robertson, published in the *Dialectical Society's Report on Spiritualism*, p. 24.

NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR.—“No one can doubt that phenomena like these (Phrenology, Homoeopathy, and Mesmerism) deserve to be observed, recorded, and arranged; and whether we call by the name of mesmerism, or by any other name, the science which proposes to do this, is a mere question of nomenclature. Among those who profess this science there may be careless observers, prejudiced recorders, and rash systematisers; their errors and defects may impede the progress of knowledge, but they will not stop it. And we have no doubt that, before the end of this century, the wonders which perplex almost equally those who accept and those who reject modern mesmerism will be distributed into defined classes, and found subject to ascertained laws—in other words, will become the subjects of a science.” These views will prepare us for the following statement, made in the *Spiritual Magazine*, 1864, p. 336: “We have only to add, as a further tribute to the attainments and honours of Mr. Senior, that he was by long inquiry and experience a firm believer in spiritual power and manifestations. Mr. Home was his frequent guest, and Mr. Senior made no secret of his belief among his friends. He it was who recommended the publication of Mr. Home's recent work by Messrs. Longmans, and he authorised the publication, under initials, of one of the striking incidents there given, which happened to a near and dear member of his family.”

BARON CARL DU PREL (Munich) in *Nord und Sud*.—“One thing is clear; that is, that psychography must be ascribed to a transcendental origin. We shall find: (1) That the hypothesis of prepared slates is inadmissible. (2) The place on which the writing is found is quite inaccessible to the hands of the medium. In some cases the double slate is securely locked, leaving only room inside for the tiny morsel of slate-pencil. (3) That the writing is actually done at the time. (4) That the medium is not writing. (5) The writing must be actually done with the morsel of slate or lead-pencil. (6) The writing is done by an intelligent being, since the answers are exactly pertinent to the questions. (7) This being can read, write, and understand the language of human beings, frequently such as is unknown to the medium. (8) It strongly resembles a human being, as well in the degree of its intelligence as in the mistakes sometimes made. These beings are therefore, although invisible, of human nature or species. It is no use whatever to fight against this proposition. (9) If these beings speak, they do so in human language. (10) If they are asked who they are, they answer that they are beings who have left this world. (11) When these appearances become partly visible, perhaps only their hands, the hands seen are of human form. (12) When these things become entirely visible, they show the human form and countenance. . . . Spiritualism must be investigated by science. I should look upon myself as a coward if I did not openly express my convictions.”