

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

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

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe

No. 345.—VOL. VII.

[Registered as a
Newspaper.]

SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1887.

[Registered as a
Newspaper.]

PRICE TWOPENCE

CONTENTS.

Weak and Strong Points in Spiritualism	365	Philosophy of Occultism	372
Lecture by Mr. Alderman Barkas	366	The Spirit Body	372
Notes by a London Correspondent	366	What is Spiritualism?	373
Prejudices of the "Enlightened"	367	The Katie King Episode	373
Spiritualism and Catholicism	370	Mr. Price's Mesmeric Séances	374
The <i>Athenæum</i> and the Occult	370	Cures by Mr. Omerin	374
Carlyle as a Mystic	371	An Open Letter to Professor Fullerton	375
Physical Phenomena at a distance	371	"A Matter of Demonstration"	384
		The Mystery (poetry)	384

NOTES BY THE WAY.

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

WEAK AND STRONG POINTS IN SPIRITUALISM.

PART I.

Mr. Abbott's presentation of the weak points of Spiritualism* is instructive, and I propose to make some brief remarks on some of his arguments. These he does not set forth as sufficient to disprove Spiritualism: but he thinks that "they very seriously stand in the way of mankind generally accepting it as true." Before I proceed to any notice of his arguments, I may say that it is in my mind by no means certain that Spiritualism is not making its way quite fast enough. Regarded in whatever way you will its growth and development have been both rapid and enduring. It is not yet forty years since it arose, after the witch-persecutions when the mediums were killed off, in its resuscitated form, and what system of philosophy, religion, or whatever may be rightly included within the broad name of Spiritualism, ever made such progress before? Mr. Abbott calls it "a new religion." Well: he corrects himself, for the Bible is full of it, and, "if it teaches any one fact above another it is this, that the way of communication between the terrestrial and spiritual states was not in those days sealed up, but continually open and used." If he go on, however, to compare its effects with that of Christ's teaching on the world, how are we to estimate the forty years' influence of this "new religion"? The forty must be multiplied by ten before you arrive at a comparative parallel. Turn again to the way in which the ideas peculiarly the property of Spiritualism now permeate modern literature: the literature of devotion, of philosophy, of fiction: of the pulpit, the Press, and the circulating library—three of the mightiest engines for the formation and development of opinion. There were some of us who, when we first grasped what Spiritualism was, and what vast issues were bound up in it, thought that it would stand forth alone and unsupported as a science, a philosophy, and a religion, drawing to itself the best minds who found other systems hollow and unsatisfying. Temples were built for its devotees, wherein they might hold services of worship according to their views. Preparations were made on a large scale for this new "sect that is everywhere spoken against" to set itself up on high, and draw all men into its fold.

But man's ideas in this, as in so many other things, have proved vain. The temples have been failures. From the first there has been, as those who look back may see, a marked disinclination on the part of the world of spirit to

be hampered by forms and bound by professions of faith crystallised into dogmas. It was soon found that the services to be held according to the views of these Spiritualists, which were to draw from the churches those who found no nourishment there, were heterogeneous and quite destitute of cohesion. Instead of providing a rallying point round which all might gather, coming out from existing churches and being separate, the centre was disputing as to what was to be *de fide* with almost all their brethren who dissented each of them from nearly every definition, and each of whom had, moreover, an idea of his own. It became apparent that instead of Spiritualism growing into something separate, into another sect, the reverse would happen. Spiritualism would leaven the churches, not set up an opposition. So it has been. Nothing has been more obvious in the last twenty years than the change that has come over theological teaching. It has lost much of its narrowness, its sectarian acidity, its hide-bound dogmatism, and has widened and broadened under the influence of that great movement of thought, of which Spiritualism is one of the best expressions, in a way incredible. Its conceptions are less revolting, less crude, less obviously man-made, and made in times when man was not at his best. Its teachings are more simple and practical, turning more on man's part in his own development, and in fitting himself for his inevitable future. I need not pursue the subject. Spiritualism in its higher aspects has had much to do in bringing this about.

It has been much the same with literature. The Society for Psychical Research has made it fashionable to talk of Hypnotism, Telepathy, and much that concerns the fringe of this wide subject. The Occult in many of its phases is found, not only in Christmas literature, where one expects it, but at Mudie's and Smith's libraries, where one does not expect it. It is not wise indeed for a novelist who aims at success to neglect this most promising field. The public desires its fiction to be a little occult and creepy, with a dash of Spiritualism, Theosophy, or Magic, and this flavour is distinctly recognised as present in the most successful recent fiction. It is only when Spiritualists point out (as Mr. Rider Haggard does for his own work) chapter and verse, evidence and authority for what spices the current fiction that the public, or some portion of it, shies and faintly hints that it was not really serious. It was only playing with ghosts. Yet I know some whose first interest of a really serious nature in Spiritualism was unconsciously fostered by Mr. Mudie. Needless to say how strong a direction the study of this subject has given to some schools of German Philosophy; nor how such men as Hellenbach and Du Prel must influence future thought. Nor can I stay to point out how this wave of thought has influenced modern science, and checked its tendency to materialism. That has already been pointed out in these columns in connection with Mr. Crookes's recent utterances.

Spiritualism, therefore, has not exercised a cohesive influence in binding its votaries together: rather it has disseminated its faith and become influential as a modifying

power in all directions. That is its present phase, and the work that it has done, the influence that it has exercised, are enormous. It may be that the time has not come yet, it must be that the time will come—and the sooner the better for the future of Spiritualism—when it will organise its forces and close its ranks. I have not ceased to advocate such reasonable methods of organised effort as may enable Spiritualists to do what all other bodies associated in a common belief find possible by means which are found by all men most serviceable. Until that is done much must be left undone. But it is no use to force on such measures: and the time must be ripe for the effort before it can be expected to be successful. Meantime, the disruptive force holds sway, and we may be thankful that the seed is being scattered in so many directions. None the less, where cohesion, even on a small scale, can be had, so much the better for us.

LECTURE BY MR. ALDERMAN BARKAS.

FROM THE NEWCASTLE *Daily Leader*.

On Sunday night last Mr. Alderman Barkas gave a lecture before the members of the Newcastle Spiritual Evidence Society, in the Cordwainers' Hall, Nelson-street, Newcastle, on "Remarkable Conversations with Inhabitants of the Spirit World Respecting Future Conditions." There was a crowded attendance. After hymns and prayer, Alderman Barkas gave his address, prefacing his revelations by stating that he had before him the original manuscript containing the questions and answers, which was open to the inspection of the curious. The conversations took place at a series of sances in a private house, and in the presence of four or five witnesses. The replies were written by the medium with great rapidity, and, though not absolutely correct either in composition or spelling, they were certainly no more incorrect than would be the replies of twelve of the most intelligent men in England if they had to supply such ready replies on such abstruse points. The revelations which he would read to them were made at a sance on the evening of December 17th, 1876, and the spirit interrogated was that of a deceased materialist, who, in the course of the sance, described the sensation of death, which was the sinking into a stupor, the cessation of pain, and then a feeling of exquisite and intoxicating pleasure. He was conducted over hills and through valleys to a city beyond description, and as they wandered through it he saw men discussing—men whom on coming nearer he recognised to be some of the grand old heroes of whom he had read and heard about, and he involuntarily bowed himself before them. Further on they came to the children's village, and his guide explained that as the children grew in wisdom and understanding they took their places amongst the men and women. Further journeyings showed him good and great philanthropists continuing the work which they had begun on earth, with kings and statesmen as their scholars, and goodness and virtue the one test of caste and position. In answer to further questions, the spirit informed them that in his sphere they were deprived of all their physical senses—understanding without hearing, seeing without seeing, speaking without speaking. Could they, asked the spirit, imagine such a state of acute perception, for if they could he could give them no better idea of the manner in which they saw, heard, spoke, and understood. Their music was the perfection of sense and sweet sound, and they had books and records just the same as on earth. Not the smallest trifle escaped record. There were histories of those inhabitants who had lived in the sphere before them, and had now passed on to a still further advanced state. Chinese characters represented their writing more nearly than anything else, each symbol being the expression of a thought. Asked the question, "Can you give us a sketch of any one of the written forms to which you refer, and give us the interpretation?" the spirit replied, "I would, but I may not." Further interrogatories brought out the fact that in the next world there were many to correspond with the idiotic in our world, but that they were not hopelessly so, being capable of improving their understanding. There were many more occupations there than here, most of a somewhat similar character, but there was no individual accumulation of riches and property. It was a commonwealth state, where everyone made wealth as much for his neighbour as himself. One never gained but to bestow it on others, and the more he bestowed on others the

richer he became. Angels visited them in the same way as they had appeared on earth in times gone by, and in the same way they were doubted by those who did not believe in a still higher sphere, and who, if the Deity came amongst them, would ask for His credentials. The spirit went on to state that he had been amongst them on earth many times, though, of course, in an invisible state. In the spirit sphere there were different grades in the same way that there were different classes of scholars, and the wisest man was the richest. Their principal avocations were teaching and learning, and most of them were teachers and scholars, the object being to perfect every one in everything. There were some who were too idle to work, and these remained miserable, grovelling creatures.

NOTES BY A LONDON CORRESPONDENT.

We take the following cutting from a "London Letter," which appeared in the *Sunday Herald*, Boston, U.S.A., written by Mrs. Louise Chandler Moulton, the special London correspondent for that journal:—

"The Holman-Hunts talk of coming to America this autumn, and I hope this long-delayed visit will finally come to pass. Like everybody else in London they are interested in hypnotism, Spiritualism, &c.—interested, I mean, as inquirers, not as believers, and I saw a table move round briskly under the pretty fingers of Mrs. Hunt and a young lady cousin of hers. . . . How very sure of this after-death knowledge some happy people are. Mr. Stainton-Moses, of University College, London, is certainly a trained scientist, and a man accustomed to weigh evidence; and he tells me that with him Spiritualism is not a matter of mere belief, but of actual, personal knowledge. A great deal of spiritual writing has been done through his own hand; not professionally, but for his own satisfaction. Holding *Zoroaster* or *Aristotle* in his left hand, and reading attentively, he has written out most extraordinary things with his right. For instance, one day—in answer he thinks to a wish on his part for an especially strong test—his hand wrote of the death of a woman of whom he had never heard, giving her name and the time and manner of her passing away, &c. 'But,' he said, as he read it over, 'I don't see that this is a test. I could find it in a newspaper; I may have read it, and unconsciously remembered it.' Instantly it was written, 'No, that cannot be; she died but an hour ago, and when you see it in the paper you will have had your test.' The next day he searched the papers in vain, but on the second morning, there, in the death column, he found the announcement of the death, corresponding with what had been written through him in every particular of name, date and disease. Also he had seen spirits in friendly converse—entertained them at his own fireside. If Rider Haggard, or any of his imaginative kindred, told this story it might go for little, but what is one to say when it is told by a trained scientist accustomed to criticise evidence and to subject apparent facts to the exacting tests of experiment? I went by invitation of Mr. Stainton-Moses, to a festal reunion of the 'Spiritualist Alliance,' of which he is president, and I am bound to say that I met there men and women who seemed to me as sincere and earnest and intelligent as one finds anywhere. An admirable address was given by Mr. Cassal, and then there was music, and conversation, and supper, and all went on as merrily as if there were no ghosts in the world. Oh, and I saw Eglinton—the medium who is now what Home was—though he told me he meant soon to get out of the professional part of Spiritualism. He is a singularly agreeable man, handsome, and with a look in his dark eyes as if they might easily see visions. I am told that he has lately married a rich wife, and this may account for his intention to withdraw from Spiritualism as a profession."

LOOK OUT FOR HIM.—The London Society of Psychical Research is well known to be hostile to mediumship, its object seeming to be, not to prove, but to disprove, if possible, all spiritual phenomena. An employé of this society, at a salary of £300 per annum, is one Richard Hodgson, whose business it is to investigate mediumship, and break down and destroy, as far as possible, all mediums. He is a tall, smooth-faced man, with keen, black eyes, and boasts of his ability to prove any medium a fraud. The society sent this man to India whence he sought to discredit Madame Blavatsky; they are now about to send him to America to investigate, and if possible, to prove our prominent mediums cheats. We warn all mediums to look out for him, and on no account to hold sances with him.—*Golden Gate*.

THE PREJUDICES OF THE "ENLIGHTENED" WITH REGARD TO THOSE OF THE SUPERSTITIOUS.

From *The Prejudices of Mankind*, by Baron Hellenbach.

TRANSLATED BY "V."

Contents — PUBLIC OPINION—SUPERSTITION—THE NUMBER THIRTEEN—FRIDAY—DAY AND NIGHT—THE KIBITZ—ALCHEMISTS—ASTROLOGERS—MAGICIANS.

In accordance with the principle of the division of labour, we must let many people work for the production of many things. It is not everyone who can make a coat for himself, prescribe his own medicine, or manufacture a watch; there is no person capable of compiling an ordinary astronomical calendar, and at the same time of manufacturing the paper it is printed on, arranging the type, and printing it himself.

We need not, therefore, wonder if we very often allow others to think for us, when we are too idle to think or even to learn for ourselves. Instead of studying books, we read journals, which is a much easier task, and more convenient; we learn the theories of a Newton or a Darwin from the *feuilletons* of a daily paper, and instead of forming our own opinions we adopt the views of another. From thence it arises that even among the friends of philosophy, as a rule opinions are adopted which have been sucked in with university milk; we think the thoughts of a Hegel, a Herbart, or a Spencer, and sail along the stream with "public opinion"; this is certainly a more convenient plan than reading various authors and thinking for ourselves.

What is public opinion, and how does it originate?

The force of public opinion does not depend on any kind of general conviction on some point, but only on the supposition that it is general.

Now let us imagine public opinion as represented by the letters of the alphabet, each letter comprising perhaps some millions of persons; the reader can easily represent to himself an endless number of letters.

A knows, or thinks that he knows, that B, C, D, E, F, to Z hold a certain opinion; B believes the same thing of A and the others, and so it goes on up to Z, who again has the conviction that from A to Z all are of the same opinion. Public opinion is, therefore, in reality, no true concurrence of views, but only an imaginary and pre-supposed one.

Let us now suppose that some occurrence has caused A to think for himself, and that by so doing his opinion has become directly contrary to the so-called public opinion; he must, in the first place, have self-confidence enough to renounce the old and very convenient habit he has got into; this he may be able to do, but rarely will A have the courage to make his change of opinion public, and so he continues to contribute to the false estimate given to public opinion. Only slowly does he come to an explanation with B, and then with C, and just when the number is sufficiently strong for them to avow themselves as renegades, without the risk of being laughed at, does a new doctrine take its place among a minority, till the present generation die off; and then perhaps it becomes the ruling opinion, till in its turn it is displaced by another.

Politics have their watchwords and seasons of popularity, and science no less so. Political representatives have often had to blame themselves, and those of science have had to do the same thing. Therefore public opinion is frequently deceived; and this is quite natural, because it is in reality no general public opinion at all, but only the belief that such an opinion really exists regarding some circumstance or question.

It thus is to be understood that half-educated people, who as a rule are accustomed to think the thoughts of others, are far more easily converted to modern views than the quite ignorant, who often hold fast to their opinions with an extraordinary tenacity. In consequence of this, the world, as regards spiritual matters, is usually divided into two classes—the "enlightened" and the "superstitious." Be it said, by the way, that the phrase "it is impossible" of the "enlightened," is as a rule opposed to the "it is" of the ignorant.

Nock and Prudhon have given vent to the proposition that popular superstitions generally run parallel with one of nature's laws. This proposition contains a great truth; for the superstitions of the people are generally due to some uncomprehended or misrepresented phenomena, which, however, frequently occur. Every superstitious peasant knows instances of such which he asserts to be facts but otherwise he can bring nothing forward in proof of them. And as the really cultivated world

adduce laws from a series of similar phenomena, so the peasant adopts his superstition from a number of real or false facts.

This is almost always the fruit of tradition, the roots of which may be traced back to two different sources. Firstly, that of outward or objective experience; and, secondly, that of unconscious life, instinct, or the perception of the meta-organism; for it is beyond a doubt that most of our medical remedies owe their origin to this source.

Dioscorides, in the time of Nero, had the opportunity as a military doctor of collecting various remedies among different nations; and Hypocrates made similar collections. Even the idea of inoculation by cow-pox was given to Dr. Jenner, the supposed discoverer, through the revelations of a young girl. (See Dr. Baron's *Life of Dr. Jenner*, 1828.) In Mecklenburg, besides, it was a well-known saying that cow-pox was a protection against small-pox. (*Annals of Schleswig Holstein*, 1815.) Instinct guides certain children of Nature, and repeated experience brings these remedies into use for the common welfare. Later on, and sometimes not at all, science follows after with its explanations.

Since a superstitious person will not sit down thirteen at a table, he can have no experience in the matter that out of the thirteen one must die before the year is out; and as persons who are not superstitious about this take no notice of it, they would not be likely to remark if accidentally a death should occur during the twelvemonth among the thirteen. Still there are other equally prevalent ideas among the people, and it has happened that experience has proved them in the right as opposed to the prejudices of the "enlightened" world.

The so-called world of culture as a rule, form the following false conclusions.

We rightly reject every asserted combination of phenomena in which a causal nexus is impossible. The "enlightened" world, however, often takes the impossibility of a causal nexus for granted, when it is simply a question of the phenomena not being comprehended.

Because I do not understand the event, I should not therefore conclude that it has not occurred. The limits of my knowledge of Nature are far from being the limits of Nature herself. On this subject there are four different imaginable standpoints: (1) I can comprehend the causal connection of the phenomena; (2) I cannot exactly comprehend it, but I can imagine it; (3) I can no longer imagine it, and this is a step further towards the assertion (4) that it is impossible. To illustrate this by examples, the action of a steam-mill is understood by me, but that of the magnetic needle is not, though I have several modes of explanation before me. The actions of a somnambulist with the influencing at a distance (*Fernwirkungen*) are still more difficult to understand, as regards the causal connection. If, however, I am told that a field can be sheltered from hail by means of some hocus-pocus, I know that no connection here can exist.

To recognise distinctly the connection of phenomena is called "to know"; to assert an unjustifiable connection or cause would be to "err"; superstition only exists where an impossible concurrence of circumstances is asserted. It is clear with respect to the number thirteen, that if thirteen old people are together the probability is in favour of the death of one of the party within the twelvemonth, and it is a question of calculation at what age the probability begins. The number thirteen itself can exercise no possible influence, which, however, does not hinder enlightened persons in the best society from slyly sending a carriage to fetch a friend to dinner when the fourteenth guest is prevented from coming, and only thirteen in consequence would be present at table. Certainly, if anyone were nervous about this, it might exercise an influence on his life, for all my readers know by experience what effects imagination can produce.

Now as to Friday being an unlucky day, this superstition shows an utter absence of thought. It is clear that in the human life of seven days, not one only but several so-called unlucky days must often occur; besides which the alterations in the calendar and the occurrence of leap-year must cause a change in the order of days. In spite of some coincidences, a causal-connection in this case is utterly and entirely inconceivable.

All these omens,—as far as they are not subjective forebodings,—are quite valueless. An officer nearly related to me once spent New Year's Eve with his comrades; at midnight they all took their glasses in their hands to drink to their meeting again the following year. The glass fell from the hand

of my relation, and he is still alive and as well as he was before. Now, supposing he had come to misfortune, supposing even the accident had been of an exceptional nature, a somewhat abnormal state would suffice in a moment of excitement for a warning to be given through the transcendental subject, which many would describe as an involuntary presentiment, which might cause the glass to fall or be broken.* It is not even absolutely inconceivable that some invisible friend might take such an opportunity of giving a *memento mori*. *Only in no case can the 31st of December have anything to do with it.*

Accident often contributes in a wonderful manner to nourish superstitious prejudices.

In the province of Neutraer an old castle was still standing a few years back, which was for centuries the seat of my family. This castle had two storeys and several towers, besides many subterranean passages, which alone sufficed to give it an ill name. To this old building was added an incongruous wing of a storey higher, which in my youth I thought quite unnecessary and superfluous. I was told later on that this wing had been built a long time ago on purpose for the lady of the house to be confined in, on account of a superstition that male children born in the castle itself would die in early infancy. The reader will readily believe that the sort of illnesses which carry off newly-born infants cannot be localised in such a manner that they are to be found in some chambers and not in the adjoining ones; nor will he credit that invisible infanticides should haunt these rooms.

It will readily be believed that both my father and mother set themselves above such foolish gossip, in spite of the solid witness which owed its objectionable existence to this superstition, and my mother resided in the castle itself and not in the wing. None the less my two elder brothers died within a month of their birth; later on there arose a difference between my father and his mother, who likewise inhabited the castle in her widowhood, and he moved to a farmhouse which belonged to the estate, where I was born. After my birth my grandmother died and my father returned to the castle, where my two younger brothers were born and died—also in early infancy! I must remark that I do not belong to a delicate race, and that my brothers, particularly the two elder, ought to have been very strong, healthy children. Anyone, therefore, who is in the habit of taking no account of the *causal nexus* may easily be induced to attribute such extraordinary events to superstition; but those who consider such events free from prejudice will readily be able to distinguish the impossible from what is conceivable, as well as to decide if a combination of circumstances may be due to the abnormal nature of man or to the unseen world—the far rarer case. But a less degree of physical knowledge often leads to prejudices.

Confidence in our diplomatised instructors causes actual facts to be thrown on one side, on account of the incapacity of the enlightened world to explain them, and so the prejudices of superstitious ignorance and those of “enlightened” learning run side by side with one another.

For instance, superstition has always ascribed to night something uncanny, and the supposed manifestations of a supposititious other world are generally said to happen at night-time; the question now arises whether a different influence is not exercised over the imagination by day and by night, and unprejudiced experience proves that there is a difference, both from *objective reasons* and on subjective grounds.

We must allow, as far as objective reasons are concerned, that, besides the greater quietude which reigns in the night season, we miss the heat and rays of light of the sun, and consequently a number of oscillations, which thus leave room for

other possible oscillations. As, however, all phenomena in the last analysis may be traced back to vibrations, we need not be surprised at that. I advise anyone to whom this appears too mystical to buy two rockets and to send off one of them by day, the other by night, and he will be convinced that there are other things besides stars which may be seen at night and which are invisible in the daylight.

My readers who have read the second volume of the *Prejudices* will know who Crookes is, namely, the first experimental English physicist who, in opposition to public opinion, investigated the physical phenomena of Spiritualists. He says that darkness is not absolutely essential to the success of the experiments, but adds:—

“It is a well authenticated fact that, when the power is weak, a bright light exercises a disturbing influence on some of the manifestations. The power possessed by Mr. Home is sufficiently strong to overcome this antagonistic influence, and, therefore, he always dispenses with the element of darkness at his séances. In fact, with the exception of two occasions, at which, on account of some particular experiments instituted by me, light was excluded, everything which I have witnessed in his presence took place in the light. I have had many opportunities of testing the operation of the light proceeding from different sources and colours; for instance, that of sunlight, of dispersed daylight, of moonlight, gaslight, lamplight, candle-light, the electric light from an air exhausted tube, &c. The disturbing rays seem to be those at the outer edge of the spectrum.”

If anything is wanted to the experiences of a man and physicist such as Crookes, I may add that I have made exactly similar experiments with other mediums; some of these can only succeed in the dark, others, like Slade, only in the light, and others both in darkness and light. Experiments with Eglinton prove the latter.

There can be no possible doubt that objective causes may exist, and indeed really do exist, which produce a difference in day and night with respect to *perceptions*; still by far the greater half of the causes proceed from subjective influences, which cannot, however, alone be attributed to the force of imagination.

We know that our perceptions depend not only on the kind of influence, but likewise on the degree of our sensibility. Who can deny that in the stillness and darkness of night, and therefore during the repose of two of the most important of our senses, the inner life of the soul or power of perception is not increased? A certain Baron Reichenbach made experiments with various persons in a dark room, among whom some were found who were able after a certain time to see light issuing from objects in the darkness. This fact was much criticised and laughed at, but it was corroborated by many persons. Because I, for instance, might spend two hours in a totally dark room without seeing anything, it does not follow that the same thing should be the case with other persons.* Reichenbach's mistake is only that like a true scientist he immediately found out a *stuff*, christened it *Od*, and endowed it with such peculiarities as he was in need of.

He who adopts the theory of Newton as to a light-æther, and believes that a table or a statue must give out some radiance, in order that I may be able to see it in the dark, will certainly recognise the “*Od*” force; but he who knows that in consequence of the attraction of masses both table and statue operate on each other and cause vibrations or stretch out imaginary threads, and that it only depends on the power of the observer to be able to see such objects in some wise, will no longer wonder about the matter, or at least will transfer his wonder from the table or the statue to the abnormal power of vision of the spectator. It is even the same in the case of the ordinary operations of light. A cloth which appears to be red in colour is only actually so when seen by my eyes; I cannot distinguish the colour with my elbow, and yet the cloth remains unaltered.

The “enlightened” world is therefore quite wrong in looking at day and night in relation to the power of perception as the same thing, or in asserting that by day more can be perceived than by night, and not seeing that this condition of things is sometimes

* There is another superstition, connected with breaking a *looking-glass*, to which I think the above remark applies with great force. I have always had a sort of belief in it, and this *may* have influenced the following events. I do not, of course, think that the mere fact of breaking a looking-glass influences our destiny in any way, but my theory is that “invisible friends” have taken advantage of my *superstition* to give me warning by this means. A person closely connected with me had the looking-glass standing on his dressing-table *twice* broken during the year preceding his death. I forget how it occurred the first time, but a new toilet glass, which replaced the broken one, was dashed to the ground by a violent gust of wind entering at an open window, the table standing between two windows, and I never forgot the sensation of horror that came over me. Many years after this I was suffering great anxiety on account of a dear friend from whom I could obtain no news, when one day a hand-mirror dropped from my hand without any apparent cause and was smashed to atoms. This seemingly trifling event so affected me that I at once went to a place where I knew I could receive news of my friend, when I found he had died suddenly a month previously! It was this occurrence which first determined me to investigate Spiritualism, with the result among other things that I discovered I possessed strong mediumistic powers. One of the first messages I ever received from my friend, was that he *did* break the little mirror to try to warn me of his death.—Tn.

* When in total darkness, as after I am in bed at night, a sudden sound outside my room is frequently accompanied to me by a flash passing across my eyes; when the noise is very loud, being produced perhaps by a door slamming, or a heavy object thrown down in the next room, the light will resemble a flash of lightning. Reichenbach mentions *sound* being among things which produce the “*Od*” luminosity.—Tn.

reversed. Certainly, with regard to the functions of the eyes, more can be seen by day than by night; but other known and unknown powers of perception are increased at night-time. Even those relating to the eye are only relative; for rockets cause the same vibrations by day as by night, so far as they are not impeded by the vibrations of the sun. Thus, in this case, the eye sees by night what is invisible by day.

Certainly there is no cause in this for the terror which night-time so often inspires; yet no one can estimate the sensitiveness to agreeable or disagreeable impressions possessed by different persons. I know a very courageous young fellow who cannot sleep without a light, because in the dark he is sensible of all kinds of perceptions; no one can get out of his own skin.

A not less absurd pretension of the "enlightened" world is the summary condemnation of the power of sympathy.

If the sun operates upon us, as a mass, every particle of the same must do so; this we have already explained. Consequently every stone on the earth operates upon the moon, and therefore upon me; and the action is so much the stronger as it is larger and nearer. The operation, that is, the operating force, is present in any case, only I am not capable of perceiving it. It nowise follows, however, that sickly persons, or those with very sensitive natures, may not be sensible of it. This is the less to be wondered at, as there are, in fact, natures which increase in sensitiveness under this influence. No one can assert that it makes absolutely no difference whether we live in houses of stone, iron, glass, or wood. This has first to be proved, and if, as would probably be the case, it were found to make no perceptible difference to me, it does not follow that the same thing would be the case with others.

It is a self-evident fact that the influence exercised by planets, animals, and persons must be a much greater one; even the idea that the disease called St. Anthony's fire may be cured by the presence of a bullfinch in the room, though the cure is paid for by the death of the latter, is, if such a cure should take place, not absolutely incredible, since there can be no doubt that a human being in the room with an animal does have an influence upon it, and *vice versa*. I certainly, were I attacked with this malady, should not take a bullfinch for my physician or remedy, because I personally have no experience of this legend; but it would not occur to me to assert, *a priori*, such a cure to be an impossibility.

The superstitious man fears the evil eye of certain persons; and yet does not the approach of everyone exercise a certain influence? Is not the will itself one of the factors that increase the powers? Alexander Humboldt says that to every act of the will belongs a certain electric force, and that it can, according to circumstances, develop greater or less energy. Have not even the so-called men of enlightenment themselves their sympathies and antipathies? How, then, if these are grounded on some unknown operation, presentiment or experience?

I may be permitted to ask a man of enlightenment, if he were struck several times in the street by a morsel falling from an overhanging roof at the same spot, whether he would not avoid that place in spite of his attributing the fact to a "remarkable coincidence"? Now the belief in a good or bad omen is often sufficient to influence the whole conduct of a person. It cannot occur to a thinking man that the good or evil will of persons is a matter of indifference; yet as a rule the influence exercised is too small to be actually perceived. It has been proved through Hansen's performances that the power of the will may be much greater than the enlightened world are ready to admit, though perhaps not so great as a simple peasant believes it to be. It is well known that somnambulists experience peculiar sensations at the approach of certain persons, and even that sometimes these sensations are capable of producing frightful convulsions.

One of the most common superstitions, well known to all true gamblers, is that of the so-called Kibitz, which brings good or ill luck. Now it can scarcely be necessary to remark that the fall of the cards, at least when they are shuffled by other persons, cannot depend in any way on those looking on, the hypothesis of false play being excluded; and yet there is or at least may be something in it. I will say somewhat further about this, not on account of the importance of the circumstance, which it does not possess, but in relation to the manner and way in which such an idea should be regarded.

The chances of the game depend on three factors: the value of the cards, correct and quick judgment in playing them, and a certain instinct in those cases, in which the proba-

bility is the same, and in which nothing can be decided by combination. The last factor is of more importance in games where something has to be declared, such as *lombre* and *tarok*, or where cards have to be thrown away before buying others, as in *piquet*, and most of all in the game of *hazard*, where everything depends on the so-called impulse of inspiration.

Let us now take the case of a player who in the presence of a particular person has the oftener either lost or won, and has remarked this fact; would it not affect him in some degree? Can it be denied that the tone of one's mind does in some way influence one's condition and actions? The Parliamentary orator, the sportsman in the forest, the scholar at school, most persons indeed can be influenced by the most trivial and often quite accidental circumstances, and why not the gambler? I go still further, and say that one man acts upon another; he evokes vibrations in his neighbour, and therefore it must not be thought that it is a simple question of imagination, but it may be that even physical reasons are at the bottom of this. It is not to be denied that the tone of mind or temper is intimately connected with the accomplishment of our object; the orator, the musician, the painter or the sportsman is either in good or bad cue, and this frame of mind may be produced by a disordered stomach, as well as by the presence of some antipathetic person, while, on the other side, a good state of health or sympathetic companionship is calculated to induce a happy frame of mind.

If the sportsman looks upon a meeting with an old woman as an unlucky omen and with a young maiden as a lucky one, he is justified if the sight of the one is, as can easily be understood, more agreeable to him than that of the other, and therefore puts him in a better humour. Sport depends as much on instinct as on intuition. Only he who possesses both these at the proper moment is likely to have good sport. A good frame of mind is half the battle, and anything which disturbs this is an obstacle in the way of success.

The enlightened world would do well to use a little more precaution with their "enlightenment," especially as they so often have to own themselves in the wrong. If an ignorant peasant sees in an accidental event a law of nature, or rather finds some necessary connection where none exists, it does not at all follow that some necessary connection or cause does not exist because a man of "enlightenment" does not see it. What is an accident? An uncomprehended connection between cause and effect, for there is nothing without a necessary cause. Men of enlightenment are quite right when they reject the supernatural, because there is no such thing, but everything is not supernatural which is beyond their comprehension.

The celebrated Paracelsus von Hohenheim says: "Before the world comes to an end, many arts which were formerly ascribed to the devil will be publicly known, and it will then be seen that the greater part of these operations depend upon natural forces." It is true he revered sympathetic remedies and talismans, but he did so, as Lessing remarked, because experience vouched for them, not his own conviction. The transmutation of base into precious metals has been the aim and endeavour of mystics in every age except the present, in which, at least in Europe, nothing is known of alchemistic researches. Alchemists proceeded on the assumption that metals are not simple, but are compounded from three elementary sources, and they thought that to one of these sources must be ascribed their brilliancy and ductility (mercury), to another hardness, and to a third colour.

(To be continued.)

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."

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.

Light:

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 13th, 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.

SPIRITUALISM AND CATHOLICISM.

In June there appeared a curious article in a semi-scientific French journal called *Cosmos*. This periodical, which seems to be a sort of Roman Catholic analogue of the *Knowledge* of our own Proctor, gives an account of certain phenomena obtained at Naples by Professor Chiaja, during an investigation extending over three years.

The results arrived at, at Professor Chiaja's various sittings, are evidently of some importance, but in this article it is rather to the remarks of the author of the paper, Dr. Albert Battandier, than to the account of the phenomena, that we wish to draw attention. The phenomena themselves are not denied, indeed the writer speaks somewhat contemptuously of such as do deny them, but he puts a curious construction on their meaning. Dr. Battandier says, speaking not too clearly of the various explanations of these things:—

"There are three principal theories. The first, on account of its importance, is what I shall call the *demoniacal* theory. It is that of the Catholic Church, and it attributes all the phenomena we have just related, and which belong to the *preternatural* order of things, to evil spirits. The devil, by permission of God, makes use of these means to seduce men. This theory, which is the true one, has not yet distinguished the different orders of facts which we have noted; moreover it would be contrary to critical science to suppose that all these facts *indiscriminately* have the devil for their agent. The condemnations which have been pronounced are against special phenomena, of an order which I shall consider as a higher one, and for those the Church has very wisely answered *Prout exponitur, non liceret*."

Dr. Battandier then goes on to speak of the fluidic theory, that is, the theory which supposes the medium to obtain all his power and information from the people present at a séance, by an interchange of a sort of refined æther. This the doctor objects to, and comes to the third theory, that of the action of spirits, either "the gnomes and sprites of the middle ages," or the "souls of the dead who communicate with the living, these souls having the excellencies or defects they possessed during their terrestrial existence." This theory, says the writer, is more in accordance with Catholic teaching, but yet it differs considerably from that teaching:—

"The Church admits not only the possibility, but the actuality, of certain apparitions of the souls of the dead. The souls which are in purgatory can be *invoked*, but they cannot be *evoked*, for man has no right over them. Evoca-

tion, therefore, can only be addressed to such as are in hell, though, at the same time, it is not very probable that God would allow them to leave their prison even for a moment. It would seem more likely that the devil takes their place, appears with their characteristics, and consents apparently to obey the orders of man in order the better to get him into his power. The power of the devil is moreover greater according as the Christian religion is less spread abroad, or less observed. This will explain the intensity of Spiritualistic phenomena in heathen countries in general, and in India in particular."

Dr. Battandier then proceeds to the doctrine of future existence as explained by Spiritualists themselves; and he is horrified at this doctrine, in which he can find no necessity for doing more than your best, whether you are Catholic, Protestant, or Buddhist. He sums it all up in despair:—

"No original sin, no redemption. Jesus, Who had probably got His knowledge in India, nothing but a medium more powerful than the rest. No hell, no Holy Church. Denial of all natural order whatever."

What can be the state of a man to whom original sin is a boon, and who esteems as one of his cherished possessions a share in the fee-simple of hell!

Nevertheless, Dr. Battandier points out a serious danger, a danger which Spiritualists would do well to note more than they do, though the reason for their doing so would be not quite the same as that of Dr. Battandier. Says the doctor:—

"Spiritualism, then, destroys the faith in souls" (whatever that may mean). . . . "It does not stop there, it ruins the body as well, showing thus that it has for its author one who was a 'murderer from the beginning.' . . . The habitual and exaggerated excitement of the nervous centres, the contact with a spirit superior in strength and in intelligence, to whom you are forced to give yourself up, who enters little by little into possession of you, makes use of your organs and considers you as his chattel, can only be disastrous for both soul and body, and must powerfully contribute to the destruction of the harmony established between them by the Creator."

Of this danger there is no doubt. The evils caused by so-called religious revivals, and by the abnormal functions imposed upon its members by the Catholic Church itself are evidence enough, without going into the stories of obliquity told of many mediums, too true as they often are. As to the agent being the arch-fiend, that is a very different matter.

In taking leave of Dr. Battandier, one might express astonishment that a journal which treats of all science, from Fingal's Cave to lightning-conductors, should admit such nonsense, but that in a paragraph of the same number we find it gravely asserted that the butter of the Children of Israel was flavoured with the juice of the Jerusalem artichoke!

II

THE "ATHENÆUM" AND THE OCCULT.

A review of Mr. Edward Waite's edition of *The Writings of Eliphas Lévi*, in the *Athenæum* for August 6th, concludes with this paragraph:—

"Meanwhile, lest our readers should suppose that the modern students of the science of magic are not in deadly earnest, or that they are few in number or poor in substance, let them, with all due awe and thankfulness, buy this handsome volume, and as they open it let them cast a glance at the amazing list of works published and publishing by a single firm on the various branches of the occult sciences. Having done that, let them ask themselves whether some forms of faith—for we dare not drop a hint of disrespect—do not die hard."

In the same number an account of the meeting of the Royal Archæological Institute at Salisbury ends with this paragraph:—

"Just before the beginning of the session of the Institute, a cormorant, strange to say, paid a visit to the cathedral, and took up a position, which it retained for two or three days, on one of the highest gargoyles. Of what is this a portent?"

Some forms of faith—or, shall we say, even though not avoiding disrespect—inconsistency?—do die hard.

CARLYLE AS A MYSTIC.

It is interesting, when it is practicable, to contrast contemporary opinion with the views of that fickle personage, Posterity. What hidden revenges has he in store for the present illustrious living? Will he by-and-bye unearth a new Shelley or Blake? Will he consign much of our present imaginative literature to the storehouse of Jubilee odes? Above all, what will he think of Carlyle? We are shocked when the Sage of Chelsea lifts the veil of private life; but perhaps Posterity will prize his caustic diatribes on his contemporaries far higher than his eulogies of the stick of Frederick of Prussia, and the slave whip.

Above all, what will Posterity think of *Sartor Resartus*? This is a question that has been disturbing me lately. *Sartor Resartus* is a profound mystical treatise. This raises the question, Was Carlyle a Mystic? It can scarcely be held that he was such, in the sense that Rama or Buddha, or Swedenborg or Jacob Böhmen were mystics. He never attempted to develop the psychical powers which were his and are the possession of every child of Adam. He never sought to free himself from the garment of flesh and to summon the Samuels, the dead prophets of the past. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine that *Sartor Resartus* is a mere unintelligent echo of German transcendentalism.

"Thou wilt have no mystery and mysticism; wilt walk through the world by the sunshine of what thou callest Truth, or even by the hand-lamp of what I call Attorney-Logic; and 'explain' all, 'account' for all, or believe nothing of it? Nay, thou wilt attempt laughter; whoso recognises the unfathomable, all-pervading domain of Mystery which is everywhere under our feet and among our hands, to whom the Universe is an oracle and a temple, as well as a kitchen and a cattle-stall—he shall be a delirious Mystic. To him thou with sniffing charity wilt protrusively proffer thy hand-lamp and shriek as one injured when he kicks his foot through it? *Armer Teufel*, . . . Thou art a *Dilettante* and sand-blind Pedant."

Here is another passage.

"'Temptations in the Wilderness!' exclaims Teufelsdröckh: 'Have we not all been tried with such? Not so easily can the old Adam, lodged in us by birth, be dispossessed. . . . For the God-given mandate, *Work thou in Well-doing*, lies mysteriously written in Promethean Prophetic Characters in our hearts; and leaves us no rest, night or day, till it be deciphered and obeyed. . . . And as the clay-given mandate, *Eat thou and be filled*, at the same time persuasively proclaims itself through every nerve—must not there be a confusion, a contest, before the better Influence can become the upper?'

"To me nothing seems more natural than that the Son of Man, when such God-given mandate first prophetically stirs within Him, and the Clay must now be vanquished or vanquish, should be carried of the spirit into grim Solitudes, and there fronting the Tempter do grimmest battle with him; defiantly setting him at naught till he yield and fly. Name it as we choose: with or without visible Devil, whether in the natural desert of rocks and sands, or in the populous moral Desert of selfishness and business—to such Temptation are we called."

In another passage he talks of a "Baphometric Fire-baptism," a "Spiritual New Birth."

It is scarcely possible to conceive that such passages could be mere parrot echoes of mystical discourses.

Mysticism has many symbols, but only one truth, and that is that the seen and the unseen worlds are contemporaneous, and that the main duty of man is to discover the difference between the two. We have a "needy Mother," the "poor earth with her poor joys." We have a Father in Heaven, "whom with the bodily eye we shall never behold only the spiritual." "The dark, bottomless abyss," says our philosopher, in a passage of great beauty, "yawns open; the pale Kingdoms of Death, with all their innumerable silent nations and generations, stand before us."

It is not my purpose to criticise the Carlyle of more modern times. I have written enough to exhibit at an earlier date a very different Carlyle from the peevish old man eaten up with spite at the success of his rivals and the imperfect appreciation of his own works. In the "pale Kingdoms of Death" he has by this time discovered that "Baphometric Fire-baptisms" and the applause of "Double-barrelled game preservers," "Clothes-wearing Dandies," and the "Sham priest" (*Schein priester*) "of a Church gone dumb with old age, and which only mumbles delirium prior to dissolution," do not go well together. By this time he has also discovered that his real grievance was not the neglect, but the applause, of the "hollow shapes" and "unclean beetles."

ARTHUR LILLIE.

PHYSICAL PHENOMENA AT A DISTANCE FROM THE MEDIUM.

In an article on "The Ether as Solution of the Mystical Problem," in the August number of *Sphinx*, Baron Hellenbach relates the following experience:—

"For the power of the meta-organism to dispose of electricity, I have at hand perhaps the most-surprising case, which I have not hitherto published, as it happened subsequent to my latest publication. I had already before made the attempt to transmit raps, or rather crepitations, at a distance, and indeed with success—from Vienna to the twelve miles distant château of F.K. The proprietor and his wife were not prepared for it; I wrote first after the sitting, and the letter crossed another, informing me from there of the occurrence of the sounds. I was thus led to make an experiment, in which I was the recipient and not the transmitter. It was arranged with Eglinton that on the day on which he was to leave Vienna for Venice, when at the frontier, and after the Customs inspection, he should occasion raps. I had purposely chosen this moment for the following reasons:—Because it was in the evening, when I should be in the company of friends; because the distance from Vienna to Udine is considerable; because Eglinton would certainly be in a normal and not in an hypnotic condition; and lastly, because the point of time was not exactly determined, the inequality of the proceeding at the Customs stations admitting easily of a difference of fifteen to thirty minutes for the different travellers. We were, therefore, not at all in a state of strained expectation, but sat talking and smoking by the fire-place, when the raps occurred and went on a long time. It is here to be remarked that the character itself of the sounds in general betrays the relation to ponderable or imponderable forces;* the reader has only to rap on the table with the finger nail and with the knuckle to represent the difference. They occur both feebly and strongly, so the imitation is to be made with different degrees of force. One cannot easily imagine a surer proof of the relation of the meta-organism to electricity, in whatever way one will explain the process. Eglinton telegraphed—no matter whether directly or indirectly."

To which the editor of *Sphinx* appends the following note:—

"Herein we can only agree with the author. If it is unquestionably established that the raps heard at Vienna were at the same time produced by supersensuous action, according to prior agreement, when Eglinton had passed the Italian Customs inspection at Udine, it is indifferent whether we suppose these sounds to have been produced (*directly*) by Eglinton's 'ether body,' or (*indirectly*), by means of the ether bodies of other beings (the Spiritists' so-called 'spirits')."

THE JERSEY SPIRITUALISTS met recently at Mr. Hewett's Vinery, Havre de Pas, St. Helens, when Mrs. Hardinge Brittain, on a visit to the island, kindly gave an address. All, to the number of about thirty, were delighted with the words of encouragement and advice from her spirit guides, and promise of good results to the little community if faithful to each other, and working in harmony. On the Tuesday following at Mr. Hewett's house, an impressive ceremony took place in the naming of Mr. Holloway's child, under the direction of Mrs. Brittain's guides, when white roses were sprinkled upon the child and the spirit name of "Gordon" was given to it. I have to thank Mrs. Brittain on behalf of the society for her kindness in devoting a portion of her short stay for our benefit, and we hope to have the pleasure of hearing her on some future occasion, when she may perhaps be disposed to remain a little longer with us.—F.K.

* Forces associated with ponderable or imponderable forms of matter.—Tr.

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.]

The Philosophy of Occultism.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I agree with "B.A." that it is high time this discussion should cease, as it has touched on that fringe of ontology where a rigid logic can establish contradictory propositions with equal accuracy. However, a few parting words may not be amiss. Meanwhile, I must express my regret that "B.A.'s" attitude towards occult philosophy—the only possible answer to that widely spread pessimism which regards the Kosmos as a "failure"—is tempered so obviously with a hostile bias. The religious philosopher should exhibit a complete impartiality.

I must first call attention to the fact that "B.A." has no objection to interpreting my position so as to harmonise with the varying necessities of his argument. Thus, in his last letter ("LIGHT," July 30th) I find the two following sentences:—(1) A recognition of the occultist "insertion of a *nominal matter* behind phenomena," and (2) "I thought we were both agreed that there was *no objective reality* outside consciousness"! Considering the fact that I was defending the occultist philosophy, the above remarks appear somewhat out of place, not to say self-contradictory. In this impeachment my defence of esoteric doctrine is impugned—first, because I am made to admit and subsequently to deny the existence of an objective reality "outside" of perception! I need hardly say that I distinctly uphold the thesis of the objectivity of the Universe. "B.A." also declares that "all modern philosophers" assert that the "so-called objective reality of the world is inside our consciousness." The very reverse is the case, the creed of to-day on the subject of perception being a Transfigured Realism as enunciated by Herbert Spencer and others. This doctrine, while recognising the phenomenonality of the *sensuous* universe—of the Kosmos as given in consciousness—nevertheless regards space and time as forms of things-in-themselves, and postulates the demonstrable reality of the transcendental object. The sun I perceive is an illusion; it is a "*mere retinal impression*." [But is the retina an object?] It is, however, most assuredly a *symbol of a reality beyond consciousness*. We perceive things not as they are in themselves—there is no light, sound, colour, heat, &c., &c., outside a perceiving mind. That the veriest tyro in philosophy will admit, though the denial of the transcendental object will strike him as fantastic nonsense. The pure idealistic theory is rejected by common-sense, simply because it does not, as Mr. Belfort Bax remarks, cover the facts of every-day experience. It is easy enough for a hermit or "dreamer of dreams" to vote the mind "evoker of the realms of being," but it is different when we come to deal with the actual facts of existence. The ship I see from my window sailing in the distance may be termed "a subjective retinal sensation," but that object (however *symbolised* in my consciousness) is most decidedly a concrete reality, and will remain so whether I commit suicide this moment or not. The unreality of an acosmism which dethrones the transcendental object is fatal to all philosophy. As the author of *What do we Know?* writes, "The idealism of Berkeley may afford a resting-place for a while, but . . . the inquirer . . . cannot stop there; he must pass on either with Fichte to Egoism, from which the final plunge into Nihilism is certain; or, with Hume, he must take the plunge at once." The doctrine held by Berkeley that the will of God determines our sensations, hence our knowledge of *all* objects, is, to my mind, degrading. It is certainly unpsychological, as modern thought goes; but putting that aside, we tremble to think of the *inferences* such a philosopher must accept. No need to specify instances.

I would suggest to "B.A." that his apparent acceptance of the idea of a Deity bound by conditions is unthinkable. He says that Theism is able to escape from the inference suggested by the origin of evil by investing Deity with limitations. But who made the limitations, if not the Deity Himself? A recent apologist has argued that God is *compelled* to work under the limits allowed by matter, forgetting that *ex hypothesi* He made those limits as the "ultimate of ultimates"! Such a Being, moreover, would only occupy the position of a Dhyan Chohan in the occult cosmogony.

As to the origin of evil, I do not see that anything can be added to the lucid exposition given by Mr. Sinnett in *Esoteric Buddhism*, when summing up the main points of the doctrine. Good and evil are relative, of course, but distinct actualities as far as they go. A tendency resulting in individual or general suffering and materiality is evil; the reverse good. May I advise "B.A.," however, to study our text-books before he poses as a critic?

As to cosmogony in general—the origin and purpose of the universe, &c.—I hope to deal with it shortly in a series of articles to the agnostic *Secular Review*.—Yours truly,

St. Winfred's, Ryde,
Isle of Wight.

E. D. FAWCETT.

The Spirit Body.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I would on no account revive the discussion brought forward every now and again on the subject of "Re-incarnation," and I therefore beg such of your readers as are in favour of this idea, and are *happy in their belief*, kindly to pass by this letter, if you think it worthy of publication; for I only wish to record a few ideas which have been strongly impressed lately upon my mind, in consequence of personal communications and reading the experiences of others, for the benefit of those who, like myself, believe in the continuous onward and *upward* progress of the human spirit after its release from the bondage of the flesh.

I refer particularly to the accounts given by "M.A. (Oxon.)," A. J. Davis, and others, of what is called by Mr. Davis "The Resurrection of the Dead," but what I think would be more correctly described as the birth of the spirit body when released from the earthly body. These accounts are quite confirmed by the communications I receive from my spirit guide; but I do not wish to refer more than I can help to my own experiences. The spirit body, then, it appears, is born with us and grows as we grow till it reaches maturity, but does not pass that stage, for not being subject to illness, accident, or decay, it does not grow old, and is only affected by the moral character of its owner; vice or evil conduct leaves its stamp on the spirit body more or less, and that of a bad man or woman could not, therefore, be bright or beautiful. Thus the spirit body is a portion of ourselves while still on earth, and my guide tells me frequently that he only sees my spirit body, except when, as on very rare occasions, at a dark séance he has been materialised (that is sufficiently so to touch me materially), when he sees my natural body. So that the spirit body grows to maturity either in this life, or in the next if the person has died in childhood.

It becomes, therefore, fully grown, perfectly organised and fitted for residence in the spirit-land, and nothing has been more firmly impressed upon me in the "volumes" I have received both in *direct and automatic writing*, than the fact of the *reality* of that land and of the life of its inhabitants.

It is a logical impossibility that a fully-grown and organised spirit body could enter into the body of an infant, but some Re-incarnationists say that this is not what they mean by their theory of Re-incarnation, but that what is re-incarnated is the "spiritual essence," the "*geistige Wesenskern*," as the editor of the *Sphinx* calls it. This, I take it, is what is commonly called the "soul," of which the spiritual body is the envelope, and as, when this spiritual essence leaves the natural body, death ensues, so if it left the spiritual body and took up its abode in a new organism the spirit body *must* die too, or in some way be dissolved into the elements!

What, then, becomes of the assertion that there is *no death* in Heaven? Imagine the case of one who, like myself, lost her only child in infancy, and who, although nearly broken-hearted, yet could resign that child without utter despair, because she knew it would be safe, happy, and free from temptation in God's garden. Imagine that mother, united once more to this object of her tenderest love, grown up to beauty and perfection, and then perhaps after a short period to have to resign that darling child once more, *not* to a higher sphere in the heavenly mansions, but to return to this region of gloom and sadness, there to encounter again all the trials and temptations which beset frail humanity!

Conceiving, as I do, the bright spirit land to be a place where every high and pure feeling is intensified and where the keynote of everything is *love*, love to those we have loved on earth, leading up to love to our Heavenly Father, "for if we love not our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen?"—I say, believing as I do that our love for our

dear ones will even far exceed that we had for them on earth, just imagine what that mother's grief would be at losing her child once more, and *for ever!* for the new organism would not be her child, but that of another. Rachel weeping for her children *could* not be comforted, all the joys of Heaven would be as nought compared to her anguish and sorrow. But such a picture is, thank God, as contrary to reason as it is to every idea of His goodness and love to humanity.

I have referred to the loss of my only child at the age of six years, and I cannot refrain from telling of the great happiness which has come to me lately. Through Mr. Eglinton's mediumship I have obtained a beautiful portrait of her in direct spirit-drawing, *as she now is*. It represents the head and neck only, the former surrounded by a halo of light and crowned by masses of her beautiful hair; the face looks about one-and-twenty, and gives the idea of being an excellent likeness; the small, pretty features bear a resemblance to those in the portraits of her as a child, though, of course, there is a great difference in the face, and I do not know whether I was more surprised or delighted to see the beautiful, rounded contour and the look of *blooming health* which distinguish it, than by its sweet expression and the deeply spiritual look of the eyes. The design and execution are alike exquisite. In a long letter I received from her yesterday, through my own powers, she tells me it is exactly like her, and the same thing is told me by my guide, "V.," who adds that she is taller than I and that her hair is the same colour as it was in childhood, a beautiful bronzy gold—it was one of her great beauties, being remarkably long and luxuriant for a child, which characteristic is noticeable in the portrait, as it is not only heaped up on her head, but hangs in loose curls round the neck. You will, I hope, pardon a mother for being rather prolix on such a subject, and trusting I have not trespassed too much upon your space, I am, yours truly,

"V."

What is Spiritualism?

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—No answer has appeared in "LIGHT" to my question—What is Spiritualism? but I am scolded for eleven words I used in connection with the subject, namely, "Spiritualism is, as a rule, in bad repute throughout the Empire," an assertion I am ready to prove by simple evidence; but as, at present, that is merely a side issue, I shall not be drawn from desiring an answer to the question put.

I frankly state that, as a Spiritualist of thirty to forty years ago, I had, and still hold, the original creed—say dogma, say tenets, say principles. In years gone by, on the platform, in the Press, and in social life, I have advocated Spiritualism before the Hotspurs of college "rooms" were born; but I as distinctly affirm that the word Spiritualism appears to me to have a meaning attached to it in 1887 very different to that of 1855. But, for fear I am in error, I desire to have the question I put answered.

It so happened that in "LIGHT" of July 30th, when my letter appeared, there was a twelve-clause summary on the subject by a professional lady platform lecturer, which appears to be the usual stock-in-trade texts for amplification before audiences by lecturers I have heard. Eleven of the twelve texts are used in the effort to scrape down the mountain of Christianity; but the twelfth is the declaration of teachings to the audiences.

On examination of that clause, there are seven divisions, and five of them simply Christian tenets—principles—dogma, appropriated and used as if they were something of the new thing—Spiritualism. Thus, Fatherhood of God: "*Our Father.*" The Brotherhood of Man: "*Jew and Gentile, bond and free.*" Immortality of the soul. *Future life after physical death is a leading dogma of the Churches.* Personal responsibility: compensation and retribution hereafter for all good or evil deeds done here. These are simply the Churches' tenets of *future rewards and punishments for the deeds done in the body.*

The last-named division is to me a puzzle. The writer's tenet or dogma is: "A path of eternal progress is open to every human soul that *wills* to tread it by the way of eternal good." Well, suppose she does not will it, there is of course *no* eternal progress—evil everlasting.

The wholesale filching of the tenets of the Churches is ushered in by the astounding declaration: "Spiritualists have no creed." If Spiritualists have no tenets—no principles—no dogma—no creed (see dictionary definitions), then Spiritualism is simply Negation. If it be something else in 1887, again I ask, What is Spiritualism? so that I and others may rest in

knowledge; so that we, in company of friends and foes, may converse without thinking and talking nonsense.

I desire to say that the good or bad repute of Spiritualism may have arisen from persons thinking it a thing it is not.

Norwood Junction, S.E.

J. ENMORE JONES.

The Katie King Episode.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—In the lecture by James Abbott on "The Weak Points of Spiritualism," recently published in "LIGHT," occurs this passage: "The Katie King episode in Philadelphia has not yet passed out of mind, by which no less a person than Robert Dale Owen was deceived, although he was quite certain that some of the forms which appeared before him were the spirits of departed friends whom he recognised. In that instance it would seem as if a most stupendous fraud had to have the assistance of a self-deluded and self-deluding imagination on the part of the spectator to make the delusion complete."

This unfortunate affair, which happened some thirteen years ago, seems not yet to be forgotten, and has all this time exercised a prejudicial effect with regard to Spiritualism in the minds of the general public and been regarded by Spiritualists as one of the worst frauds that has taken place in connection with the movement; but, from what I know of the matter, a very wrong impression exists in relation to it, and a good deal more has been made of it than the circumstances warrant. Although rather late in the day, it may not be out of place to state what I know of the affair, and it may not be without interest to your readers. Whatever fraud existed in the case, the amount has, doubtless, been greatly exaggerated, as is the case, in my opinion, in most similar instances.

I happened to be in Philadelphia at the time, and, in company with Mr. J. J. Morse, went the night after the alleged exposure to the Holmes' residence, with the view of having a séance, but found the birds flown and the house locked up, and saw nothing of the alleged delinquents at the time, although we remained a month in the city, during which we heard all the *pros* and *cons* of the matter, as it was the principal topic of conversation and a theme of comment with the Press. On the following Sunday, at the close of Mr. Morse's lecture, at which about a thousand people were present, Mr. Owen made a lengthy statement in regard to the Holmes, and on the following Sunday, D. Childs, who was mixed up in the matter, gave his version of it. The evidence was conflicting, and it seemed impossible to arrive at a just conclusion. Mr. Owen, doubtless, believed he had been imposed upon, so far as the "Katie King" spirit was concerned, but maintained that Mr. Holmes possessed mediumistic power. The Holmes, however, have denied throughout that they practised fraud even with regard to that, and some years after gave me a letter to read, which I believe I have in my possession still, which goes far to bear out their assertion of integrity in regard to the materialisation of "Katie King." During the time I was in Philadelphia Mr. Owen was induced to witness a performance by the young woman who purported to have enacted the character of "Katie King" at the Holmes', which assertion it was alleged she made at the instigation of the Young Men's Christian Association for a consideration. The same night, however, the Holmes held a séance, which Mr. Owen had been invited to attend, when the real "Katie King" appeared as before.

But whatever truth there might have been in the accusations of fraud against the Holmes, I had abundant evidence some time after that they were genuine and remarkable mediums, whatever may have been their moral worth, respecting which the least said the better. During my residence in Boston, Mr. and Mrs. Holmes visited that city, and for a period of over six months held séances nightly, which I attended as often as two or three times a week, and therefore had ample opportunities of judging of the genuineness of their mediumship. On these occasions, after a dark séance had been held, Mrs. Holmes acting as medium, during which very remarkable phenomena occurred, Mr. Holmes would go into a cabinet, and about a dozen different forms would appear, some coming fairly into the room, whilst others only came a little in front of the curtain. One form that was accustomed to appear was that of J. H. Powell, who acted as editor of *The Spiritual Times*, the first English Spiritual journal. He was recognised one evening by a lady who knew him in America. One of the figures that frequently appeared was that of a tall, handsome-looking individual, dressed in French court costume of a former period—black

velvet coat, knee breeches and white stockings, with buckles on shoes, and an elaborately frilled shirt-front. On one occasion, in consequence of a remark made by a sceptic, this figure unlocked and opened the door of the room leading to the back of the cabinet and invited the sceptical gentleman to go and make an examination of the partition, which he and another did. Mr. W. J. Colville, on his arrival in America, took up his quarters in the house in which the Holmes resided, and in the evening was present at the séance, when his grandmother, who brought him up at Brighton, and who died a few weeks before, appeared to him. But it would occupy too much space to give an account of all the remarkable incidents I witnessed in the course of the numerous séances I attended; suffice it to say that I witnessed phenomena both at the materialising séances and at the preliminary dark séances of the most indubitable character, placing the mediumistic power of the Holmes beyond doubt. Indeed, I may say that, if they are not mediums, there are none such. Mr. Darius Lyman, of Washington, a gentleman of the highest integrity and of great intelligence, makes the same claim for them. He asserts that he attended some ninety séances of the Holmes, during which time he witnessed very remarkable phenomena but no trickery, which fully accords with my own experience.

When the Holmes came to Boston I gave an account of a séance in the *Banner of Light*, which was the means of introducing them to the public after their temporary obscurity; and when they left the city I saw their cabinet arrangement taken down, and I helped the carpenter to take to pieces the framework structure in which Mr. Holmes was confined during the materialising manifestations, thus proving that it was not a "trick box," but a secure cage from which it was impossible for him to emerge. As Mrs. Holmes sat in the room, the figures that appeared could not have been either herself or her husband, and from the way in which the cabinet was constructed, I had positive assurance there could be no communication from the exterior. It may be well to add that I suggested and arranged a séance for prominent Spiritualists, at which Mr. Epes Sargent and Mr. Luther Colby were present, when the results were in every way satisfactory. The conclusion I came to relative to this Philadelphia exposure, which made so much noise in the world and had such a prejudicial effect on the public mind, is that the Holmes did not practise fraud, so far as producing a bogus "Katie King" is concerned, for there was no reason for their acting fraudulently in the matter when they could get genuine materialisations. At the same time, there is no doubt that they connived with others, as a ready way of making money, in the production of a fraudulent photograph of "Katie King," for which the young woman before referred to posed, and who afterwards asserted that she had personated the spirit at the séances. This is probably the extent of the fraud that was practised by the Holmes, and taking into consideration the whole of the circumstances, including their undoubted mediumship and denial of fraud, together with the character and antecedents of the young woman who purported to have personated "Katie King," and her motives for doing so, as well as Mr. Owen's doubts as to how far he had been imposed upon, I consider the explanation I offer to be a reasonable one, and that more importance has been attached to the affair than the circumstances warrant.

In conclusion, I would remark that in a recent number of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, the Rev. Dr. Watson, of Memphis, Ten., has an article entitled "Experiences with Exposed Mediums." The Holmes are included in the category, and the learned doctor gives a graphic account of a séance he had with these mediums, which placed the genuineness of their mediumship beyond all doubt in his mind.—I remain, yours faithfully,

Eastbourne, August 8th, 1887.

ROBERT COOPER.

Mr. Price's Mesmeric Séances.
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—We have not seen any mention in your journal of the interesting séances given by Mr. Price, every Wednesday, at his rooms, 15, Upper Baker-street, N.W., and we venture to call the attention of your readers to the same, believing they would spend a profitable evening in witnessing some of the phenomena produced by his subjects under his direction. Not only is Mr. Price a powerful healer—having, to our knowledge, performed some very extraordinary cures—but he thoroughly understands the science of mesmerism, magnetism, and hypnotism, and

takes pains to carefully explain the *modus operandi*, so that one may learn for oneself the advantages and dangers of the subject. We have recently had the privilege of being present at his Wednesday evening séances, and saw various experiments conducted to our entire satisfaction, and knowing how closely allied mesmerism is to Spiritualism, we feel sure by calling prominent attention to Mr. Price we are helping the cause as well as being of some possible service to suffering humanity.—Yours obediently,

W. EGLINTON.

VASILY KLUDOFF.

ALEXIS MAYTOFF.

CURES BY MR. F. OMERIN.

We have been requested to give publicity to the following testimonials to the success of the treatment practised by Mr. Omerin.

"Rome, 3rd June, 1887.

It is with great pleasure I testify as for the good and guidance of others, that, finding myself afflicted with swollen and insensible hands and arms, the neck affected, and the dorsal column very much weakened, when I came to London, I placed myself under the treatment of one of the most eminent doctors, who assured me I was suffering from *suppressed gout*, and I continued under his care until month after month had elapsed, but I experienced not the slightest relief. I subsequently placed myself in the hands of Mr. Omerin, who convinced me after the first attendance that I was not suffering from suppressed gout, and that he would cure me in a very short time; and in fact he did cure me after ten visits, and I have not since had a return of the complaint, although the last winter was so severe all over Europe.

P. L."

(The wife of an Aide-de-Camp to one of the reigning Sovereigns of Europe.)

"46, Bryanston-square, W.

11th June, 1887.

For two years I was suffering from rheumatic gout in the hands and knees; the pain was horrible, and I was absolutely unable to extend the fingers or use the hands, much less the legs, which were bent up at the knees, and incapable of being articulated. They had to lift me from the bed into an arm-chair, and from this they returned me to the bed. As the treatment to which I was subjected by the eminent doctor who attended me was principally the application of iodine to the parts affected, the only effect produced was to remove the skin, which naturally very much augmented the pain, to allay which it was necessary to daily administer chloroform. I experienced no benefit whatever from the treatment, but became, on the contrary, each day sensible of being worse. In this miserable condition, I requested Mr. Omerin to take my case in hand, and in sixteen visits he enabled me to use the hands and legs without difficulty or effort, and he hastened by his treatment the renewal of the skin which had been destroyed by the iodine. Since the cure was effected, more than two years ago, I have remained perfectly well.

H. G. RAMSAY "

(The widow of General Ramsay).

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

1ST M.B.—Regretfully declined with thanks, as calculated to offend the beliefs and opinions of some of our readers. We hope, however, to hear from you further. Your letter, inadvertently unstamped, cost a double postage.

WE have received several letters dealing with the doctrine of the Trinity from various points of view; some purely theological, which is not our province; some in a tone of flippancy, which we cannot offend the beliefs of our readers by publishing. We beg that our general request that our correspondents would avoid purely theological matters of dispute may be borne in mind.

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUAL INSTITUTE, WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—We had a floral service on the passing into spirit life of one of our Lyceum scholars. The controls of Mr. Robson delivered a suitable address on "Death and Immortality." The platform was decked with bunches of white flowers, the majority of those present wearing a flower of the same colour. In the evening Mr. Savage gave an excellent address on "Spiritualism and Christianity" to a large audience. Our annual outing to Cheam Park takes place on Wednesday, August 17th. Those desirous of obtaining tickets must do so before August 14th. Tickets to be had at the Hall, or of W. E. Long, Hon. Sec., 9, Pasley-road, Walworth.

ZÖLLNER.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PROFESSOR GEORGE S. FULLERTON,
Of the University of Pennsylvania, Member and Secretary of the
Seybert Commission for Investigating Modern Spiritualism,
By C. C. MASSEY, of Lincoln's Inn, London.

DEAR SIR,—

A few days ago I accidentally heard that the Preliminary Report, of what is known as the "Seybert Commission," contained a reference by yourself to a conversation we had here one day in August of last year, that being the only occasion on which I have had the pleasure of meeting you. Having now seen the Report, I feel obliged to make some observations upon the passage in it to which my attention was called, as it is rather prejudicial to the character for careful statement which I endeavour to deserve. I propose also—this letter being intended for publication—to trouble you with some further remarks on the question dealt with in this part of the Report.

At pp. 110, 111 you say:—

"As to Professor Zöllner. . . . (1) The question of his mental condition at the time of the investigation [with Slade]. It is asserted by his English translator, Mr. Massey, that he was of sound mind. I inquired of Mr. Massey, when in London, upon what authority he makes this statement; and found that it is based upon a letter from a Spiritistic correspondent of Zöllner, and upon no other authority."

I read the above with surprise, arising less from its actual inaccuracy, and from its very misleading character, than from the fact that such use should have been made of our conversation, without any opportunity having been offered me of correcting your impressions of it, or of adding any information to my answers to any (apparently to me) quite informal and casual questions you may have put to me during your call here. I have, indeed, no recollection of your putting to me, directly, any questions at all; whatever was said by me seeming to arise simply and spontaneously in the course of our conversation. I had no intimation that your visit to me had any more particular object than an interchange of courtesy—I having left a card at your lodgings a few days before—and in contesting, as I did, the opinion you appeared to have formed that Zöllner was insane, I was much more impressed with the inherent weakness of the evidence for that conclusion, than with the necessity for answering it by counter evidence. You did not convey to me the impression that you wanted from me a full and deliberate statement of the grounds of my belief in Zöllner's sanity. How little this seemed to be the case is apparent from a circumstance which I remember with some distinctness. I had referred, not to "a letter from a Spiritistic correspondent of Zöllner," but to a very explicit statement in a published work, by Baron Hellenbach, a man of literary distinction in Austria. I took the book from a shelf, and began turning over the leaves to find the passage. I could not at once succeed, and not observing that you seemed to be interested, I flung the volume aside, I think with some remark to the effect that I would not waste the time of a visit I much esteemed in hunting through a book. Our conversation was also to some extent interrupted by the entrance of another visitor. I may or may not have told you that, besides Hellenbach's testimony, I had also seen the statement of a gentleman (a "Spiritist" it is true), not a "correspondent" of Zöllner, but residing at Leipzig, and in somewhat intimate relations with Zöllner for some weeks before the latter's sudden death, and who, writing just after that event, described Zöllner as having been in excellent health and spirits, and full mental activity, a few days before,—a statement not in allusion to the report of his "insanity," for that seems only to have taken tangible shape at a later date, and in obedience to polemical exigen-

cies. But had you said that you wished to make use of any evidence I could give, or refer you to, on the point, you would have been fully and exactly informed to the best of my ability.

When "insanity" is alleged, without qualification, as a ground for putting aside the recorded observations and statements of an eminent scientific man, one understands to be meant some definite stage of mental disease which would be recognised by medical science as actual unsoundness of mind, unfitting the patient for intellectual work, or subjecting him to hallucinations which he could not detect to be such; not merely some possibly inducing cause or tendency, as, for instance, an excitable temperament. Now it has not been even suggested, as far as I am aware, that Zöllner's state was ever such as to lead his friends to seek for medical advice or opinion about his mental condition; nor is it denied that he continued to hold his public position in the University of Leipzig, where he resided, to the hour of his death. These circumstances would of themselves, in my judgment, justify positive denial of an unqualified statement of Zöllner's "insanity." What you call my assertion that Zöllner was of sound mind has always—on the two or three occasions of my publicly referring to the matter—taken the form of a denial of reports of this gross and palpable character, having nothing to do with difficult questions of incipient disturbance of perfect mental equilibrium by emotional states. I had to deal with such statements, for instance, as that of Dr., or Professor, Cyon, the German physiologist, who, writing in the *Contemporary Review* three or four years ago, said that Zöllner was "insane" for some time before his death, 'and died mad'! Such reports, in Zöllner's case, stank of polemical and personal animus, which Zöllner had excited, not only by his testimony to facts against which the whole dominant mode of thought was deeply committed, but also by his strenuous denunciation of certain practices, horrible to the unsophisticated mind, but fanatically defended. The scientific sense of the Germans quickly understood that mere criticism would be eventually impotent against a record of experiments which, to quote the words of one of the foremost leaders of German thought, who has come forward to refute the "Spiritistic" explanation of the facts, "are excellently contrived, give the best conceivable security against conjuring, show everywhere the skilled hand of an accomplished experimenter, and are reported with clearness and precision."* The "short way" with Spiritists, who are unfortunately also men of science, is to declare them mad! And in Zöllner's case this imputation received colour from, and probably was merely suggested by, the circumstance that a brother and sister—two out of a family of nine—had actually been thus afflicted. Zöllner himself mentions this fact in an "Open Letter" to one of his chief opponents—the very Professor Wundt whose testimony you adduce without reference to the fact of his controversial relations with Zöllner.† But no one can read of the personal insults and contumelies and estrangements which followed the publication of the investigation with Slade without being sure that such provocations, acting on that highly-strung nature, must inevitably have overthrown a really delicate balance, and developed any latent tendencies to insanity in a far more marked degree than is even alleged by any witness who condescends to particulars. "Particulars," indeed, rightly speaking, we have none whatever from anybody! Of the "evidence" you collected at

* E. von Hartmann, *Der Spiritualismus*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1885. I quote from my translation, published in London the same year, by express authority of the author.

† *Wiss. Abh.*, Bd. III., s. 37. The mention of this fact by Zöllner is not in connection with any reports concerning his own mental condition, but with impressive relevance to the history of his early opinions. The fact had, however, already been made use of, for the purpose of insult, by one of the "friends" who turned against him.

Leipzig I shall have something to say before closing this letter. But first let me quote the statement of Baron Hellenbach, upon which my own was partly—and but partly—founded, and which you could have referred to for yourself had you been sufficiently interested to have asked me for the title of the book I was examining in your presence, or to have requested me to persevere in my search for the passage I wanted to show you. And I will next add some information as to the intellectual reputation of this witness in his own country and Germany, from which you may judge whether he can be suitably dismissed with the anonymous description, “a Spiritistic correspondent of Zöllner.”

The book I quote from is entitled *Geburt und Tod als Wechsel der Anschauungsform, oder der Doppel-Natur des Menschen*. Von L. B. Hellenbach. Wien. 1885. Wilhelm Braumüller.* After severely characterising Zöllner's assailants, the author says at p. 96 (the parts here underlined being emphasised in the type of the original):—“—und da sich so viele dieser Herren nicht scheuten, Zöllner als verrückt oder irrsinnig zu erklären, so erkläre ich, dass ich mit dieser Manne oft verkehrte, dass ich in Correspondenz mit ihm stand, deren Gegenstand in der letzten Epoche meine ‘Magie der Zahlen,’ also ein ernstes und tiefes Thema, war, über welches ich wenige Tage vor seinem Tode noch einen Brief erhielt, und dass auch nicht ein Schein von Berechtigung für obige Behauptung vorliegt. Zöllner hatte eine grosse Schnelligkeit des Denkens, eine übergrosse Lebhaftigkeit des Geistes, war in der letzteren Zeit tief verletzt und verbittert durch die Handlungsweise seiner Collegen, deren Angriffen er zu grosse Bedeutung beilegte (was ich ihm wiederholt sagte, und ihm auch schrieb, dass sie seiner Zeit und Beschäftigung nicht werth seien); aber Zöllner war geistig gesund bis zu seinem letzten Athemzuge.” (“— but since so many of these gentlemen have not shrunk from declaring that Zöllner was deranged or insane, I declare that I was in frequent intercourse with this man, that I was in correspondence with him, latterly on the subject of my *Magic of Numbers*—thus a serious and deep topic—on which I received a letter from him a few days before his death, and that there was not even the semblance of justification for the above allegation. Zöllner had great quickness of thought, an over-great vivacity of spirit, and he was latterly deeply wounded and embittered by the treatment of his colleagues, to whose attacks he gave too much importance (I said to him repeatedly, and also wrote to him, that they were not worth his time and consideration), but Zöllner was of sound mind to his latest breath.”)

(You will observe from the above passage that the writer of it was not only a “correspondent” of Zöllner, but a friend who had conversed with him at a time when we are asked to believe that he was insane.) Now this witness, the author of *Die Vorurtheile der Menschheit, Eine Philosophie des gesunden Menschenverstandes, Der Individualismus im Lichte der Biologie and Philosophie* (works which are said to have had a great circulation), &c., is a man of even brilliant attainments. He was described in one of the principal German newspapers—the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Vienna—as “completely equipped with modern learning” (mit dem ganzen Rüstzeuge des modernen Wissens ausgestattet†). And E. von Hartmann refers to him as possessing also just those qualities of the “Weltmann” which are perhaps least in accordance with the popular conception of a “Spiritist.”‡

I think I have sufficiently shown that your slight, but obvious suggestion of levity of statement on my part has not been made with due care. A more interesting question is

whether the opinions—I cannot call them evidence—you have collected at Leipzig afford any reasonable ground for suspecting the accuracy of Zöllner's reports.

I think every sensible and impartial person will put aside Professor Wundt's wild, undefined, and evidently prejudiced statement that Zöllner was “decidedly not in his right mind at the time” (of the investigations with Slade). You do not seem to have tested it by any sort of cross-examination, but you “would regard it as of special value,” for the reason that Wundt “is by profession an experimental psychologist.” It is not a privilege peculiar to experimental psychologists to discover that an opponent in controversy is insane, and as it does not seem to have occurred to you to ask this expert, who you nevertheless admit, “might naturally be inclined to underrate Zöllner,” the grounds of his opinion, we may safely assume that experimental psychology had very little to do with it, and prejudice and animus a great deal. We have had some experience of that sort of thing here in England. It is not many years since another expert, another “experimental psychologist,” an alienist of repute, of whom one might have presumed that “his profession would not permit him to speak hastily upon this topic,” informed the public through the *Standard* newspaper, that there were 10,000 Spiritualists in lunatic asylums in the United States of America! This incredibly gross misstatement, made with the reckless credulity of intense prejudice, was of course instantly disproved by statistics, and brought (if I remember rightly) upon the physician who was guilty of it a grave rebuke from our chief medical journal, *The Lancet*. And for proof of the licence, not only of speech, but even of responsible action, into which professional prejudice on this subject (even without any colouring from personal animus) can betray men of respectable scientific attainments, I need only point to the results of rather recent actions in our Law Courts, and to the emphatic censures of some of our most distinguished judges.

Professor Wundt's loose and unexplained general statement is also distinctly opposed to the opinions of the other witnesses cited by yourself. Professor Fechner* speaks of what is called in your English notes an emotional derangement, such that he does not consider it to have incapacitated Zöllner as an observer, even supposing to have existed at all at the date of the experiments, and it was only from that time, according to him, that “it was more pronounced.” Yes; it was just “from” that time that Zöllner's admittedly very sensitive disposition had to encounter the attacks and provocations of colleagues and others, who certainly did not spare him upon any doubt his sanity.† Assuming that your English notes, with the word “derangement” therein, quite accurately represent to us Fechner's meaning (and I advert here to the very proper caution of Professor Scheibner, who obliged you to use your notes of his testimony on your own responsibility, refusing to set his name to their publication “for the reason that he was not sufficiently familiar with the English‡ to judge accurately of the shades of meaning, and thus could not say whether he accurately agreed with the notes as they stand or not”)—I should still say that the fact Fechner deposes to amounts to nothing more than this, that Zöllner had an excitable temper, which was much aggravated by the annoyance and controversy following upon the publication of his investigations with Slade. And I put forward with some confidence the following view, as the natural, sensible,

* Italics are mine whenever they occur.

† As, for instance, when his colleague, Professor Ludwig, refused his hand when they met at Weber's house on the 3rd May, 1878, with the remark: “I no longer know you.” (*Wiss. Abh.*, Bd. II., 1087.) Had Zöllner acted thus, the circumstance would probably have been appealed to as a proof of his “derangement.”

Fechner, according to my information, is not acquainted with English, as appears also from the fact that you had to translate your notes to him.

* An English translation of this book, *Birth and Death, &c.*, by “V.” was published in London last year. The Psychological Press Association, 16, Craven-street, W.C.

† An article copied into *Psychische Studien*, March, 1884.

‡ *Der Spiritismus*, s. 17.

and probable explanation of the otherwise rather surprising expressions attributed by your notes to Fechner and Scheibner, so far as these seem to import anything pathologically abnormal in Zöllner's mental condition. It must have been difficult, I think, for Zöllner's friends to regard any excitement betrayed by him in controversy, or in private intercourse, without reference to the fact of the well-known affliction in his family. What would never have seemed to anyone more than irritability, had that circumstance been unknown, almost inevitably connected itself in people's minds with the liability to mental disease which we always (most often causelessly) suspect in those whose families are known to have been thus visited. What in the one case would only be called failure of temper and discretion, would in the other be very probably described as "mental disturbance," or as "emotional derangement." Almost any marked defects of mind or temper might be thus described, but the big phrases appropriate to mental alienation of course cover a great deal more than the actual symptoms. I suggest that if it had been put to Fechner and Scheibner whether they would have applied to Zöllner phrases derogatory to his general sanity had they never heard of his unfortunate brother and sister, they would have bethought themselves that they had in truth jumped to a conclusion for which there was no sufficient warrant in anything within their experience of their friend.

But be that as it may, there can be no doubt whatever as to Fechner's opinion of Zöllner's capacity as an observer in 1877-8; for, writing in 1879, he says:—"If Zöllner . . . is regarded as a visionary, who sees what he wishes to see, it should first be asked whether he has ever shown himself to be such in the province of observation, and whether his fine inventions and discoveries, so fruitful for the exact natural sciences, are illusions."* You may say that I have no occasion to quote this, because your notes prevent any misapprehension of Fechner's opinion on this point; but the use I make of the above passage is this: that if, in 1879, there was a known doubt as to Zöllner's capacity at the date of his investigations with Slade (1877 and 1878), as against his admittedly great capacity for scientific work in earlier years, Fechner would certainly not have used the above argument without betraying the least consciousness that it begged a notoriously debated question, or that there was any serious suggestion of failure of Zöllner's mental capacity since his earlier work. This remark has an evident bearing on your suggestion, speaking of Professor Weber's testimony, that being from Göttingen, Weber may not have had such good opportunities for judging of Zöllner's mental condition as his colleagues at Leipzig. You have adduced no scrap of evidence that *at the date of the investigations with Slade* anyone of Zöllner's colleagues then doubted his sanity in any sense.

Now as to Professor Scheibner. To your notes, Scheibner, as already said, refuses to commit himself, on which he is to be congratulated, for they read more like a satire on some absurd attempt to prove a man mad than like anything put seriously forward. However, let us deal with them as if they were signed by Scheibner himself. "Professor Scheibner thinks that the mental disturbance under which Zöllner suffered later might be regarded as, at this time, incipient." Now "the mental disturbance under which Zöllner suffered later" suggests something tolerably definite and positive. But "Professor Scheibner would not say that Zöllner's mental disturbance was pronounced and full-formed, so to speak, *but that it was incipient, and if Zöllner had lived longer would have fully developed.*" So that we have an "incipient" disturbance in 1882 (when Zöllner died), which "might be regarded" as incipient in 1877-8, and a very positive conjecture, in the form of a statement, as to what would have happened had Zöllner

lived. Professor Scheibner is a distinguished mathematician, but his authority on questions of mental disease is not so notorious that we can allow him the use of a phrase importing partial insanity, without begging to be informed of the symptoms. He does inform us:—"He became more and more given to fixing his attention on a few ideas, and incapable of seeing what was against them. Towards the last he was passionate when criticised." Mercy on us! Is that such a very uncommon result of heated controversy as to be evidence of unsoundness of mind in a pathological sense?

There is some danger that the "few ideas" may be supposed to have related exclusively or chiefly to the Fourth Dimension of Space, and to the verification Zöllner believed that to have obtained through the experiments with Slade. That would be a complete mistake. Zöllner held strong opinions on a variety of controverted questions, and was prominent in them on the side disfavoured in scientific and academical circles, and generally by the Press. Now everyone knows that the battle against a majority, or against prevailing influences, is far more absorbing, supposes greater enthusiasm, and a consequently more exclusive concentration of attention, than is the case (till the moment when the struggle becomes really critical) with those who know themselves to be of the dominant party. And the temper of the representatives of the minority is far more tried, for the other side is naturally scornful, and assumes airs of superiority. Moreover, when a man of science, or an academician, or a student plunges into exciting controversy (such, for instance, as on the Vivisection question), it is because he has been profoundly moved. When a man of Zöllner's prestige has two such controversies (and there were others) on his hands as Vivisection and Spiritualism, he soon finds that he has brought about him a swarm of hornets, and will have enough to do to brush them away, even if they do not sting him to death.* To old friends and former associates his pre-occupation, unavoidable as that has become, easily seems like monomania, especially if they have little sympathy with the impulses and the depth of feeling which actuate him. Friends like Fechner and Scheibner, cooler, perhaps, by temperament, and less personally concerned, may well have thought him, as he may have been, sometimes wrong in the course of these controversies, and then, if he defended himself to them, possibly with vehemence, they would be very likely to go away shaking their heads, reminding each other of the family affliction, and fearing that his insensibility to *their* arguments showed an incapability of seeing what was against him, suggestive of "incipient" aberration! Suppose that Zöllner did fall into the degenerate habit of mind which too often results from incessant controversy, did become less open-minded, more positive and one-sided, and, "towards the last, passionate when criticised," what sort of reasoning is it which would, first, antedate these defects of judgment and temper by years, and, secondly, infer that they had already then infected the whole scientific habit and training of his life, so that in the quiet field of pure observation, where there was nothing to cross or perturb him, his senses were hallucinated by bias? In 1881 or 1882 he could not easily see the force of an opponent's argument; *ergo* in 1877 and 1878 he could not see what was going on under his physical eyes! Your witnesses, it is true, do not countenance this suggestion. Fechner expressly negatives it, and the remarks attributed to Scheibner, under head 5 of your notes of his testimony, are not connected with any alleged abnormality of Zöllner's state. I shall deal with

* Zöllner died quite suddenly, presumably of heart disease. He fell down dead at his writing desk, shortly after conversing cheerfully with his mother. It seems probable that the agitations of his latterly troubled life may have affected a naturally infirm heart, and accelerated his death.

* Die Tagesansicht gegenüber der Nachtsansicht. 1879.

them presently. Meanwhile, to give the fullest legitimate force to Scheibner's statement, we will suppose that a tendency to excitability and positiveness was to some extent observable in Zöllner in 1877-8.

Many years ago it happened to me to read parts of a well-known professional work: Winslow's *Obscure Diseases of the Brain and Mind*. I remember my consternation at recognising, in the account of the incipience and progress of cerebral disorder, one after another of my own "symptoms." "Irritability." Yes, I am certainly irritable—sometimes very. "Tingling at the finger-ends." I have felt it often. "Lapses of memory." I am horribly forgetful. "Omission of words in writing." I never can write a letter without it happening. "Singing in the ears." My "case" frequently. And so on. (I daresay I do not remember it all quite rightly, but the above is a typical impression.) The disease of my brain must evidently have already got beyond the incipient stage, as the symptoms had been long observable. In a very few years I should probably be in an asylum. But some twenty years have now elapsed, and here I am, not conspicuously more insane than other people, though the "symptoms" are in full play still. No doubt if I live—long enough—they will be "pronounced" and "fully developed." Meanwhile I have occasionally been amused by comparing notes with others who at some time had read Dr. Winslow's book, and had been similarly alarmed. But I do not think that we should any of us have been made so anxious if all that twaddle had been written by a professor of mathematics instead of by a celebrated alienist.

But the third witness on the point now in question, W. Weber—I do not regard Wundt as a witness, but place him in the same category as Dr. Cyon*)—next claims our attention. Now, when I came to your introductory remarks, at the bottom of p. 109, upon your interview with Weber, it required no great astuteness on my part to understand, as I did, before turning over the page, that the testimony of this man, decidedly the most scientifically eminent of all Zöllner's colleagues, was going to prove extremely unfavourable to the view you have taken. He is "eighty-three years old, and does not lecture. He is extremely excitable and somewhat incoherent when excited. I found it difficult to induce him to talk slowly enough, and systematically enough, for me to take my notes." All which, except the incontestable facts that he is eighty-three, and has given up lecturing, comes, I submit, to this: that Weber, whose temper may very likely not have been improved by age, was impatient at being importuned by a stranger (however respectable his position), about an experience as to which, and a man as to whom, his convictions had been generally and notoriously expressed already for eight or nine years past. He very likely did not think himself called upon to attend very diligently upon your questions, but desired to tell you, since he must, what he knew and thought right off, and so make an end of a possibly inconvenient visit. You break in upon his account with doubts or questions. He loses, in consequence, for a moment the thread of what he was saying, is annoyed, and shows it. Thereupon down goes on your notes "irritable," "excitable," "somewhat incoherent"; so that if Weber would not give the smallest colour to the suggestion that Zöllner was at "any time, in any sense, in an abnormal mental condition" (but distinctly declared the contrary), he might almost appear to be himself in that condition! How often, may I ask, do you suppose that Pro-

fessor Weber has had to express himself on this subject? How often has he contradicted, perhaps with increasing indignation, the growing myth that Zöllner was insane? How often may he have had occasion to point out that it is not necessary for men of science and exact observers, who were at liberty to take such precautions, to establish such conditions, and to institute such experiments as Zöllner describes, and as he witnessed, to be familiar with the whole art of conjuring? And with what commission did you come to interrogate him all over again about it all? May he not have thought, also, that a really sincere and unprejudiced inquirer would *first* make a thorough study of Zöllner's statements, weighing well the suppositions as to the witness, &c., necessary to invalidate them, and that your questions indicated no such preparation, no such appreciation of the definite character of the evidence? And yet you can range his answers or information under eight heads, and mention no one point on which he refused or omitted to satisfy you.

Unfortunately we cannot sympathise with your inability to get Weber to submit himself to your method of interrogation, since we know that you did not avail yourself of the opportunity of cross-examining willing witnesses, and of testing the value of vague general statements or expressions throwing some doubt upon Zöllner's perfect sanity. It would be impertinent in me to assume that you do not know how utterly worthless such statements are until they are rigorously traced to their ultimate foundation in definite facts and experience. Sometimes you seem to have got a very little way, as when Wundt's general statement was backed up by another hardly less general, viz., that Zöllner's abnormal mental condition was "clearly indicated in his letters and in his intercourse with his family." Here seemed to be promising material upon which it might have been supposed that anyone, of even less distinguished intelligence than yours, who desired to arrive at the truth, would at once have seized. "What were the letters? Have you seen them yourself? If not, who is your informant? Can you refer me to him?" &c. So Fechner should have been asked (seeing that, as will appear, you regard "emotional" derangement as relevant to the general inquiry) what were the sort of things by which Zöllner evinced it "in his family and in his intercourse with friends." And from Scheibner, through you, we ought to have learnt what the occasions and instances particularly were in which Zöllner displayed the tendencies to even the very ordinary mental defects on which it is sought (however preposterously, as it seems to me) to found the suggestion of mental abnormality. But no: just whenever your notes seem to open the prospect of something that might be dignified by the term evidence they stop! You are therefore estopped from any complaint of Weber, whose testimony as to Zöllner's perfect sanity at the time of the investigation with Slade is conclusive, notwithstanding that he is "from Göttingen." For Weber, though a visitor at Leipzig at the time, saw far more of the investigation, and Zöllner's conduct of it, than either Fechner or Scheibner. He was present at eight of the séances, Fechner at only two, Scheibner at three or four. He must have been associating intimately with Zöllner during this visit, nor is the distance between Leipzig and Göttingen such that we cannot assume very frequent opportunities of intercourse between the two men both before and after this particular visit.* At all events you have laid no foundation for a suggestion to the contrary by any questions (which would presumably have been answered) addressed to Weber as to the extent and period of his acquaintance with Zöllner. In an English law-court, when a counsel neglects to ask a pertinent question, upon a matter peculiarly within a witness's knowledge, it is considered to

* *Ante*. But only, it must be understood, in this particular. I respect Professor Wundt's philosophical distinction; of the physiologist Cyon I know nothing, but believe that his wild and intemperate article in the *Contemporary* was regarded as unfortunate, even by his own party in this country. He is mentioned somewhere in one of Zöllner's polemics, and had, like Wundt, his subjective reasons for regarding Zöllner as "mad." The latter, if living, might with equal or better reason have returned the compliment,

* And in fact we know from Zöllner that he was visiting at Weber's house in May, 1878.

be because he does not desire the answer, and he is not allowed afterwards to suggest to the jury what, if true, he might have proved by the witness. But quite irrespectively of the degree of his intimacy with Zöllner, Weber's testimony is indirectly, but conclusively, fatal to the suggestion which alone makes the inquiry into Zöllner's state of mind of any importance in relation to the Leipzig investigations with Slade. For nobody has suggested that Weber, at least, was not in full possession of his scientific faculties at that date. If, therefore, we find Weber not disclaiming the character of an independent observer at those eight sittings at which he was present; if, on the contrary, we find him expressly declaring "that he can testify to the facts as described by Zöllner, and that he could not himself have described the occurrences better than they are described in Zöllner's book," and "that he had the greatest freedom to experiment and set conditions, and that the conditions were favourable to observation," *what becomes of the suggestion that it was some abnormal mental defect of Zöllner's that made him see or describe the facts as recorded? Let Zöllner have been as mad as you please, his madness was not responsible in any degree for his reports, if Weber would have similarly described the facts.* Upon the supposition—violent and absurd as it appears to me—of Zöllner's insanity, the case is somewhat analogous to that of a criminal trial in which the principal witness for the prosecution is an accomplice or person of tainted character. Corroboration is required; but if corroboration is forthcoming, circumstantially or otherwise, on any material point of the testimony, the jury is invited to convict, because the presumption against the witness's credibility is *ad hoc* rebutted. A bad man may be telling the truth; a man of unsound mind may be an excellent observer; only in each case we want *some* proof of it. What better proof of the latter fact can there be than that a sane man, who is admittedly a good observer, independently observed the same things in the same way? Weber's corroboration sets up the *whole* of Zöllner's reports, whether Zöllner was of perfectly sound mind or not, because it rebuts the presumption that there is any connection between his mental infirmity (granting that) and his reports. It is unnecessary to insist on Weber's competence at that date. But I cannot refrain from quoting what Fechner said in 1879, in the book already cited* upon this point:—"Yet his (Zöllner's) account of Spiritualistic facts rests not solely on his authority, but also upon the authority of a man in whom the very spirit, so to say, of exact observation and induction is embodied, W. Weber, whose renown in this respect has never been impugned up to the moment when he avouched the reality of Spiritualistic phenomena. To hold him also from this moment for a bad observer, who has let himself be duped by a conjurer, or for a visionary, seduced by a predilection for mystical things, is truly somewhat strong, or much rather weak, and yet that is implied in the rejection of his testimony. For my own part, I confess that after he, in a whole series of sittings, along with Zöllner, and, for the most part, also Scheibner,† one of the most acute and rigorous mathematicians, not only looked on at the experiments with Slade, but took in hand and had in hand all appliances and measures adopted at them, one word of his testimony for the reality of the Spiritualistic phenomena weighs more with me than all that has been said or written on the other side by those who have never, themselves, been observers in this field, or have only

observed it as one looks on at conjurers, and who hold themselves thereafter entitled to speak of objective conjuring tricks."

But before passing to other considerations upon Zöllner's testimony, less or not at all connected with the question of his partial insanity, and the bearing of that (even if one could, as most assuredly one cannot, concede it), upon the value of his reports, I will add (though addition is unnecessary) to the use already made, in this respect, of Weber's testimony, *that of Fechner himself also.* Writing in 1879, Fechner says: "Zöllner, in the account which he has given in his *Scientific Treatises* of the Spiritualistic sittings at Leipzig with the American medium, Slade, has made mention of my testimony as well as that of W. Weber and Scheibner, nor have I disclaimed this testimony, only it falls far short of, and weighs even with myself much less than that of Zöllner himself and of his other co-observers, for I was only present at two of the first series of sittings, which were not among the most decisive, and even then much more as a mere looker on than as an experimenter; and this would certainly not have sufficed, for myself even, conclusively to repel the suspicion of trickery." But he goes on to add: "But taking what I saw myself, *without being able to discover any deception by the closest attention*, with the results," &c., &c. It therefore appears, *that so far as observation goes*, Fechner's on these occasions corroborate Zöllner's, thus affording additional evidence (were that wanted) that Zöllner's *observations*, at all events, were not vitiated by any mental abnormality. Now it is remarkable, that whereas you make use of Wundt's statement that "Professor Fechner was afflicted with an incipient cataract" (what a convenient word this "incipient" is!) "and could see very little," Fechner himself, though evidently and avowedly desirous to minimise the value of his own observations, neither in 1879 nor in 1886 says anything at all of this "incipient" cataract in 1877. And it is further remarkable, as exemplifying the value of your inquiries in Germany, that you were contented with the second-hand, and off-hand, statement of Wundt upon this point, and though you saw Fechner himself on the same day (and apparently later on that day), it does not seem to have occurred to you to get his *first-hand* testimony on a point so personal to himself!! Had it been a point on which you laid no stress, and of which you made no argumentative use, there would be little to say upon this, except that it is not suggestive of a very rigorous sense of what evidence is and means, on the part of one who is so ready to reject the evidence of Zöllner and Weber. But you do make a very express and special use of this statement of Wundt's; for you turn it against Weber's testimony to Zöllner's perfect sanity, objecting (p. 113) that he might be mistaken in that because he had entirely neglected to note that Fechner was "partly blind." And you actually say, moreover, that "the fact is admitted that he (Fechner) was, at the time of the investigation, suffering from cataract, which made all observation extremely defective." "Admitted!" by whom? There is not one word about it in your note of Fechner's statements, Scheibner says nothing about it, nobody says anything about it but Wundt (and even he does not go so far), and the only person who could "admit" the allegation of Wundt, in his absence, is not asked a single question about it! If this is a specimen of the judgment, care, and impartiality of the Seybert Commission, it is hardly entitled to credit for even the most elementary of the qualifications for research in the great and difficult subject it has undertaken, or, indeed, in any subject whatever.

As regards Fechner's disposition as a witness, you say (p. 111):—"If anyone could be tempted to make Zöllner as sane as possible, it would be one in the position of Professor Fechner." Why? You do not say; but in the

* *Die Tagesansicht*, &c.

† This, as we see, is a mistake, as Scheibner was at only three or four of the sittings. But if Scheibner really doubted, *at the time*, it is curious that his colleague, Fechner, residing at the same university, and presumably in very frequent communication with him, should have thus publicly adduced his testimony a year or two later. Did Scheibner *then* disclaim it? We know how frequently it happens that impressions of these things fade from the mind, and *then* doubts arise, which may easily be antedated.

absence of any more apparent reason, most of your readers will probably suppose you to refer to some notorious bias of Fechner's in favour of Spiritualism. Well ; here is what he said for himself on that point in 1879 :—

"If in the foregoing I have interested myself for the reality of Spiritualism, that is, as is not less evident from the foregoing, not from any sympathy with it, but because justice is due to the thing and to persons ; for willingly as one would put aside Spiritualism at any price, yet is the price of truth too high. The *Day-view* (Tagesansicht) can exist with or without Spiritualism : preferably, however, without rather than with it ; for if in some weighty points they coincide, and the latter may, and I believe up to certain limits actually does, support the former, yet does its abnormality disturb not only this, but the whole system of our previous knowledge ; and only just on this account can I content myself with its reality, because I take account at the same time of this its abnormal character, owing to which it can find a fitting place neither in the healthy life itself, nor in the healthy life of science. Now it is no satisfaction for the champion of the *Day-view* to be obliged to admit one more shady side in the account of the world. That I am not generally well-disposed to mystical phenomena is proved by my pamphlet *On the Last Days of the Doctrine of Od.* However, I am seventy-eight years old, and have written the *Zendavesta* and this book, facts which will be more in requisition by opponents who encounter Spiritualism in the manner described above."*

So we see that his bias was just the other way. And it so happens that I am able to supply further testimony, as well upon this point, as also perhaps to some extent, indirectly, on the degree of confidence Fechner attached to his own observations *at the time*. I have before me a letter, which I feel at liberty to use, from a German gentleman, a friend of Fechner's, and *not a Spiritist*, but one who writes : "I have to confess that my sympathies with Spiritualism have not been very warm," and with whom I had some correspondence in 1882. Under date of the 29th October in that year, he wrote me :—"I have seen a manuscript extract from Fechner's diary, referring to the séances held at Professor Zöllner's, and it was most interesting to observe how his inclination to consider Mr. Slade's experiments as all humbug or conjuring tricks had gradually given way, not to the enthusiasm roused in Zöllner, but to the conviction at least that there must be 'something in it,' that to deny the reality of Spiritistic phenomena would be to impugn the possibility of establishing any facts by way of experiment," &c. Now it will hardly be disputed that Fechner's impressions, recorded in his diary at the time, have an evidential value for whatever question they bear upon, incomparably higher than that of a conversation with you nine years later on the subject. Did you ask Fechner if he had any notes or record of his own made at the time? If you did not, what are we to think of an inquirer who is indifferent to such a possibility of checking or correcting long subsequent impressions by an authentic and contemporary record? That there is, or was, such a record appears certain from the letter of my correspondent, and if we cannot treat his second-hand and general information of its contents as affording a presumption of much value that Fechner rather underrated, even in 1879, the effect upon his mind, in 1877, of *his own* observations, it at least suggests that Fechner's convictions as regards the genuine character of the phenomena were quite as decided as Zöllner represented them to be. I shall have to refer to this point again, when dealing with your misunderstanding of a remark of Scheibner's, on which you attempt to raise a doubt on Zöllner's accuracy on this point, without having asked either of your witnesses, point-blank, whether Zöllner had or had not the

authority from them to make the statement he professed to make on their express authority.

I have just one more stone, but that as weighty as any, to fling after this wretched offspring of prejudice and animosity, founded upon nothing but the affliction of collateral members of Zöllner's family, the suggestion that he was "insane" ("incipiently" or otherwise) in any sense of that term which can be evidentially dealt with.* That is an appeal to the internal evidence of the reports themselves. Only read them, first with regard to their method, their exactitude, their perfect clearness, and then with regard to the character of many of the facts alleged in them. On the first point, I have already quoted the opinion of E. von Hartmann, one of the most scientifically educated of men whose speciality is less science than philosophy. Look at the tests devised, the precautions taken, the discrimination apparent. Then as to facts, judge what degree of hallucination, of mental aberration, must be supposed in the case of some of them, if they did not occur as described, and under the conditions described. Not to go through the book, take, for a single instance, the fact described (p. 89 to the end of the chapter, in my translation) of the little table vanishing, and then reappearing in descent from the ceiling upon the heads of the two sitters. No form of insanity, short of that which subjects the patient to the most positive and pronounced hallucination of the senses, would at all cover such evidence as this, unless amounting to a complete moral perversion of the sense of truth, that is, unless Zöllner is held to have *invented* the fact. So that to be of any use to sceptics, the insanity theory must go the length of suggesting that in 1877-8, either Zöllner was little better than a raving lunatic, or his moral nature had become utterly depraved and diseased. Your conclusions, of course, fall very far short of this ; but nothing less than this will suffice, if you would fairly encounter *all* Zöllner's testimony. Let us see, however, how far you are helped by an "incipience" of "emotional derangement."

Hitherto, I have not dealt with the alleged or suggested disqualifications of the *normal* Zöllner for an investigation of the kind in question, nor with the attempts of recent criticism to show that, in general, statements apparently the most exact and careful of conditions and observations exclusive of fraud in relation to these phenomena are to be received with distrust. By all means let such criticism do its worst with Zöllner's reports. But we are asked to *reinforce* adverse criticism with presumptions derivable from the alleged abnormal state of the witness. Now upon this point you say : "Bearing in mind, therefore, the mental attitude in which, and the object with which, Zöllner approached this investigation, we cannot look upon any subjective, or emotional, mental disturbance, which results, as described, in making him narrow his attention more and more upon a few ideas, and find it difficult to observe what seems contrary to them, as without objective significance, particularly where we know the man to be a total stranger to investigations of such a nature as this one, and not only quite ignorant of possible methods of deception, but unwilling to doubt the integrity of the medium." Let us examine these positions. By all means we will bear in mind, as you desire, the "mental attitude" with which Zöllner approached the investigation, that it was, in your own word, "Receptive" ; and I will only ask what would be rightly thought of any man of science who did *not* approach an investigation with a readiness to recognise affirmative results, should they occur? But if you mean more than this, I must reply by supplementing your quotation from what Zöllner had written himself at an earlier date by adding a passage you omit : "Now whether the Spiritualistic phenomena belong to the first or second

* *Die Tagesansicht*, &c.

* For, as already seen, the statements of Fechner and Scheibner cannot at all be thus regarded.

category of these conceptions" (objective or subjective) "I do not venture to decide, so far never having witnessed such phenomena." As to his "object," the verification of the fourth dimension, we know that on his own authority, and do not require "Professor Scheibner's testimony" on the point. The verification of hypotheses is the usual and legitimate purpose of novel scientific experimentation, and it so happens that in this case it was just this hypothesis which led Zöllner to the devising of tests the least familiar to the medium—such as the production of the true knots in an endless string, the removal of the coins from the closed box, &c., &c. So much for the "mental attitude" and the "object." The next passage in your above quoted remarks refers to head 6 of your notes of the statement of Professor Scheibner, upon which I have already commented. You here take the "subjective, or emotional, disturbance" as proved to have been existent in 1877-8, but I have already pointed out that it is only by an inference, so liberal as to be barely warranted, from the language attributed to Fechner and Scheibner, that we can treat even the faults of mind and temper, denoted by the imposing term "disturbance," as having been observable at that date. But I will concede that. Only I must decidedly object to your (of course accidental) altering of the word "seeing" in your notes ("He became more and more given to fixing his attention on a few ideas, and incapable of seeing what was against them") into the word "observe" when you would use your notes argumentatively with reference to Zöllner's capacity as an "observer." The note of Scheibner's statement about Zöllner is not very lucid as a whole, but upon this point, the meaning is unmistakable; and you cannot be allowed to convert a statement of a theorist's inability to "see" an objection into a statement of an investigator's inability to "observe" a trick,* though you are, of course, at liberty to argue from one to the other. The objection *in limine* to your argument is that it is entirely *à priori*, that you would use it as a substitute for criticism of Zöllner's experiments, and not really in aid of criticism. You have to show, and you do not attempt to show, how the assumption of Zöllner's theoretical bias, intellectual one-sidedness, impatience of contradiction, emotionalism, nay, if you will, decided and even eager desire for the evidence he thought he obtained, helps you in the least to a sceptical conclusion when you come to examine his testimony in detail. The hypothetically admitted qualities give you a considerable latitude of presumption against any of Zöllner's proceedings, or any of his beliefs, in which they may have played a part, but only on condition that the presumption is not rebutted by positive proof—such as criticism can recognise—that in the particular proceeding or belief in question they played no part. To ascertain whether there is this rebuttal, you must look at his testimony itself, and not turn away from it. Now I have put the case against Zöllner quite as high as you have ventured to put it yourself, or as anyone whose opinion can pretend to be at all guided or controlled by evidence can possibly put it. But this case does not include unveracity, nor actual hallucination of the senses. It therefore admits that when Zöllner says he took certain precautions, or describes with rigorous particularity and the most marked emphasis certain conditions, those precautions were in fact taken, and those conditions in fact existed. But if they have only one conceivable purpose, and that the avowed one, of obtaining strictly scientific evidence by elimination of all possibility of deception or conjuring, there is no longer room for the suggestion that unscientific qualities of mind presided over the investigation, and criticism must proceed

as best it may, the assumption of any abnormality of Zöllner's mind remaining quite idle and useless on its hands. The psychologist may interest himself in the not difficult task of reconciling the hypothetical existence of that abnormality, or of those unscientific growths of the mind, with the reassertion of the scientific habit and training of the life, when the occasion for them recurs; the man of common-sense and experience may perhaps prefer to laugh at the hypothesis that there was anything abnormal in Zöllner at all, a disposition which would be much enhanced by the study of the evidence for that hypothesis.

The above remark, that the truth or relevance of assumptions of Zöllner's partial or "incipient" abnormality has to be tested by the very evidence which those assumptions are used to dismiss, is equally applicable to the account given of Zöllner's *normal* characteristics under head 5 of your notes of Scheibner's testimony. "He was childlike and trustful in character, and might easily have been deceived by an impostor." Might he? I should like to know what you would think of a reasoner who, on the strength of a subjective estimate of an investigator's character that he was shrewd, sceptical, and the last person in the world to let himself be deceived by an impostor, should rely upon an investigation of mediumistic phenomena in which every obvious precaution against deception had been neglected? That is the converse case, and illustrates the worthlessness and irrelevance of these subjective estimates when we have the materials for an independent and objective judgment. "He expected every one to be honest and frank as he was. He started with the assumption that Slade meant to be honest with him. He would have thought it wrong to doubt Slade's honesty." Now, upon these points we know from Zöllner himself upon what principles he proceeded. It is not the fact that "he started with the assumption that Slade meant to be honest with him." He imposed a preliminary test (which he describes), and it was when this was satisfied that he says:—"This observation decided my position towards Mr. Slade. I had here to do with a fact which confirmed the observations of Fechner,* and was, therefore, worthy of further investigation." Nor did he, upon this account, thenceforward abate any security suggested by his scientific caution, and the "position" which was thus "decided" towards Slade was not that of a confiding dupe, but that of a scientific investigator who has found something "worthy of further investigation." In view of the precautions actually taken, it is killing the slain to insist that Zöllner explicitly recognised the possible existence of trickery by mediums, for though he says he never himself observed any attempt of the sort with Slade—he adds a consideration—(one of a number familiar to *real* students of the subject, who know the necessity of "inwardness" in this research)—to be taken into account "if this has been the case elsewhere."†

But then Zöllner (and Weber) "knew nothing of jugglery." This objection (as well as the extreme form of it, now being urged in this country, that even professional conjurers are not satisfactory witnesses, because they do not know one another's tricks) merely raises the question of the sufficiency of precautions and conditions, and of observation under them, to prevent or detect conjuring in general. It comes apparently to this, that I cannot protect a particular point by surrounding it with a wall, unless I know all the roads by which the point can be approached. Analogies, however, are notoriously fallacious. I have elsewhere dealt with the question of the possibilities of mal-observation under the circumstances of these experiments. I am content here to say with Weber: "If another

* Under head 5 of your notes of Scheibner's testimony, there is the statement, "but in his investigations apt to see 'by preference' what lay in the path of his theory. He could 'less easily' see what was against his theory." Here, again, "see" is evidently not used in the sense of objective observation.

* Of much older date, and with another sensitive. See Chapter II of *Transcendental Physics* (translation).

† *Tr. Ph.*, p. 121.—Tr.

can understand how jugglery can explain the facts, well and good—I cannot.” I would only insist that the facts must be studied before they are explained. The only attempts I have seen to explain any of Zöllner’s facts by trickery either involve a neglect of main elements of the evidence, or suppositions which it is difficult to treat seriously.

It remains to notice your remark :—“There are things in Zöllner’s own accounts which indicate a certain lack of caution and accuracy on his part, and tend to lessen one’s confidence in his statements. As an instance of inaccuracy, I may mention the statement he made in the *Quarterly Journal of Science* as to the opinions of his colleagues. Professor Zöllner says :—‘I reserve to later publication, in my own *Treatises*, the description of further experiments obtained by me in twelve séances with Mr. Slade, and, as I am expressly authorised to mention, in the presence of* my friends and colleagues, Professor Fechner, Professor Wilhelm Weber, the celebrated electrician from Göttingen, and Herr Scheibner, professor of mathematics in the University of Leipzig, who are *perfectly* convinced of the reality of the observed facts, altogether excluding imposture or prestidigitation.’ Here the attitude of the four men is not correctly described, and Professor Zöllner’s statement does them injustice, as Professor Scheibner remarked. At least two of the men were merely *inclined* to accept the facts, and to those two the words ‘*perfectly* convinced’ will not apply.”

Now to begin with an inaccuracy of your own in the above, which I should be far from saying should “tend to lessen our confidence” in any deliberate statements you might make of facts of personal observation. You say that Zöllner does not correctly describe the attitude of the four men (in saying that they were *perfectly* convinced of the reality of the observed facts), “and Professor Zöllner’s statement does them injustice, as Professor Scheibner remarked.” Now the following, according to your notes, is Scheibner’s remark :—

“Professor Zöllner’s book, said Professor Scheibner, would create the impression that Weber and Fechner and he agreed with Zöllner throughout in his opinion of the phenomena ‘and their interpretation,’ but this, he said, is not the case.” The significant words here are those which you have put in inverted commas. So that what Scheibner complains of is not that Zöllner attributed to him a perfect conviction of the reality of the observed facts, but that his book “would create the impression” of agreement in the interpretation of the phenomena. The “interpretation,” however, was the Fourth Dimensional one which Scheibner had just said was the theory Zöllner was intent on proving, that being evidently not the only one by which the facts might be explained, allowing them to be genuine phenomena. The use of the words, “create the impression,” makes it additionally evident that it was to this Scheibner was referring, those words being the natural ones for that meaning, but were not natural or adequate if he had meant to refer to the distinct and formal statement of his conviction of the “reality” of the facts. As regards the facts themselves he explains that “to him, *subjectively*, jugglery did not seem a good ‘or sufficient’ explanation of the phenomena,” and he also says, “he is short-sighted, ‘and might easily have left unnoticed something essential.’” But the question is, not what Scheibner says or believes *now*, but what he believed and what he said to Zöllner, and authorised Zöllner to say, in 1877. Nowhere in your notes is he made to say: I never gave Zöllner authority to state that I was perfectly convinced of the reality of the facts—(that is to say, that they were not conjuring). *Has Scheibner ever publicly repudiated Zöllner’s statement that he had such*

authority from Scheibner? Surely that is a question which it would have been proper for you to ask him, if you had received the impression that he was repudiating the statement to you! And since Scheibner minimised to you his own opportunities for observation, you had a splendid opportunity, had you chosen to avail yourself of it, of testing either his memory, or Zöllner’s accuracy of statement (so far as any counter-statement of Scheibner’s, nine years later, could affect our judgment of the latter). You might have asked him whether the following statement by Zöllner was or was not an accurate representation of what occurred, *or if he had ever in any way contradicted or corrected it*: “Hereupon Slade gave the accordion to Professor Scheibner, and requested him to hold it in the manner described” (that is, grasping the *keyless* end, so that the side with keys hung down free) “as it might possibly happen that the accordion would play in his hand also, without Slade touching it at all. Scarcely had Scheibner the accordion in his hand, than it began to play a tune exactly in the same way, while the bell under the table again rang violently. Slade’s hands meanwhile rested quietly on the table, and his feet turned sideways, would be continually observed during this proceeding.”*

Now to this statement, if true, assuredly that of Scheibner to you will not apply, when he says: “He was merely a passive spectator, and would not, properly speaking, make observations—could not suggest conditions ‘or gain the control which seemed necessary.’”

I will not do you the injustice to suppose that your notions of how evidence is to be dealt with are so crude that you think that such a particular statement of Zöllner’s at the time is to be disposed of by a general statement of the sort quoted, by Scheibner, nine years after the occurrence, without any attempt to bring Scheibner’s mind into present contact with the specifically alleged facts. I can only suggest that you had really taken no trouble whatever to study the evidence before seeing the witnesses. Nothing is easier to understand than that Scheibner’s attitude now may be very different from what it was in 1877, and that his recollection may be exceedingly defective of particulars. But no man with the least sense of scientific, or even common responsibility, would allow himself to be publicly represented by a distinguished colleague as the principal figure and actor in such an incident as the above, without protest or a single qualifying word, if the statement did not accord with his own knowledge or recollection at the time of publication. Your omission to put a single question to him on the two important points: 1st, of his present recollection of this incident (for one); 2nd, of his tacit allowance of Zöllner’s statements, in my view is alone sufficient to deprive your interview with Scheibner of any possible evidential value. And I should be much surprised if any lawyer, at least, could be found to disagree with me.

I personally know of a case, stronger than Scheibner’s, of the effacement by time (and long cessation of active interest in the investigation) of an impression of the same sort as regards all its value and significance for the mind. A gentleman of a scientific profession, now holding an important public post, recorded an experience in detail, which he rightly himself said excluded every possibility of fraud, and his record was published many years ago. Making his acquaintance comparatively recently, and finding him exceedingly sceptical, I reminded him of this remarkable experience of his own, and found him very disinclined to admit that there was anything in it, but quite unable to explain his statement if there was not. With the weakening of the impression in memory, all his original subjective presumption against such facts, before he had witnessed anything of the sort, reasserted itself; the phenomenon was isolated in his experience, and could

* This general statement is, of course, to be read in connection with the accounts, which show what witnesses were present at each particular sitting.

* *Tr. Ph.*, p. 40.—*Tr.*

not relate itself to any context in his mind. Neither in his case nor in Scheibner's should any value be attributed to mental disparagement of an old experience, recorded at the time, unless the witness is able to correct his testimony in detail, or to show how it had less than its apparent objective significance.

When I find you next saying, "As one of the numerous instances of lack of caution" on Zöllner's part, I pause in the middle of the sentence to make the remark that the foregoing review does not encourage the reader to accept, without considerable caution on his own part, your general statement of numerous instances of lack of caution on Zöllner's. But I willingly consider the particular to which you condescend—"I may refer to Zöllner's statements that at certain times writing was heard upon the slate, giving no proof whatever to show that the writing was really done at the time of hearing the sounds, and apparently quite ignorant of the fact that deception may readily be practised on this point." Now this is a good illustration of the fallacy of abstract criticism, of criticism not brought into contact with the definite cases to which it is applied. For when you say that Zöllner states that writing was heard on the slate, "giving no proof whatever to show that the writing was done at the time of hearing the sounds," I can only express my amazement at such a misrepresentation. What proof of this fact could Zöllner possibly have offered (short of seeing the writing in course of execution) other or better than the circumstances which he so often and so minutely describes? Why, do you suppose, does Zöllner take the trouble on such occasions to account for Slade's hands and feet, and to say that they were under observation even when the slate was at a distance from Slade? And why is he not to speak of the sound of writing, when the whole of the circumstances and conditions of the experiments are the proof that the sound could have been nothing else? Certainly the sound of writing may be simulated, and there are cases in which to say "the sound of writing" (instead of the sound *as* of writing), would beg the question, though even in such a case there is no harm done to the evidence, because the only fact *evidentially* alleged is the *sound*, and its resemblance to that of writing, the explanation of the sound being *obviously* only a mental act of the witness. And if, in such a case, the question-begging expression might, taken by itself, afford some presumption of a want of mental discrimination, or of ignorance of alternative possibilities on the part of the witness, we have still to see whether that presumption is borne out by the general character of his evidence, by any want of particularity and discrimination in his *observations*, apart from their explanation in his mind. But what are we to say of a critic who abstracts from all the conditions and circumstances of an experiment, and treats as applicable under *any* conditions, and in *any* circumstances, a general proposition which only may or may not be relevant, according to the surrounding facts? It is true that the sound of writing may be simulated; so it is true that the note of a bird may be simulated by the vendor of toys in the streets of a crowded city, and it will require a very experienced and attentive ear to tell the difference merely by the ear; but I may nevertheless be permitted to speak of hearing the note of a bird in the apparent solitude of a wood, as evidence that a bird was then and there singing. This, of course, is only put as an extreme case to expose the general fallacy. Birds are *veræ causæ*, and I am not pursuing an analogy. But it is evident that for any application to the evidence for psychography, to the proposition, "the sound of writing can be simulated," must be added the proposition, "*and localised*." Now I quite admit that if I hear a sound which I am expecting to hear in a particular place, I shall be very apt to do the localisation for myself, *within certain limits*. But these limits are the whole question, whenever Slade's hand was not in contact with the slate at the time the

sound was heard, or in immediate proximity to it. And in the cases in which the localisation of the sound presents little difficulty, we have to see whether the other observed conditions were such as to put the simulation hypothesis out of the question. Now it is remarkable that on occasions in which simulation of the sound of writing is not excluded, either by the localising difficulty, or by the described conditions—the observed position of Slade's hands, and sometimes also of his feet, at the time of the sound—Zöllner does *not* use the word "writing," but the word "scratching" (*Kritzeln*). Thus in the first specific instance mentioned by Zöllner of psychography with Slade, we find this term used to describe the sound when the slate was held by Slade over the head of Professor Braune.* And further on, in a case where the slate was held half under the table by Slade, we have the same expression.† Nor is it possible to suggest that Zöllner accepted the sound as of itself sufficient evidence of writing, when we find him, in the very same sentence in which he speaks of "very loud writing," adding "between the *untouched* slates," and expressly showing how the supposition of "previous preparation" was excluded—that of simulation of the sound of writing necessarily involving also the supposition of such previous preparation. Seeing that Zöllner was proving psychography up to the hilt by particulars only necessary at all on the pre-supposition that the sound as of writing was *not* sufficient evidence of writing then and there, to adduce his use of the term "writing" in cases where the sound could not possibly have meant anything else, as an instance of lack of caution, I respectfully submit is not criticism, but talking without critical regard to facts.

I had not intended in this letter to have travelled beyond the question of Zöllner's sanity, and its bearing on his evidence. But I found that when two or three big words, such as "derangement," "disturbance," &c., had been reduced to their substantial content, there was really no case of this sort to answer, and we had nothing under this head to consider practically, but certain alleged emotional and intellectual qualities or defects of the normal Zöllner. I know scarcely any one who cannot be said to be in some sense of unsound mind, if anything we hear of Zöllner entitles you to say that of him in any sense. That the thing should be said of him, and should even be believed in some vague, feeble, and uncertain way by some of his own friends, without any foundation in fact, seems to me not only natural, but almost inevitable in the circumstances. A man of strong feelings, who deeply exasperated more than one prevailing prejudice, who was vehement in controversy, who made enemies, and was not always patient with candid friends, *and in whose family there was known to be insanity*, what more do you want? But there is his evidence. Look at it, study it from beginning to end, and say how much insanity you want to explain it away. We will not trouble you with the other witnesses. You shall antedate Fechner's cataract, and shall call its existence in 1877, without a scrap of evidence, an "admitted" fact. You shall avail yourself of Scheibner's nine years' late disclaimer,‡ upon notes which he refuses to sign, of the "objective" value of his own observations, without testing the value of the disclaimer by the inconvenient questions I have suggested in the course of this letter. You shall get rid of Weber in the best way you can. And I leave you with Zöllner's evidence alone. You need have said nothing about Zöllner. The Commission, of which you are the secretary, in the Preliminary Report expressly declines the examination of existing testimony, on the ground that to sift the evidence of merely half-a-dozen of

* *Wiss. Abh.*, Bd. II., 331.—Tr. p. 33.

† S. 339.—Tr. p. 45 (where I rather carelessly translated *Kritzeln* "scribbling").

‡ We do not know the date of his answers to German inquirers mentioned in your notes of his testimony.

the "so-called 'facts'" "would require incalculable labour." And yet this same Commission in the same report thinks it impartially consistent with an attitude which is professedly one of reserve, if it is not one of patent prejudice, to call "especial attention" to your report which I have just been considering. Would the Commission have called especial attention to your report if it had evidently been of a character to confirm, rather than (in your and their view) to impair, the authority of Zöllner's evidence? Or would they not rather have said—We have not undertaken to deal with that evidence; we have no occasion, as a Commission for original research, to say anything about it? It would have been reasonable and fair enough to say so, if your inquiries in Germany were not undertaken at the instance of the Commission. But what is not fair and not reasonable, nor in any way profitable to truth, is to offer such a substitute as this report of yours for the "incalculable labour" of criticism.—I beg to remain, yours faithfully,

C. C. MASSEY.

1, Albert Mansions,
Victoria-street, London, S.W.
August, 1887.

"A MATTER OF DEMONSTRATION."

From the *Hartford Daily Times*.

Among the pleasant unreported features of Yale's recent Commencement was the reunion of the class of '37. Among these survivors, who are more numerous than anybody could suppose, were Senator Evarts, Professor Lyman, and a number of other noted gentlemen, not excepting John Hooker of this city. A letter was received and read to the company, from the Rev. Joseph D. Hull, well known in Hartford as a teacher, and a gentleman of rare accomplishments, but who is now confined by chronic illness to his house in Boston. Mr. Hull's letter was very full of life and good spirits, as well as of tender feeling for his old classmates, and memories of the college times and scenes of half a century ago. Before ending it, Mr. Hull had this to say:

"I owe it to say to you that within the last few years I have arrived at some very important and very assured convictions, which, though sustained by considerable numbers of men eminent on both sides of the Atlantic for their learning and ability, are as yet repudiated by a large majority of the intelligent and even scientific world, both physicist and philosophising theologians. To me, the great doctrine of a future life, or the continuance of our existence after the death of the body, is no longer merely an article of *faith*, dependent on the teachings of the Scriptures, or any tradition or philosophical reasonings. It is a matter of *demonstration* by methods as truly scientific as those by which four-fifths of our knowledge called scientific is accepted. This is to me so great a thing that I have no words wherewith to express adequately its value. Coupled with the equally important and to me equally demonstrable truth that our condition in that future life is most accurately determined by our character—that character which here we form and there voluntarily continue in—(for a moral being must be presumed to remain essentially such so long as he exists), this belief is the one which above all others the world needs, which every man needs, both for his own sake and all his fellows', and so should hold among his strongest convictions.

"Of course I do not now propose to argue at all for my belief. But I desire two things: first, to put myself plainly on record; and next, I should be happy if I could induce any of you to pay any such attention to the subject as would be rewarded ultimately as my study of it has been.

"While I am writing, a newspaper comes to me containing a lecture by the distinguished Englishman of science, Professor Alfred Russel Wallace, now in California, on the question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' I have obtained as many copies as the publisher said he could spare, with the view of sending one to each of you, in the hope that you will do me the favour and yourselves the justice to read it. You will easily

find many foolish things in the newspaper, as in all the papers devoted to the exposition of a science but *very* imperfectly developed, and offering perhaps peculiar temptations to crude writers. But Professor Wallace is one who should command the respect of the wisest of us. Ten years ago the ablest essays and volumes that had appeared had failed—with such attention as I gave to them—to convince me. So I cannot reasonably hope to do more than draw some earnest attention to this or other of the best writings on the subject. Pray, concede me this.

And now let me, before closing a strain of remark which I hope has not been listened to with a degree of prejudice amounting to manifest scorn and impatience, comfort some of you who, without any of my personal experience, may entertain fears for my sanity, or worse still, as *they* may look at it, of my "orthodoxy," by saying that my science has not run away with my religion. My deepened impression of some spiritual realities has not dimmed—as in some cases they most unfortunately seem to have done—my apprehension of other religious truths which most of us cherish. My theology has no doubt been considerably modified, but it is only in the direction in which my reason has been pulling me from my youth against the *dicta* of mere authority. But if I know myself I am a more profoundly religious man than ever. The One Supreme Mind, inconceivably glorious in every perfection, and as such governing eternally the universe; the benign, instructive, and purifying revelation made of Himself through human souls from time to time, and especially through the exalted Man of Nazareth; the soul stimulating power of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, though by no means their infallible dogmatic authority; such truths as these are as grand and precious to me as they ever were. Nay, they are more so; for I see them now in connection with other truths which throw light upon them, remove difficulties and assist to their reception.

But lest you all cry out *Siste gradum, puer*, or *Claude jam rivum* (Anglice, "pray shut up"), I desist, only assuring you, one and all, of my affectionate remembrance, of my sincere wishes for your happiness, and my joyful hope to meet you all again sometime and somewhere, when we shall see more perfectly, eye to eye, and know even as we are known.

THE MYSTERY.

The river hemmed with leaving trees
Wound through the meadows green,
A low blue line of mountain showed
The open pines between.

One sharp tall peak above them all
Clear into sunlight sprang,
I saw the river of my dreams,
The mountain that I sang.

No clue of memory led me on
But well the ways I knew,
A feeling of familiar things
With every footstep grew.

Yet ne'er before that river's rim
Was pressed by feet of mine.
Never before mine eyes had crossed
That broken mountain line.

A presence strange at once and known
Walked with me as my guide,
The skirts of some forgotten life
Trailed noiseless at my side.

Was it a dim-remembered dream
Or glimpse through æons old?
The secrets which the mountains kept
The river never told.

J. G. WHITTIER.

(From *The Path*.)

THE CHURCH OF HUMANITY.—Mr. T. Dowsing (the Manse, Framlingham) writes to express his agreement with the opinions of 1st M.B. respecting the Trinity. He has himself expressed similar ones in the trance state for several years. He encloses us a card of membership in the "Church of Humanity." The profession of faith is: "One Father God; One humanity, His children. God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth. The rich and poor meet together—the Lord is the Maker of them all." The condition of membership is "a desire to worship God, Who is infinite love and wisdom, by loving and blessing my brothers and sisters of humanity. He who loves not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God Whom he hath not seen?"

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.

*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 Guldenstübbe, &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 Cathness 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 TORNEBOOM 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 clouded 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 DIALECTICAL 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,’ ‘somnambulist,’ ‘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 every thing 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 anylegerdemain, 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, Homeopathy, 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.”

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS,

Which may be procured at the Offices of "LIGHT," and the
LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE, 16, Craven-street, W.C.

Orders must be accompanied by remittances, which should be
made payable to B. D. GODFREY.

Astrology Theologized: The Spiritual Hermeneutics of Astrology and Holy Writ; being a Treatise upon the influence of the Stars on Man and on the art of ruling them by the Law of Grace (reprinted from the original of 1649). With a Prefatory Essay on the True Method of Interpreting Holy Scripture. By ANNA BONUS KINGSFORD, M.D., &c. Price 10s. 6d.

Astrologer's Guide (Guido Bonatus). With Notes and Preface. By W. C. ELDON SERJEANT. Price 7s. 6d.

Apparitions. By NEWTON CROSLAND. Price 2s. 6d.

Across the Zodiac, 2 vols. By PERCY GREG. Price 6s.

Behmen, The Epistles of Jacob. Price 6s.

Bhagavad-Gita, The: or, a Discourse between Krishna and Arjuna on Divine Matters. A Sanskrit Philosophical Poem. Translated with copious notes, an Introduction on Sanskrit Philosophy, and other matter: by J. COCKBURN THOMPSON, Member of the Asiatic Society of France, and of the Antiquarian Society of Normandy. Price 7s. 6d.

Birth and Death: as a Change of Form of Perception. By BARON LAZAR HELLENBACH. Translated into English by "V." Price 3s. 6d.

Blavatsky, Incidents in the Life of Madame. Edited by A. P. SINNETT. Price 10s. 6d.

"Bob and I": or Forget-me-Nots from God's Garden. By MISS F. J. THEOBALD. Price 1s.

Chaldean Magic: Its Origin and Development. Translated from the French, with considerable additions. By F. LENORMANT. Price 5s.

Davis, A. Jackson: An Autobiography of—The Magic Staff. Price 10s.

Debatable Land, The. R. DALE OWEN. Price 7s. 6d.

Electrical Psychology. J. B. DODS. Price 6s.

Esoteric Buddhism. A. P. SINNETT. Price 6s.

Footfalls on the Boundary of Another World. R. DALE OWEN. Price 7s. 6d.

Geometrical Psychology; or, The Science of Representation. An Abstract of the Theories and Diagrams of B. W. BETTS. By LOUISA S. COOK. Price 7s. 6d.

Handwriting, Character by. By ROSA BAUGHAN. Price 2s. 6d.

Heaven Opened. MISS F. J. THEOBALD. Price 4d.

Homes and Work in the Future Life. MISS F. J. THEOBALD. Price 3s. 6d.

How I was Taught of the Spirit. By "VIVAT VERITAS." Price 6d.

Isis Unveiled. A Master-key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology. 2 Vols. By H. P. BLAVATSKY. Price £2 2s.

Improvisations from the Spirit. Price 10s.

Kalpa Sutra, and Nava Tatva: Two Works illustrative of the Jain Religion and Philosophy. Translated by the Rev. J. STEVENSON, D.D. Price 5s.

Karma: A Novel. A. P. SINNETT. Price 3s. 6d.

Kernel and the Husk, The. By the author of *Philchristus* and *Onesimus*. Price 5s.

Light on the Path. A Treatise written for the personal use of those who are ignorant of the eastern wisdom, and who desire to enter within its influence. Written down by M. C., Fellow of the Theosophical Society. Price 1s. 6d.

Magic Staff, The: An Autobiography of A. JACKSON DAVIS. Price 10s.

Medium's Book, The. ALLAN KARDEC. Price 7s. 6d.

Mesmerism: with Hints for Beginners. By CAPTAIN JAMES. Price 2s. 6d.

Mesmerism and Electrical Psychology. By J. B. DODS. Price 3s. 6d.

Mesmerise, How to. J. W. CADWELL. Price 3s. 6d.

More Forget-me-Nots. MISS F. J. THEOBALD. Price 1s.

Mystery of the Ages Contained in the Secret Doctrine of all Religions. By MARIE, COUNTESS OF CAITHNESS, DUCHESSE DE POMAR. Price 10s. 6d.

Mysteries of Magic: A Digest of the Writings of Eliphas Levi, with Biographical and Critical Essay. By ARTHUR E. WAITE. Price 10s. 6d.

Nature and Law: An Answer to Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." Price 2s.

Night Side of Nature. By MRS. C. CROWE. Price 1s. 6d.

Occult World, The. A. P. SINNETT. Price 3s. 6d.

Occult World Phenomena. A. P. SINNETT. Price 1s. 6d.

Palmistry, Handbook of. ROSA BAUGHAN. Price 1s.

Paracelsus, The Life of; and Substance of his Teachings. Extracted and translated from his rare and extensive works and from some unpublished MSS., by F. HARTMANN, M.D. Price 10s. 6d.

People from the Other World. By H. S. OLCOTT. Price 5s.

Physiognomy, Handbook of. By ROSA BAUGHAN. Price 1s.

Primitive Christianity, A Study of. By LEWIS G. JANES. Price 6s. 6d.

"We do not remember to have met with a more exhaustive treatment of a very wide subject within so brief a compass. . . . It is a model of what such a book should be alike in matter and in form."—*Light*.

Signs Before Death: A Record of Strange Apparitions and Remarkable Dreams, &c. Price 6s.

Spirit's Book, The. ALLAN KARDEC. Price 7s. 6d.

Spirit Messages Relating to the Nature of Christ's Person. By MISS F. J. THEOBALD. Price 6d.

Spirit Workers in the Home Circle: Being an Autobiographic Narrative of Psychic Phenomena in the Family Circle, spread over a period of nearly Twenty Years. By MORELL THEOBALD, F.C.A. Handsome Demy 8vo. Price 10s. 6d.

Spiritualism at Home. MORELL THEOBALD, F.C.A. Price 6d.

Theosophy, The Purpose of. By MRS. A. P. SINNETT. Price 3s. 6d.

Theosophy, Religion, and Occult Science. By H. S. OLCOTT. Price 7s. 6d.

Through the Gates of Gold: A Fragment of Thought. Price 4s. 6d.

Transcendental Physics: An Account of Experimental Investigations. From the Scientific Treatises of Johann Carl Friedrich Zöllner. Translated from the German, with a Preface and Appendices by C. CARLETON MASSEY, Barrister-at-Law. Price 3s. 6d.

Twixt Two Worlds: A Narrative of the Life and Works of Wm. Eglinton. By J. S. FARMER. Price 6s.

United: A Novel. 2 Vols. By A. P. SINNETT. Price 10s. 6d.

Virgin of the World, The. By HERMES MERCURIUS TRISMEGISTUS. A Treatise on Initiations, or Asclepius; the Definitions of Asclepius; Fragments of the Writings of Hermes. Translated and Edited by the Authors of "The Perfect Way," with an Introduction to "The Virgin of the World," by A. K., and an Essay on "The Hermetic Books," by E. M. Price 10s. 6d.

Witchcraft of New England: Explained by Modern Spiritualism. By ALLEN PUTNAM. Price 6s.

The Psychograph (Registered). Supersedes the old-fashioned Planchette. Moves easily. Writes rapidly. Is better suited to its work than the more expensive instrument. Invaluable for Writing Mediums. Price 2s. 6d. Postage 3d.

16, CRAVEN STREET, CHARING CROSS, W.C.

THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE.

16, CRAVEN STREET, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

This Society of Spiritualists, founded for the

purpose, primarily, of uniting those who share a common faith, and then of giving information respecting that faith to those who seek for it, has now occupied Chambers at the above address. There will be found an extensive Library of works especially attractive to Spiritualists; the various Journals of Spiritualism published in this and other countries; and opportunities of converse with friends like-minded. The Alliance holds periodical Soirées at the Banqueting Hall, St. James's Hall, where papers on interesting phases of the subject are read, and discussion is invited. Members of the Alliance are eligible for joining its Research section. Donations solicited.

[One or more Members of Council attend on Tuesday evenings in each week, from Five to Seven (excepting on the Second Tuesday in each Month, when the hour is from Six to Seven) to receive friends and answer inquiries.]

Minimum Annual Subscription of Members and Associates, One Guinea, payable in advance, and on the 1st January in each year. Further particulars may be obtained from B. D. GODFREY, Librarian, on the premises, or of

MORELL THEOBALD, Hon. Sec.

62, Granville Park, Blackheath, S.E.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED BEFORE THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE AT ST. JAMES'S HALL.

VOICES IN THE AIR: Being the President's Inaugural Address. Price 3d.

SCIENCE AND THE PHENOMENA TERMED SPIRITUAL. By Major-General DRAYSON. Price 3d.

SPIRITUALISM AT HOME. With Appendix, &c. By Mr. MORELL THEOBALD. Price 6d.

SPIRITUALISM: SOME DIFFICULTIES WITH SOME SUGGESTIONS. By Mr. ALARIC A. WATTS. Price 3d.

SPIRITUALISM AT HOME AND ABROAD. By THE PRESIDENT. Price 6d.

SOME THOUGHTS ON MEDIUMSHIP. By MRS. DE MORGAN. Price 2d.

SPIRITUALISM: SOME ASPECTS OF COMFORT. By Mr. ALARIC A. WATTS. Price 2d.

THE APPLICATION TO SPIRITUALISM OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. By Mr. C. C. MASSEY. Price 3d.

WHENCE AND WHITHER? By Mr. W. PAICE. Price 2d.

THE SEERS OR PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Rev. J. PAGE HOPPS. Price 2d.

DEATH. By C. E. CASSAL. Price 3d.

MAY BE HAD AT 16, CRAVEN STREET, W.C.; OR OF G. REDWAY

YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

Mediumship, Mesmerism, etc.

Mr. W. Eglinton requests that no more letters be addressed to him at 6, Nottingham-place, W., as he no longer resides there.

Mr. F. Omerin's Address is 3, BULSTRODE-STREET, WELBECK-STREET, CAVENTISH-SQUARE, W.

Magnetic Massage.—Mr. Edward Williams receives Patients by Appointment, for Treatment of Rheumatism, Liver Complaints, Neuralgia, Paralysis, &c. Testimonials from Nobility, Physicians, and Ladies and Gentlemen who have been successfully treated. Massage à domicile if required.—Address, 33, ADELAIDE-ROAD, UXBRIDGE-ROAD, W.

Mr. G. Milner Stephen's Consulting Rooms are at No. 51, BAKER-STREET, PORTMAN-SQUARE, W. Hundreds of his "CURS at PUBLIC HEALINGS," reported by the Press, are there exhibited; also four Cancers (discharged without operations).

Mr. Towns, for Medical Diagnosis, Test and BUSINESS CLAIRVOYANCE, is at home daily, and is open to engagements.—Address, 143, KENTISH TOWN-ROAD CAMDEN TOWN, N.W.

Mr. W. R. Price, Curative Mesmerist, having successfully treated Nervous and other cases for many years, receives Patients daily from 12 to 4, at 15, UPPER BAKER-STREET, N.W. To explain the uses and power of Mesmerism as a Curative Agent, Mr. Price invites those desirous of investigating the subject to a short address, followed by demonstrations, every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock. Admission One Shilling.

Mr. Cecil Husk, 29, South-grove, Rye-lane, PECKHAM, S.E. (near Rye-lane Station) holds Séances on Sunday evenings at Eight o'clock. For Spiritualists only.

Mr. John Hopcroft, 3, St. Luke's-terrace, CANTERBURY-ROAD, WEST KILBURN (opposite the Falcon Hotel), Trance, Clairvoyant and Psychometrist, at home daily for Private Séances; Two till Six.

Miss Lottie Fowler, Trance, Medical, and Spiritual Clairvoyant, 16, THAYER-STREET, MANCHESTER-SQUARE, W. Hours: 2 till 7 daily. At home on Monday evenings at 8, to friendly callers.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilkinson, Clairvoyant and Writing Mediums, &c. At home from 11 to 7; or, by appointment. Mr. Wilkinson (Phrenologist) holds consultations daily.—Address, 32, HAWKSLEY-ROAD, STOKE NEWINGTON, N.W.

Miss Godfrey, Curative Mesmerist and Rubber, sees Patients by appointment only. She has been specially successful with Ladies and Neuralgic Patients, as well as in cases of Paralysis and Congest'on of all kinds, and she holds Testimonials from Ladies and Gentlemen whom she has cured.—229, HAMFSTEAD-ROAD, N.W.

D. YOUNGER,

PROFESSOR OF MESMERISM AND MASSEUR.

Strongly recommended by many eminent physicians for his scientific and successful treatment of diseases. At home daily from one to five, or visits patients at their homes.

Address, 22, LEDBURY ROAD, BAYSWATER, LONDON, W.
(Almost opposite his former address, No. 23.)

IN THE PRESS. PRICE, 10s. 6d.

THE MAGNETIC AND BOTANIC FAMILY PHYSICIAN,

AND

DOMESTIC PRACTICE OF NATURAL MEDICINE.

A Demy 8vo. Vol. of between 500 and 600 Pages,
WITH

Illustrations showing Various Phases of Mesmeric Treatment

Including Full and Concise Instructions in Mesmerism, Curative Magnetism, Massage, and Medical Botany; with a Complete Diagnosis of all Ordinary Diseases, and how to treat them by simple, safe, and natural means; also Careful Directions for the Infusion of various Medicines and Tinctures; the Composition of Pills and Powders; the Preparation of Medicated Oils, Salves, Liniments, Poultices, Toilet Requisites; all kinds of Baths and other Sanitary Appliances.

BY D. YOUNGER.

(See preceding Advertisement.)

N.B.—Special terms would be arranged with Societies, Libraries, or Circles for a supply of not less than six Copies.

ABOUT TO APPEAR.

A SOUL'S COMEDY.

BY

ARTHUR EDWARD WAITE.

ALSO,

THE PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE SEYBERT COMMISSION.

LONDON: G. REDWAY, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

A CLEAR SAVING OF 30%.

SPECIAL PRICE LIST FOR NETT CASH.

Superfine Dress Suits, lined Silk	£3 18 0	worth	£5 5 0
Beaver Overcoats, lined Tweed	2 10 0	"	3 10 0
All Wool Trousers	0 18 6	"	1 1 0
Suit of best Angola	2 10 0	"	3 10 0
Black Twill Morning Coat }	2 10 0	"	3 10 0
" " " Vest }			

716 GENTLEMAN'S PURE SILK UMBRELLA.

JAMES MALTBY, ARMY TAILOR, 8, HANOVER-PLACE, UPPER BAKER ST.

SAVE YOUR TEETH FROM FURTHER DECAY

BY USING ZOMOS, BY USING JASPER'S JASPER'S

and avoid the horrors of False Teeth. ZOMOS is also a Permanent and Instant Cure for TOOTHACHE. Of all Chemists, 1s. 1½d. Agents, SANGER & SONS, 489, OXFORD-STREET, W.

PENTON CLOTHING ESTABLISHMENT.

26, PENTON STREET, N.

(Closed on Thursdays at Five o'clock.)

TO meet seasonable demands, we can supply 13s. 6d. Trousers, which cannot be surpassed in the trade. Also

SCOTCH, CHEVIOT, and ANGOLA SUITINGS,

From £2 2s. 0d. per Suit.

Dr. JAEGER'S SANITARY WOOLLEN OUTER CLOTHING

ALWAYS IN STOCK.

WE GUARANTEE IN ALL CASES A GOOD FIT AND GENTLE MANLY STYLE, WITH MODERATE CHARGES.

EVERITT AND SON

Tailors and Breeches Makers,

26, PENTON STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON, N.

Established 1851.

Birkbeck Bank.—Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane. THREE per CENT. INTEREST allowed on DEPOSITS, repayable on demand.

TWO per CENT. INTEREST on CURRENT ACCOUNTS, calculated on the minimum monthly balances, when not drawn below £100.

The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the Custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the Collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the Purchase and Sale of Stocks, Shares, and Annuities. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

THE BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, post free on application. FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

The Birkbeck Building Society's Annual Receipts exceed Five Millions.

How to Purchase a House for Two Guineas per Month, with immediate possession, and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY, 29, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

How to Purchase a Plot of Land for Five Shillings per Month, with immediate possession, either for Building or Gardening Purposes.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY as above.

THE BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, on application. FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

SEE LAST ISSUE.

BEECHAM'S PILLS.

SEE NEXT ISSUE.

Why formed at all, and wherefore as thou art?

DUTY.

Knowest thou yesterday its aim and reason?
Workest thou well to-day for worthy things?

Calmly wait to-morrow's hidden season;
Need'st not fear what hap so e'er it brings.

"DUTY alone is true; there is no true action but in its accomplishment. DUTY is the end and aim of the highest life; the truest pleasure of all is that derived from the consciousness of its fulfilment. . . . And when we have done our work on earth—of necessity, of labour, of love, or of duty,—like the silkworm that spins its little cocoon and dies, we too depart. But, short though our stay in life may be, it is the appointed sphere in which each has to work out the great aim and end of his being to the best of his power; and when that is done, the accidents of the flesh will affect but little the *Immortality* we shall at last put on."—SMILES.

PLATO'S MEDITATION ON IMMORTALITY.

(Born 429—Died 347 B.C.)

"It must be so; Plato, thou reasonest well;
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after Immortality?
Or whence this secret dread and inward horror
Of falling into nought? Why shrinks the Soul
Back on itself, and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis Heaven itself that points out hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man."

—ADDISON.



PLATO MEDITATING BEFORE THE BUTTERFLY, SKULL, AND POPPY.

(The portrait of Plato is copied from an exquisite gem of high antiquity in the British Museum.)

WHAT HIGHER AIM CAN MAN ATTAIN, THAN CONQUEST OVER HUMAN PAIN?

FOR HEALTH AND LONGEVITY, USE

ENO'S "VEGETABLE MOTO"

(A SIMPLE VEGETABLE EXTRACT), occasionally A DESIRABLE ADJUNCT TO ENO'S FRUIT SALT,

As a Laxative, Stomachic, Blood, Brain, Nerve, Bile, or Liver Tonic. It will be found invaluable for creating and sustaining a natural action of the Stomach and Biliary Secretions. In a word—ENO'S "VEGETABLE MOTO" is Mild, Effective, and Agreeable, and lasting without force or strain in Indigestion, Biliousness, Sick Headache, Gout, Rheumatism, Female Ailments, Head Affections, Nervousness, Sleeplessness from Liver Derangement, Flatulence, at the commencement of Coughs and Colds, Blood Poisons and their kindred evils are prevented and cured by the use of the "VEGETABLE MOTO" and ENO'S FRUIT SALT.

A REGULAR ACTION OF THE EXCRETORY ORGANS OF THE BODY is produced by natural means; for, distinctly understand, it is impossible for a single tissue of the body to be kept in order if the effete or poisoned substances are not got rid of by a natural action of the LIVER, Bowels, and Skin.

THE HEALTHIEST OCCASIONALLY SUFFER TEMPORARY DERANGEMENT OF THE STOMACH AND LIVER. With ENO'S "VEGETABLE MOTO" and ENO'S FRUIT SALT you can always relieve and never do harm; little may be needed, but still, when you have simple and prompt assistance, many dangerous forms of disease may be arrested and removed at the onset, for this is the time or chance. ENO'S FRUIT SALT and "VEGETABLE MOTO" should always be kept in every bedroom and every travelling trunk ready for any emergency.

A GOUTY, RHEUMATIC CONDITION OF THE BLOOD, PRODUCING LIVER-DISTURBANCE, LIVER INDIGESTION, BILIARY DERANGEMENT, AND PERSISTING INDIGESTION.

"Mr. ENO.—Dear Sir,—I suffered severely for three months, consulted three eminent medical men, and had three changes of air, without any good result; my Liver and Digestive Organs felt as if they had ceased to act; my stomach was so distended with flatulence (wind) that every part of the body was afflicted. My head at night seemed to hear a hundred bells ringing. I was compelled to be propped up in bed; I got very little sleep for the severe pain under my shoulders and on my left side produced a restlessness not easily described; in a word, prior to using your 'Vegetable Moto' my Nervous System was out of order, rendering life a burden to myself and all near me; I felt there was a very short span between my life and the end of the chapter. Five weeks ago I tried your 'Vegetable Moto'; after three days I was able to take sufficient food to support nature, sleep gradually returned, and my health assumed its usual condition; I continued the 'Motos' five weeks. I can only express my gratitude by saying, make what use you like of this.—Yours, &c., TRUTH, London, 1886."

BILIOUSNESS, SICK HEADACHE.

A Gentleman writes:—"The 'Motos' are of great value. I have suffered from Biliousness, &c., for upwards of forty years; I have taken Eno's Fruit Salt for upwards of twelve years, the 'Motos' about two; I have never known them fail. There is nothing drastic or any discomfort in using them.—X. Y. Z., 1887."

HEALTH IS A DUTY.—EXPERIENTIA DOCET!

"To J. C. ENO.—Dear Sir,—Permit me to express the pleasure I feel in testifying to the great benefits consequent on the use of your 'Vegetable Moto.' They perform their work 'Silently as the twilight comes when the day is done,' and the patient is much astonished to find his bilious attack has completely fled before the onslaught of the 'Moto.' Its action is so easy that nothing I have tried comes up to it. I have exhibited it, and always with the same good effect, to a great many people engaged by the same firm where I am employed; and whenever they feel out of sorts they come unhesitatingly to me for a couple of 'Motos.' Children of both sexes take it without the least shuddering. A distinct advantage is gained if the 'Moto' is taken with a small dose (say, in half a tumbler of water) of Eno's Fruit Salt.—I am, dear Sir yours very faithfully, EXPERIENTIA DOCET.—April 12th, 1887."

PREVENTION.

Disobey ye who will, but ye who disobey MUST SUFFER; this law is as certain in its operation as the law of gravitation. With each bottle of 'Vegetable Moto' is given a 16-page pamphlet on the Prevention of Disease.

Sold by all Chemists, price 1s. 1½d.; post free, 1s. 3d. Prepared only at

ENO'S FRUIT SALT WORKS, HATCHAM, LONDON, S.E.