

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research.

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

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 351.—VOL. VII. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1887. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

"The Yorkshire Spiritual Telegraph".....	445	Professor Fullerton and Mr. C. C. Massey.....	451
Intuition and Mediumship. By Dr. Hübbe Schleiden.....	448	Jottings.....	453
A Word about Spiritualism. By Carl in Præl.....	448	Jacob Böhme and the Coming Race.....	454
"M.A. (Oxon.)" in Reply to Dr. Hübbe Schleiden.....	450	Prévost Paradol and Haunting ..	454
		Successful Treatment of Blindness	455
		Séance with Mr. Eglinton.....	455

NOTES BY THE WAY.

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

"THE YORKSHIRE SPIRITUAL TELEGRAPH."

Few of my readers, I imagine, are acquainted with the earliest periodical devoted to the advocacy of Spiritualism that was published in this country. I have before me a volume containing the issues of this journal, *The Yorkshire Spiritual Telegraph*, from the month of April, 1855, till its cessation (in that form) June 13th, 1857. It is an interesting record of a pioneer epoch. It was printed and published by D. W. Weatherhead, at Keighley, Yorkshire. Its earlier numbers give us a glimpse of the time when Professor Faraday propounded his theory of unconscious muscular action as explanatory of table-turning: a theory so soon to vanish in the face of motion without contact. Very instructive it is to see how these theories explode themselves. Now it is the conjuring theory; and that will go the way of the older and perhaps more reputable hypothesis.

In these far-off days more communications from spirits were printed. I wish we could have a more regular supply now, for I am strongly convinced that a general acquaintance with such messages would upset the notion that they are contradictory and worthless, and would lead thinking persons to a belief that they are, in many cases, what they pretend to be. Spirits are not omniscient, and what they say should be subjected to the same criticism as the communications of an embodied spirit. But, judged reasonably, and allowing for a margin of deception, spirit-messages carry on their face demonstrable evidence of their external origin. Critics who approach the question from a point of view destructive of any hypothesis of communion between the world of spirit and the world of matter give no fair heed to the fact that their theories do not explain the facts. They say—Faraday said—that unconscious muscular action explains the movement of tables. It does not, for they move without contact. They say that psychography is mere conjuring. It cannot be, for it occurs in the presence of people who know nothing whatever about sleight of hand. They say that nothing outside of the consciousness of a person present—they usually name the medium—is ever communicated. It is, and demonstrably. And they do not see, as they ought, or they will not admit, as they should, that even a single case of such communication of a new idea breaks down their theory. Nor do they face, as they are bound to do, the fact that, such communications being made, the people who make them with one consent

describe themselves as the spirits of departed human beings. This issue is systematically evaded.

One of the earliest numbers of the *Spiritual Telegraph* contains a good case of spirit-identity. At a circle, a person—a confirmed smoker—applied to the spirits for a remedy for a very severe pain in the side, and one Dr. Thornley communicating, gave advice. He stated that he had lived at Newton Heath, and that he died eight years ago. It is not important to record the prescription, which was, in effect, to abandon smoking. It was effective. On application made to "a respectable firm at Newton Heath" it was stated, "There was a Dr. Thornley living here who died about the time you name, and who, from our knowledge of him, would have done such a thing as is named." Next day another letter arrived saying that the first letter had been written under the impression that the advice had been given during the Doctor's lifetime, and "they concluded that someone must have known the Doctor's disposition and habits." This leads to a solemn declaration that "not a single individual in the room at that time had any knowledge whatever of such a person." This is a fair example of a vast number of cases within the experience of a vast number of Spiritualists. And in the face of them where are the conjuring and kindred hypotheses? I am ashamed to have to repeat the same wearying utterance, but the cause for it remains. And I have been led into this vein of thought just now by finding how in these ancient records there was always somebody with some nostrum that was to explain everything, and really did explain nothing except counterfeit manifestations which, if left alone, soon explain themselves.

The volume to which I am directing attention—it is too full of worthy matter for anything like adequate review—contains Professor Hare's letter to the Episcopal clergy, a valuable document which should be brought once more under notice. The present generation, I imagine, has never read it, the previous one has probably forgotten it. The number for April, 1856, contains the first announcement of the *Spiritual Herald*. The succeeding one has an announcement that a familiar name, "Dr. Lankester, of London, delivered the first of a course of lectures on 'Popular Scientific Errors,' on March 6th, at Newcastle-on-Tyne." Another familiar name, Mr. Alderman Barkas, is mentioned as having replied to the learned lecturer, who seems to have dealt chiefly with "the great sea-serpent, table-moving, and phrenology," a very mixed programme. Mr. Barkas gave some facts within his own experience, and then added, "In addition to the errors which Dr. Lankester advised his audience to avoid, I would place that of believing that scientific men know all the laws of matter and mind." He quotes very appositely Professor Mahan's admission in his *Modern Mysteries Explained and Exposed*: "We admit the facts for the all-adequate reason that they are real"; and Judge Edmond's reply to Faraday, in which he states, what I have before brought forward as destructive of the Professor's theory,

"the material fact that tables quite as frequently move when there is no hand upon them."

In June, 1856, we have the first mention of Crystal Seership, connected with the names of the late Mr. Hockley, at Croydon, and Mr. Brown at Nottingham. The latter gentleman published an account of his methods of procedure (different wholly from Mr. Hockley's, which I have heard him frequently describe): "He set apart and purified an upper room, spread a white cloth on a table in the midst, placed thereon the crystal, a vessel filled with perfumes, and a lighted lamp fed with olive oil. He then prayed that he might be divested of all evil and worldly desires, and be fitted to stand in the presence of celestial beings. The next step was to invoke Almighty God to pour down His holy and heavenly influence upon the crystal. After this followed a form of invocation to the Archangel Michael that he would permit the guardian angel of such a one to appear. When it appeared another form of inquiry was addressed to it. The Crystal Seer must bare his head and feet; on the table the crystal must be placed to the East, the lamp to the South, and the vessel of perfume to the North. . . . The spirits appeared to the Seer in the crystal, bearing a scroll, from which he transcribed the answers to his questions." Mr. Hockley, if I am right, communicated only with a spirit whom he called "The Crowned Angel," and did not seek communications for other people.

We come next upon the name of the unfortunate P. B. Randolph, "the wonderful speaking medium," who became entangled afterwards in I know not what complications of black magic and devilry. And then another name very familiar in our mouths, Thomas Lake Harris. He has wandered from the views he held when in 1856 he published the *Lyrical of the Golden Age*, a remarkable and, in many respects, very beautiful poem, said to have been delivered by spirits at various sittings in ninety-four hours. It contains 10,000 lines, and is far too little known by us of the present age. This very rapid and inadequate sketch will give some kind of idea of how things went in A.D. 1856. I hope to recur to the two succeeding volumes so far at least as to give some similar sketch of their contents.

PROFESSOR ZÖLLNER.

The *Religio-Philosophical Journal* reprints from "LIGHT," Mr. C. C. Massey's "Open Letter to Dr. Fullerton" *in extenso*, with the following Editorial comment:—

"When Professor Zöllner published to the world the report of his experiments with Slade under the title, 'Transcendental Physics,' the scientific world was profoundly moved. It could not ignore the evidence of so distinguished a scientist. The English reading public clamoured for the book, and in response to the demand Mr. C. C. Massey, of London, an accomplished gentleman and competent translator, undertook the task of putting into English the essential portions of Zöllner's investigations and treatises. He performed his task in such a thorough manner as to put it above criticism. The book has had a large reading and proved an ugly obstacle to those who wish to taboo psychical matters and to discredit a subject which so deeply touches the popular heart.

"Mr. Geo. S. Fullerton's unwise, unmanly, and unscientific method of attacking the phenomena of Spiritualism by libelling Zöllner is very completely answered in this number of the *Journal* by Mr. Massey. The result of the controversy will be an increased demand from the public for the original evidence as offered by Zöllner and translated by Massey."

OBJECTIONABLE ADVERTISEMENTS.—We see that the advertisement of "young Dr. Hammond," on which, among others, we recently commented, is too strong for American readers. A correspondent of the *Golden Gate* writes (August 27th) to remonstrate against its insertion. The editor thinks "its bombastic style was enough to condemn it." He cannot endorse anything that appears in the advertising columns which are "for sale, while under the control and subject to the regulation of the proprietor." That is so; but there is such a thing as editing; and all editors and managers can refuse to print such nonsense.

INTUITION AND MEDIUMSHIP,

To "M.A. (OXON)," Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—You have done to some remark of mine in the *Sphinx* (III. 16, p. 267) the honour of discussing it in your yesterday's leader of No. 349, and have urged there a very important question. In the main point I fully agree with you. I cannot draw an exact line of "demarcation between mediumship and genius." (Instead of "genius" I would prefer to say "intuition," as I suppose this word is in English used for wisdom, while "genius" refers more to science, art, and other phenomenal interests.) I also do not know where I "cease and other beings" (or influence) "begin." I further think that "an increased knowledge on our part will tend to more diffidence in claiming for ourselves an exclusive proprietary right in our own ideas." Truth is nobody's property, and I am very much inclined not to acknowledge any one's proprietary right in any wise and good thought. As to other thoughts, I do not think it worth while to give the question any consideration, because they refer only to temporal and phenomenal existence, and that is not what we are here concerned with, it appears. But now you ask me "to tell whether I seriously think that any laboriously scraped-up store of knowledge, be it ever so impressive, could rival in effect" that which you derived from "Imperator." My answer is twofold.

1. I think, no store of knowledge has by itself any value at all. Dead, stored up knowledge may serve very well for worldly purposes, but that is not our case here. The value of any knowledge is always something relative, and depends entirely on the capacity of the soul or spiritual entity to appropriate it. Thus, the highest philosophy may be stuff and nonsense for some one with whom at the right moment a simple proverb or a sentence from the Gospels may work wonders, while such plain truths may appear as mere trash and rubbish to some so-called highly-educated scientist who has his head crammed full of nothing but the facts and "exact" details that leave him a poor fool the moment he dies. In this relative respect, however, to the soul that assimilates it, there is a great difference in the various sorts of knowledge, not only according to its inner sense, but also to the way in which it is acquired. Speaking of the latter point first I discriminate three different sources of knowledge:

- (a) School or book-learning of facts of nature and history,
- (b) Instructions or teachings through mediumship and seership,
- (c) Personal experience and spiritual intuition.

Of these three kinds of materials which the soul can appropriate, the first (a) has scarcely any other but an earthly value; beyond this, I think, it gives only the advantage of mental training, which the soul has certainly to acquire somewhere, if not in the present life, then in another one. The last source of knowledge (c) is, on the contrary, that one from which especially the soul draws wisdom and attains perfection or spiritual consummation. As to the middle kind (b) it will be more or less valuable according as it tends more towards the last or towards the first kind. Setting aside the general insignificance and unreliability of such information in ordinary cases, it will do no, or scarcely any, good to the medium if it is received unconsciously, and is afterwards perhaps—as is often the case with regular mediums—not even understood, while it may enlighten and elevate the consciously inspired genius of the true seer, who receives such thoughts with right discrimination and is capable of assimilating their truth spiritually. So far the *concrete* or personal value of knowledge! But besides this, there is secondly,

2. I think, also a great difference in the *abstract* or

Intrinsic value of knowledge, according to the inner meaning that can be derived from it, whenever it is truly assimilated by a rightly qualified soul. As, however, this qualification, the capacity of turning knowledge into wisdom and means of atonement and redemption (both words in their mystic signification)—as this qualification of the soul differs very much, indeed, according to the stages of evolution or development it may have attained, any classification of knowledge in conformity to its intrinsic value must always be merely subjective. Who will declare himself superior to his fellow-men? He who would do so would simply thereby show that he *is not!* Objective standards of truth may be put up by perfect sages, but with us ordinary mortals such standards invariably become intolerant dogmas. If, therefore, you ask any man what *he* considers the highest source of knowledge, truth, or wisdom, this is precisely the same as asking him what is *his* ideal of manhood, of life, and of consummation. Now, you have done *me* the honour of publicly asking *me* this question, and I will not shrink from giving you my decision, with my reasons for it.

The store of knowledge which *I* think superior to that which you derived from "Imperator," is *Indian philosophy*, or the doctrine of redemption of the *jivas* (souls) by self-realisation as *atma* (pure spirit, absolute self-consciousness). This fundamental thought is at the same time, or has become, the esoteric wisdom of all ages and of all great religions, Christianity included as one of the foremost. It is also, I think, the only one that can stand the closest philosophical examination, the only one that can explain all mysteries of evolution, and the only one that accounts satisfactorily for man's past, present, and future. He who truly understands the facts of *Janma*, *Karma*, and a third one that I will not here mention, is, I think, able to answer any essential question that may be put to him, although it is doubtful whether his answer will be understood if the inquirer is unfit to do so. Such a case of being entirely misunderstood last happened to me when a remark of mine in the *Sphinx* (II. 4, p. 275) became the origin of a rather lengthy controversy on Reincarnation in "LIGHT." In that remonstrance which your correspondent "V." brought forward in No. 308 of November 27th last (p. 575), there are about as many misunderstandings as there are sentences; and when I tried afterwards to give an explanation in No. 314 of January 8th (p. 20), I doubt whether I succeeded in making myself understood any better.

With one who cannot comprehend that anything personal, anything that has form or quality, cannot be eternal, must have had a beginning, and must, therefore, somewhere have an end; with him there is, I think, no reasoning. That *Janma*, or reiterated objectivation (personification) of the impersonal and sexless, eternal soul—the divine, though self-deluded thought, the *jiva*—cannot be a rebirth of any personality, may perhaps be understood by those *only* who are capable of philosophic reasoning; for whenever this truth has been given out exoterically, it has always been distorted into some kind of foolish doctrine, for instance that of metempsychosis, or Kardec's theory of Reincarnation. So-called "Modern Spiritualism" is nothing but transcendental materialism, and will never lead any soul to perfect consummation and final redemption out of the vortex of the phenomenal world. But I doubt even whether Spiritualism is an improvement on the common sensuous materialism, as I have never found yet with any Spiritist that it tended to bring him nearer that which, as I see, is the *only* way of redemption of getting out of this turmoil of phenomenal life—namely, the rising above any personality and any attachment to phenomenal existence. On the contrary, I think Spiritualism tends very much to increase this attachment, the wish to see friends again after death, and other

sentimentalities. Not that I doubt such meeting again, or that I consider this wish unnatural; but anything that nourishes this tendency will strengthen the attachment to the phenomenal world, to which transcendental phenomenalism belongs as well as earthly life. If this, however, were all the damage done by Modern Spiritualism, it might be borne; but, unfortunately, that which the crowds of Spiritualists are running after—are not even such lawful personal yearnings, but rather the "signs and wonders without which they will not believe." I know fully well that some of these phenomenal practices are necessary for those hankering after messages from departed friends, and for these comparatively few such phenomena may be the means of fulfilling their mere human desires; by far the majority, however, satisfy but their sensationalism by these physical manifestations, materialisations, &c., and I cannot deny that the impure and unwholesome sphere of such witchery is utterly disgusting to me. Very often one hears the pretence raised that this phenomenalism is necessary in order to persuade scientists, or other materialists, by evidence. True, this may occasionally happen; but, then, is the eternal soul of such a neophyte any better off by plunging himself into this transcendental phenomenalism? I think all this will only help to produce or strengthen the common error, that the soul after death is any nearer to eternity than it is in earthly life; and this error is much more damaging to true spiritual progress and redemption of the soul than the full ignorant blindness of a conscientious and very often *unselfish* materialist or Pantheist.

There is only one fact to be brought forward in favour of transcendental phenomenalism or magic—and this fact, I do not deny, is quite sufficient to justify its promotion;—the fact is, that magic or transcendental phenomenalism seems to be indispensable for most persons to enter, or to advance, on the path of true mysticism. Magic appears to be almost universally a transitory stage necessary for the higher development of any mystic adept.

But possibly you agree with me in the dislike of mediumistic "signs and wonders," and are no admirer of physical phenomena. However, you lay great stress on the mediumistic information derived from your "guides, philosophers and friends in that unseen world of spirit." I think it would be unnatural if you did not in *your* case, upon which I have already expressed my very favourable opinion; and I do not see why not, even in other cases, mediumistic philosophers might be as much entitled to earnest attention as earthly friends and guides, according to the ideal merit of their influence. I concede this all the more readily, as in such cases we do not know where I "ceases and other beings begin." That stage or sphere of consciousness to which your soul must have soared up in order to receive the teachings of "Imperator," must, I think, be so far above our world of earthly thought and personal existence that I am inclined to think there *is* no line of demarcation "between your eternal soul and Imperator." Nevertheless, even such highest inspiration being received in this form, has *one* disadvantage when compared to analogous results of philosophic reasoning attained by the intuition of genius.

Any information that offers itself in personal form ("Imperator") is rather likely to be bound to the limits of the phenomenal and personal world; and such transcendental knowledge when personally represented, has more difficulty to strive and to rise entirely above all phenomenal existence than the abstract reasoning of a "living" philosopher, who by this very reasoning and in the very act of intuitive thinking, absolutely forgets his personal self and his phenomenal existence. True, this objection refers much more to all the other "spirit-teachings" of all ages, countries and persons, which have always differed, and are now differing, quite as much as the opinions of the living

persons, circles, religions, and other circumstances under which they came to pass. This is the reason why such "revelations" offer in themselves no guarantee of truth.

This is altogether different with philosophic wisdom founded on reasoning, the truth of which is deductively and inductively proven and which does not only satisfy *personal demands* but can be definitely controlled by any mind within the sphere of its own consciousness. Concluding, I will, however, mention, that, not only in "Modern Spiritualism," but also in true Mysticism in all ages, countries, and religions, some personal element has always been required for the instruction and training of the disciple by his master; and it stands to reason that we cannot entirely dispense with it while we actually are persons, and feel ourselves entirely as personalities. But I think there is a great difference, whether such a guide is accepted as a disembodied soul in the transcendental sphere, or as a living being in possession of *all* his faculties of spirit, soul, and body. Such a philosophic friend is much more likely to remain always fully aware of the fact that the transcendental sphere has no preponderance whatever, but rather is a disadvantage in our present sphere of existence, where we are in possession of all possible means of finding out and verifying the truth. Such human sages have never been missing as personal instructors, wherever esoteric teachings have been given out; and such personal guidance is also required for us in our present sphere of consciousness, in order to lead the way to the self-realisation of the final truth of *Indian philosophy*.

Neuhausen bei München. HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN.
September 11th, 1887.

A WORD ABOUT SPIRITUALISM.*

BY CARL DU PREL.

Translated by "V."

Spiritualists and their opponents are agreed upon one point, and that is that the present state of things in regard to Spiritualism is a scandal, and that it is quite time that some decision should be arrived at upon the subject. On the one side, in civilised countries there is, we may say, a daily increasing number of Spiritualists—these may be reckoned at the very least at ten millions—and with every year a growing number of journals and publications advocating with great energy these new views; while on the other side, after the period of contemptuous silence has passed over, the vehemence of opponents wages ever fiercer and fiercer.

When a cause has such enthusiastic adherents, and at the same time such bitter adversaries, it may readily be conceived that it is not so easy to arrive at a decisive and definite judgment. Such a thing almost always lies half-way between the two, and demands concessions on both sides; it can only be the result of cool, well-weighed reasoning, and, therefore, can never be arrived at as long as the combat is conducted with passion or animus.

The excitement on both sides is quite comprehensible. Spiritualism appeals as much to the heart as it does to the mind. The deepest impulse in the human breast is the desire to live; but Spiritualism strives to prove the fact of immortality, not only by arguments but by evidence. The greatest grief in life is the loss of those dear to us; Spiritualism proves that we still can communicate with our lost ones, that they can even appear to us in visible form, and that finally we shall be re-united to them. Views which offer to satisfy thus the deepest yearnings of the human heart must naturally be welcomed enthusiastically by those who adopt them.

On the other side, men at the present time, owing to the weight they are apt to give to a scientific study of things, a study which through the popularity of science has penetrated into the lower strata of society, have become so doubtful of the fact of immortality, and especially of communion with the dead, that they meet the assertions of Spiritualists with the deepest mistrust. It is true that up to a certain age we are all brought up with *religious views*, which are to some extent in accordance with those of Spiritualism; but directly this period is over, those

young persons who do not at once enter upon practical life, but continue their education, are led in quite a contrary direction. While we were yet school boys, we were examined from the Catechism; but in the next stage of our education, be it at the University or in some technical institution, we are instructed in views exactly the opposite, which give no credit to anything of a supersensual nature, and we often prematurely fall into materialism as the self-evident outcome of modern science. Now, as science enjoys a high reputation, its dicta, resting as they do upon exact research and partly even upon experimental evidence, are looked upon as unquestionable and not to be doubted or criticised like religious dogmas, and so the student considers that he possesses views which are beyond the reach of question; and now he thinks these views are assailed by Spiritualism.

It is thus explained why both parties are more under the influence of emotion than of clear reason; too much is admitted on the one side while the other party are too contemptuous, and unfortunately the subject is not sufficiently studied by either.

No weight can be allowed in a scientific sense to the fact that the teachings of Spiritualism correspond with the wants of the soul, for the wish and the truth are often in opposition. But on the other side it must be admitted that Spiritualism is supported by facts, against which its opponents have only arguments to advance. Now as it is acknowledged that ideas have to be founded on facts and not the reverse, facts cannot be disproved simply by means of reasoning. To this end the facts of Spiritualism are capable of experimental inquiry, while the arguments brought against it all take for granted the impossibility of the facts themselves, before even proceeding to examine them. In every hand-book of logic it stands written that only that which is a *logical* contradiction, such, for instance, as that iron is made of wood, is an impossibility, and that everything else is possible. Spirit manifestations and apparitions of the dead are not therefore to be condemned as logical impossibilities, and the fact that from the standpoint of the ruling opinions they appear to be impossible has no weight whatever. The opponents now are driven to the assertion that Spiritualistic phenomena are the work of trickery and imposture, and in proof of this point out various conjurers who are capable of imitating several of the phenomena in question, such, for instance, as slate-writing or spirit-forms. A vast number of things may be imitated which, however, are none the less real. We are not justified in denying the works of nature, because a landscape may be reproduced by painting, and it does not follow that because apparitions *may* be produced by an arrangement of mirrors, all ghosts *must* be brought forth by this means.

Opponents of Spiritualism say, too, that it is just the leaders of science who do not wish to know anything about it, who are the persons called upon to give judgment, and not the ordinary public. But this is not altogether the truth; science is only called upon for an *explanation* of the facts; the *existence* of the facts themselves can be proved by anyone. It is not necessary to be a professor in order to make use of one's eyesight, and discoveries of all kinds have been made by ordinary persons. The adverse attitude of most *savants* is not, therefore, the result of their inquiries, but of their unwillingness to make any inquiries at all; conduct which would be unallowable in any other branch of science, because it would be so unscientific. I, for my part, at least, have always met with rebuffs when I have invited any of these gentlemen to take part in Spiritualistic experiments.

Now, however, that Spiritualism is spreading so rapidly, many eminent scientific men have felt it their duty to examine the phenomena, and everyone who has done so thoroughly has been converted from a Saul into a Paul. The number of professors who have become converted to Spiritualism increases each year. They are to be found in England, Germany, France, Austria, and Russia, and amongst them are names of considerable importance in every branch of science, physics, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, biology, and philosophy. These have come to the conclusion that the phenomena are real, that they depend upon natural laws, and that every branch of science may derive great benefit from the study of the subject. On the other hand, the most expert conjurers have declared that Spiritualistic phenomena do *not* lie within their domain.

It is, therefore, untrue that Spiritualism is universally condemned by men of science. The real fact is that all those *savants* who have examined the subject deeply have become converts; while those who deny the truth confess, when they are questioned, that their judgment is not the result of personal

* Supplement to *Vom Fels zum Meer*.

experience, but of the experience of others. This is called "a priorism," which is one of the deadliest sins in the catechism of logic.

The amazement called forth by the phenomena of Spiritualism, and the inclination thereby produced to deny them altogether, are due principally to the fact that they form a sort of climax, and although accessory phenomena are not failing, these are too little known or studied. One of this class is that of somnambulism. It not only makes the Spiritualism of our time comprehensible, but throws light upon past periods of culture. All that has been narrated by competent witnesses in the most ancient times about Hindoo mystics, the secrets hidden behind the temple walls of Egypt and Greece, the powers of Alexandrian philosophers, the Christian saints, or the mediæval witches and magicians—all this, looked at from the standpoint of modern "enlightenment," seems utter nonsense, while it becomes quite intelligible as soon as somnambulism and Spiritualism come forward in explanation.

It is quite hopeless to attempt to understand Spiritualism unless one is grounded in the study of somnambulism. It is sufficient to bring forward one reason for this: If man is immortal, the idea that death brings forth new faculties is quite contrary to the doctrine of development. It is only permitted to imagine that we retain a portion of our earthly faculties, or that powers which in earth life were latent, after death become developed. Now somnambulists show latent faculties very different from the normal ones. From the somnambulant condition we may, therefore, draw some conclusions relative to our future state of being, and, in fact, those versed in the study of somnambulism cannot fail to see the analogy that exists between the faculties of somnambulists and those of so-called spirits.

The most important among all the kindred topics now under inquiry which throw light upon Spiritualism is, therefore, somnambulism. This subject was brought again before the notice of European scientists by Mesmer, and is by no means sufficiently recognised and studied. Hansen's performances have in late years caused a revolution in its favour. The preliminary cry of fraud was soon silenced, and under the new name of hypnotism, *savants* undertook fresh experiments, with most extraordinary results. The medical schools of Paris and Nancy are especially to be noticed in regard to this subject, German physicians unfortunately being left far behind. We recommend persons who take interest in these wonderful phenomena to consult the *Review of Hypnotism*, which began its career in July, 1886, and to read the books mentioned in it.

It is in itself a matter of indifference that the boundary line between hypnotism and somnambulism must for some time yet be undetermined. It is equally a matter of indifference which method, the hypnotic or magnetic, be made use of to place persons in a condition of somnambulism. But it is a fact that as long ago as 1831 the Academy of Paris admitted the faculties ascribed to somnambulists, after an inquiry lasting over five years, and that now the Professors of Paris and Nancy again acknowledge various phenomena, the existence of which has been asserted by magnetisers during the last 100 years, but has been obstinately denied by learned *savants*.*

If the aforesaid Professors will only follow up the researches they have begun with so much energy, it cannot fail but that they, too, will witness phenomena familiar to magnetisers though not as yet to hypnotisers. I will go further than this: even the boundary line between somnambulism and Spiritualism is a movable one and hypnotisers will meet with Spiritualistic phenomena before they have finished. I will content myself with citing an instance which occurred at a time when Spiritualism—which only dates from 1848—was unknown in Europe. I have in my library a book containing the correspondence between two celebrated physicians, who both recognised magnetism as well as somnambulism and made use of them as remedial agents in their practice. The title of this book is: "*Recherches Psychologiques sur la Cause des Phénomènes Extraordinaires observés chez les modernes voyans, improprement dites Somnambules Magnétiques, ou Correspondance sur le Magnétisme entre un Solitaire et M. Deleuze.*" Par G. P. Billot, Docteur en Médecine. Paris. Albanet et Martin, 1839. 2 tms." In this there is an account of a consultation on October 17th, 1820. A lady who was partially blind went to consult Dr. Billot's somnambulist, to ask his advice. In the dramatic manner which is usual with sleep-walkers, the somnambulist set before her the vision of a maiden

who held out to her the plant necessary for her cure. The physician did not expect much from this, because at that cold season he thought it would be impossible to procure such a plant in blossom. While, however, he was going to make inquiries where these plants were to be found, the lady cried out that at that very moment a plant of this species in full bloom was lying in the castle. The physician recognised it as a specimen of the red-blossomed pepper plant, but how and whence the plant came there could not be discovered. In his answer to this letter Dr. Deleuze, too, speaks of an eminent physician in Paris, who had told him of similar cases. Now these are instances of spiritual *apport* in the year 1820.

From the continuity, therefore, which exists between hypnotism, somnambulism, and Spiritualism it is not difficult to prophesy that if the Paris and Nancy doctors continue their experiments with zeal they will eventually meet with Spiritualistic phenomena as well.

The highest form of Spiritualistic manifestations are materialisations; and the fact of these is utterly and entirely denied; but if we make use of our reason it is not necessary to exercise any wonderful gift of comprehension to recognise the possibility of materialisations. Darwin remarks in the later editions of his *Origin of Species*, that he had undervalued the spontaneous appearance of varieties, and even in the first edition he says that natural selection, though it may be the most important, is not the only means for a variety of the life form.

* * * * *

When we have arrived at a correct conception of what the soul is, and recognise the fact that it is organised as well as capable of thought, it follows that materialisations are not only possible, but necessary. There is really nothing whatever to be asserted against the possibility of phantoms, who—as proved by Professor Crookes in London—can present themselves in a visible form, in which the beating of the heart and pulse are discerned, and who, further, can converse with us as intelligent beings and may be photographed together with the medium on the same plate, by which fact the suspicion of personation on the part of the medium, or of hallucination on that of the spectators, is fully disproved. When we remember that Crookes's medium was a young girl, almost a child, that he carried on his researches with her during four years in his own study, and with every conceivable precaution and test, we must acknowledge that the results of his experiments in this domain are proved as conclusively as were those in chemistry, which he made through the retort when he discovered "thallium." The only difference is—and this it is alone that makes incredulity conceivable—that in a scientific age the belief in chemical experiments is become a habit of the mind, while our reasoning faculties need a longer time to become accustomed to the fact of materialisations. Till that time is expired we are apt to confound the unusual with the impossible.

Every truth at the outset is laughed at as a paradox; but when it has overcome the fight for existence, then it is looked upon as quite commonplace. This will be the case with Spiritualism; mental progress—and it will be the same thing with Spiritualism—does not advance in a straight, but in a spiral, line. It consists not in receding further and further from former views or opinions, but in coming back to these over again only in a higher form. We might give vent to the paradox that all progress is reactionary. The apparitions of the Middle Ages seem, to modern enlightenment, to have dissolved into nothing; but now they reappear in modified form on a higher step of the ladder of knowledge. Nature, which we thought we had fully explored and come to the bottom of, has surprised us once more by the discovery of one of her secrets, to explore which will be the task of the next century.*

MRS. WESLEY, writing to her son Samuel, said: "I am not one of those that will believe nothing supernatural, but am rather inclined to think there would be frequent intercourse between good spirits and us, did not our deep lapse into sensuality prevent it."

THE meaning of "Thus Saith the Lord": An Unconventional Inquiry into the Origin, Structure, Contents, and Authority of the Old Testament. Seven Lectures by John Page Hopps. Price sixpence. Published by Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden, London, or direct from the author (Leicester) on receipt of the price named.—[ADVT.]

* The conclusion of this essay, which describes a séance with Mr. Eglinton, at Munich, was published in "LIGHT" of July 2nd.—Tr.

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 :

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24th, 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.

DR. HÜBBE SCHLEIDEN ON INTUITION AND MEDIUMSHIP.

The interesting communication from Dr. Hübbe Schleiden, printed in another column, is a little at cross purposes with my meaning. In the *Sphinx* the Doctor, in the course of a disquisition on the terms Occultism and Spiritism, wrote, in effect, respecting my *Spirit Teachings*, "that they were exceptional communications of high moral and intellectual import." After some flattering allusions to myself, he stated that mediums of such a character are rare: but it was scarcely to be doubted that if such a medium had worked out for himself similar teachings with full consciousness, and with a sense of personal responsibility for what he was producing, the result would have been of incomparably higher value both *for himself* and for the world. Roughly put, that is, I believe, the substance of Dr. Hübbe Schleiden's original criticism. I have italicised the words that I had in mind in my comments in "LIGHT" of September 10th.

I expressly put aside the question whether the subject-matter of anything which for the purposes of the present argument may be assumed to have been my own unaided work, would or would not be likely to be better than the communications of "Imperator." Considering the method by which the mass of those "Teachings" was given, it may be conceded that careful study, and the normal exercise of such faculties as I possess, might have produced something that contained more important subject-matter. I do not contest that point. For I have never laid any very special stress upon the mere matter contained in these communications. I have had my attention fixed on the manner in which they were given, and on the tremendous import that this evidence of the existence of a highly-developed intelligence with a noble moral consciousness, so evidenced, had for me.

It may well be that the stores of human learning contain much that is incomparably more philosophical, more profound in knowledge. But all this was open to me, and I had access to it. It was not merely that "Imperator" taught me, stirred my mind, disencumbered it of old and worn out ideas, replacing them with what I learned to regard as both true and beautiful—he did all that: but it was the way in which it was done that was the impressive thing to me. This evidence of a high order of thought, as Dr. Hübbe Schleiden frankly admits it to be—external, as I believed, and still believe, to my own mind—came at a time when it produced an effect that nothing else could have produced: not the excogitation of an elaborate system of

philosophy, though I might conceivably have been incalculably benefited intellectually by the process.

And here is the precise point where Dr. Hübbe Schleiden slightly misunderstands my question. I did not intend to ask him what "store of knowledge he thinks *superior* to that which I derived." I intended rather to fix his mind on the revolution in my thought which the conviction of disembodied life so brought to me by the fact of these communications necessarily produced. And I intended to draw a comparison between the priceless possession of this assured conviction and the attainment of any other conceivable knowledge. I am not precluded by having this from pursuing my search for truth in any direction that the bent of my mind might lead to. I may turn philosopher yet: or I may revel in the store of knowledge that is laid up for me by the researches of other people. But a lifetime of study, of the most fascinating thought, of the exercise of that creative faculty so dear to the mind that exercises it, would not have had the same effect as this.

And this feeling is not at all lessened by the consideration that I am unable to fix any exact line of demarcation between intuition and mediumship. I am by no means disposed to pin down the intervention of spirit to what is commonly known as mediumship. That is one objective form in which spirit-agency may most easily be demonstrated. Whether or not modern Spiritualism at large may properly be described as "nothing but transcendental materialism," I will not stop to inquire. I am prepared to admit that what goes by the name in popular language and estimation is only too amenable to the charge. Nor have I ever contended, I do not here contend, that any salvation, such as Dr. Hübbe Schleiden has in mind, is to be found in such Spiritualism as he defines. The redemption from the turmoil of this phenomenal life, the rising above any personality and any attachment to phenomenal existence, are not to be had by any such means. But they may perhaps more readily be had by those who have passed through a course of experience which has satisfied them of the truths which Spiritualism teaches, than by those who have never possessed the advantage of such training. It is not that what Dr. Hübbe Schleiden understands by the word Spiritualism is bad in itself; it is the resting in it, the absorption in the phenomenal, the wonder-hunting, the selfish gratification of a morbid craving, it is these and such as these that are bad and worthless.

There is one remark that I have passed over hitherto, but it is too important to be ignored. My correspondent has been discussing my observation that I do not feel able to say "where *I* cease, and other beings begin." And he continues, "That stage or sphere of consciousness to which your soul must have soared up to receive the teachings of 'Imperator,' must, I think, be so far above our world of earthly thought and personal existence that I am inclined to think there *is* no line of demarcation between your eternal soul and 'Imperator.'" That, I know, is the contention of a certain school of thought of which Theosophists form part. I can find in my experience no warrant for it. At times, I was, no doubt, in a state of great exaltation, as, for instance, while the message (p. 280 of *Spirit Teachings*) was given. But as a rule I was by no means so affected. I went about my daily work, doing it neither better nor worse than usual. I was wholly unconscious of being caught up into any superior sphere of consciousness to receive these teachings. And finally as to the line of demarcation: if I cannot fix it with certainty I can at least say that nothing is more clear to my mind than that this Intelligence, however inter-blended with my own, was distinct and separate from myself.

I thank Dr. Hübbe Schleiden in conclusion for his very interesting communication, which I am glad to have been the means of eliciting. "M. A. (OXON.)"

A LETTER FROM PROFESSOR FULLERTON TO
MR. C. C. MASSEY.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I have received the enclosed letter from Professor George S. Fullerton, and, of course, hasten to comply with the request contained in it, that I would send it for publication to the journal in which my own "Open Letter" to Professor Fullerton has appeared. I shall be obliged by its insertion in your next number, with the remarks I have appended to it.—Your obedient servant,

September 16th.

C. C. MASSEY.

Philadelphia.

September 2nd, 1887.

DEAR SIR,—Some little time has elapsed since I received your "Open Letter," with the accompanying note, and has been spent in looking among my papers, until yesterday without result, for a letter and enclosed paper, which I received from you at my lodgings in London a day or two after my call upon you, and which I here return to you. I have looked for them a number of times during the past year, but heretofore fruitlessly. Upon finding them, I discover that you justly complain of the inaccuracy of the passage in which I refer to your evidence of Zöllner's soundness of mind, and I am, of course, glad to acknowledge and correct the error. As the opening pages of your letter do not, however, seem to me to quite correctly describe the occurrences of the visit I paid you, and, as they stand, would impute to me a discourtesy of which I should be sorry to be guilty, I will state in a few words my remembrance of my visit, which seems to me to be clear, though I have no notes made at the time to which I can refer.

When I called upon you I had every reason to believe that you were aware that I had been taking some trouble to gather evidence from the survivors of the Slade-Zöllner investigation. Indeed, I had been informed by a friend in London that you were present at a meeting of the Society for Psychical Research (or perhaps of the Council—I do not remember) at which he had read a letter from me touching upon the matter, and that you had spoken on the subject, showing some feeling. Moreover, at the time of the visit I referred to some of the evidence I had collected in Germany, though I did not go into it in detail, and I asked you very directly—I feel sure that you are mistaken upon this point—upon what you based your opinion as to Zöllner's mental condition at the time of the investigation. You then referred to Baron Hellenbach, and tried to find among your papers a manuscript translation of the passage in which he defends Zöllner. Not finding this, you turned to Hellenbach's book and looked for the passage. It was then, finding some difficulty in turning to it, that you let the matter drop for the time, saying (a fact of which there is no mention in your "Open Letter") that you would send me the passage afterwards. I have not the slightest recollection of any mention of your other authority (the letter you had seen from the Spiritist resident at Leipzig at the time of Zöllner's death). Nor is there in the letter from you, which accompanied the passage from Hellenbach, any mention of other authority. I supposed, I think very naturally, that you had given me all your evidence, and, since I had it in writing from yourself, that there could be no mistake about its accuracy. And I certainly thought that you clearly understood that the evidence furnished would go with the rest that I had collected. So far, I do not feel that I have anything to regret.

On receiving your letter I read it and the enclosure, and put them away with the other papers relating to the same matter. On preparing, under some pressure, my notes for publication, I could not find your letter, with what it contained, though I searched for it long and diligently. I thought it safe to depend upon my memory, and, under the impression at the time that the enclosure was a letter from Baron Hellenbach to yourself, wrote the misstatement which you have criticised.

I can only account for my memory's having so played me false on this occasion (for it is on the whole, I think, an accurate one), by the fact that I relied upon what was written, and thought I could refer to it at the proper time. This by way of explanation, not of excuse, for I dislike inaccuracy as much as anyone, and disapprove very heartily of the bit of carelessness. The plates will be altered and the statement corrected in the next edition, now about to come out. I regret the inaccuracy the more because it is quite possible that the injustice done to yourself has had something to do with the tone of irritation observable in your letter, and with what seems to me a lack of calmness and fairness. Some of your suggestions seem to me well worthy of the serious consideration of any one who desires to form a just estimate of all the evidence to be obtained; but a number of your criticisms do not appear to me just, nor based upon a dispassionate examination of the notes which I have printed. As, however, I have no evidence except the notes that I brought home with me, and as I have printed all of them (with one unimportant exception to be mentioned presently), it does not seem to be desirable to point out in detail what, I think, anyone may readily see for himself by an examination of evidence now as much in his hands

as in mine. I have printed the notes precisely as I received them, adding nothing at all from mere memory of my conversations with the gentlemen mentioned. I am not conscious of any desire to make the evidence seem better than it is, nor to defend it if it can be successfully impugned. Such as it is, I think it should be carefully considered by anyone who desires to form a just estimate of the value of Zöllner's book, and has any knowledge of the ways of Dr. Henry Slade.

To two points, upon which I have perhaps given cause for misapprehension, I will refer before closing. The first is the question why I did not take care to have my evidence more complete and full before I left Germany. Now the proper object of my visit to Germany was to look into the teaching of philosophy in the German Universities, and the requirements for University degrees. I had been asked by one of my colleagues before I left home to try in Leipzig to have anything extant from Zöllner's effects photographed for the use of our Commission. I had this in mind on my journey, but did not then know that I would have the privilege of meeting the four men whom I afterwards met. My time in Germany was quite limited, but noticing from the *Universitäts-Kalender* that the men who assisted Zöllner in his investigation were still living, and within reach, it seemed to me very desirable to find out whether these men were fitted satisfactorily to investigate phenomena occurring through such a man, as we had very good reason to believe Slade to be. (See our Preliminary Report.)

The results of my interviews are my published notes, which would, no doubt, have been much better had my time and opportunities been more favourable; but which, nevertheless, seemed to my colleagues significant and worthy of mention. The one bit of testimony that I have not published is the following statement by Professor Scheibner, which I copy from my note-book, where it stands at the end of his testimony, and is marked (10):—

"Professor Scheibner thinks that if anything is extant from among Zöllner's effects it can be found with Herr Oscar von Hofmann, Augustus Platz, 7, I, Leipzig. This gentleman is a Spiritist, and it was through him that Slade and Zöllner met."

I went to the home of Herr von Hofmann, and was informed by a person, apparently a servant, that the family was away on a journey. As the information given me in the note led to nothing, I did not think it worth while to incorporate this note with the others on the copy which I sent to Professor Scheibner for correction, or to print it.

The second point to which I would refer, is the question of Fechner's disease. I feel sure that I have not antedated this, for he himself referred, in his talk with me, to his defective vision as a cause of the unsatisfactory character of his own observations at the time of the investigation. But as the appearance of his eyes was, to me, distressing, and as he spoke only in general terms, I felt a certain hesitancy in writing down a plain statement of his disease, elicited by a direct question, and reading it to him for his approval. Note (2) of his testimony I thought sufficient. But the fact of his peculiar disability seemed to me generally admitted, for two professors, whom I visited on other business (one at Leipzig and the other at Berlin), and to whom I mentioned incidentally this matter, as well as the evidence concerning Zöllner's mental disease and Fechner's defective vision, both spoke of these things as generally known, and the man in Berlin added that it was a knowledge of just these things that had prevented the investigation from making much impression upon him, and upon some of his colleagues. I mention these things, not because I look upon such reminiscences as at all of the same value as written notes approved by the men who are the sources of evidence, but merely to show that I have not voluntarily turned the evidence in one way rather than another, nor been purposely indifferent to any evidence which seemed at the time within my reach. Upon such a point as this last one, controversy seems unnecessary, as I should think the existence or non-existence of a palpable bodily disease of somewhat recent date could be better settled in another way.

You will do me a favour, my dear sir, if you will print this letter in the journal in which your own appeared, and (if you have no objection) with it the letter from yourself to me in London and its enclosure.—I remain, sincerely yours,

GEORGE S. FULLERTON.

Mr. C. C. Massey,
Lincoln's Inn, London.

1, Albert Mansions, Victoria-street, S.W.

August 18th, 1886.

DEAR PROFESSOR FULLERTON,—Enclosed is the passage from Hellenbach which I failed to find the other day when you were here. I must add that *no one has ever alleged a single circumstance of evidence for the allegation that Zöllner was of unsound mind, other than those very facts* which provoked the hostility against him, viz., his testimony to Slade's phenomena, and his opposition to vivisection. These facts alone were sufficient for the invention of this malicious and mendacious rumour, which was never heard of till after Zöllner's death. He retained his professorship at Leipzig, I believe, to the last, and you will judge if that is at all consistent with the fact of his being known to be insane, in any allowable sense of that term. The

underlineations in enclosed extract represent Hellenbach's own italics.

Pray do not let this trouble you for a reply. I only wish that you should see this evidence of Z.'s friend and correspondent.—Yours very truly,

C. C. MASSEY.

[The extract referred to in the above letter has already been published in the "Open Letter to Professor Fullerton," and therefore need not be repeated here.—C. C. M.]

As regards the circumstances of Professor Fullerton's visit to me last year, I can only repeat that I did not understand it to have a special object. That I afterwards wrote him the letter he now returns to me—which I had forgotten—was, of course, quite naturally due to my wish to substantiate the reference I had made in conversation, and does not at all imply that I was responding to a formal request for the grounds of my belief in Zöllner's sanity. As to my saying, at the time I failed to find the passage, that I would send it afterwards, I have no recollection on that point and do not dispute Professor Fullerton's. I probably did say so, and probably should have said so if the citation had been one of merely academical interest, as no one likes to fail to give chapter and verse for an authority he has alleged. But I should certainly have persevered in my search at the time, had I at all supposed that it concerned the main object of my visitor in calling upon me. It was just a quite different impression which elicited some remark I made when I laid the book aside. A common interest in the general question of psychical research seemed to be the motive of our making each other's acquaintance. But I readily acknowledge that if I said I would send on the passage from Hellenbach, that sufficiently disposes of my suggestion that Professor Fullerton showed indifference to the evidence by his failure to press for it at the time.

I have never said that I told Professor Fullerton of the letter of the Spiritist resident at Leipzig at the time of Zöllner's death. I said, "I may or may not" have mentioned this, implying that if I did not, that showed how little there was in my mind any sense that I was responding to a demand for evidence.

No doubt I was aware that Professor Fullerton had been making some inquiries at Leipzig. But I should infer from my letter to him on August 18th last year, that I did not appreciate the fact that he considered himself to have elicited important evidence of Zöllner's insanity, or I should not have so completely ignored his inquiries in writing to him, and as a mere matter of courtesy I should have expressed myself otherwise than I did with regard to the absence of evidence. I think I must have regarded his inquiries as bearing rather on the value of the testimony of Zöllner's colleagues to the phenomena with Slade, than on any question of Zöllner's sanity. True, I had heard Mr. Pearsall Smith's statement at the meeting of the Psychical Society, but it had passed very much out of my mind, and I failed to connect it in memory with Professor Fullerton's name. In the abridged report of the *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research* (July, 1886) I do not find that Mr. Pearsall Smith gave any details from Professor Fullerton on the point in question, or anything to raise the statement that Zöllner was "diseased in mind," above the level of mere prejudiced and vague hearsay. And as such I see I treated it on that occasion. And when I met Professor Fullerton I did not at all recall that he was the person who had been cited by Mr. Smith. Certainly I did not know that Professor Fullerton's "evidence," whatever it was, was to be published in a report. Nor, it seems, would Professor Fullerton himself have then known that, for he was not commissioned by his colleagues to make these inquiries, which were also foreign to the purpose of original investigation to which the Seybert Commission had decided to limit itself. Still less did I know, or could I infer, that I was being "interviewed" with a view to a report. Had I known that I was being asked, with that view, why I believed Zöllner not to have been insane, my reply would have been simply, in the first instance, "Because I have not seen any evidence that he was." I should not for one moment have admitted a *primâ facie* case of insanity, which needed rebuttal by positive evidence to the contrary, or have consented to such a transfer of the *onus probandi*, as would be implied by the demand to adduce evidence of sanity, in the absence of any presentable evidence on the other side. But I had no wish to keep Professor Fullerton, individually, at logical arm's length in this way. I was really anxious that he should not be prejudiced against Zöllner's evidence, and therefore I urged upon him a bit

of positive testimony which I thought adapted to disabuse him of an erroneous impression. This well-intended attempt seemed to me quite spontaneous, but it may well be that my visitor asked me the question he says he asked me, in the course of our conversation. I have not denied that; I have only said that I have no recollection of it. The point is that Professor Fullerton said nothing to make me understand that I was in presence of a reporter, and, as it were, on my defence before the public for a statement I had made.

But the recovery of my letter of August 18th of last year, with the passage underlined in it, shows exactly my position, viz., that there was *no evidence* of insanity; and had I recollected that letter when I wrote my pamphlet reply to Professor Fullerton, his misrepresentation of my position in regard to the allegation of Zöllner's insanity would have seemed to me far more extraordinary than it did.

But, in truth, I cared extremely little for what concerned myself personally, which merely offered the first occasion for the criticism on which I was really intent. Professor Fullerton thinks he discovers a tone of irritation and a lack of calmness and fairness in this criticism. It is so obviously natural for him to think this that I almost wonder he has thought it worth while to say it. But in case any impartial person should consider that there is any acidity in the style of my criticism, I may point out, with reference to the suggestion that this is traceable to personal resentment, that I had already, according to Professor Fullerton's informant, shown "some feeling" on the same subject, at a meeting of the Society for Psychical Research, at a date when certainly no personal provocation existed to animate my expressions. I am so constituted that I am made indignant by attempts to hustle out of sight formidable evidence for unacceptable facts, to get rid of a formidable witness, by imputations which will not bear a moment's critical examination, but which escape such examination because they favour the preconceptions of the public, or of those by whom the public is led. And when I see the rotten evidential supports of such imputations being carefully propped up to be made to look substantial to this uncritical public, and when I hear the loud acclaims of happy prejudice, announcing its myths as established facts, it is possible that some accent of irritation may be observable in a criticism not substantially unound. And perhaps discussion is not more lowered by such a tone—if it is really discoverable—than by the suggestion that this failure of suavity is attributable to personal pique. I hope it is not incomprehensible to Professor Fullerton—who has himself rather unnecessarily (though appositely for my present purpose) referred to the "feeling" he is informed that I displayed on the same subject at an earlier date—that I can have been indignant on Zöllner's account, and on account of what I believe to be the interests of truth. But as to my lack of fairness, I can only meet that charge when I am shown wherein the unfairness is thought to consist. At present I can only say that I was careful always to quote *verbatim* from Professor Fullerton's notes and comments, omitting nothing which could add to their force,* or put another colour upon them.

I find nothing further calling for observation in the above letter till I come to the statement about Fechner and his cataract, which Professor Fullerton feels sure he has not antedated. He now supplements his published and even his written notes of his conversation with Fechner, by the statement that the latter himself referred to his defective vision, as a cause of the unsatisfactory character of his own observations at the time of the investigation. As this statement did not go down upon the notes, and was therefore not submitted to Fechner for revision, we are unable to apply any test to the accuracy of Professor Fullerton's understanding and recollection of what Fechner said on the point. But it is as certain as any fact can be made by negative evidence, that as late as 1879—about two years after the investigation—Fechner himself did not consider his sight to have been impaired when he gave, as he says in the book I cited, his "closest attention" to the phenomena he witnessed, "without being able to discover any deception." Fancy such a man as Fechner talking of his "closest attention," in a case of visual observation, if he knew that he was suffering from cataract and was "partly blind" at the time, without saying a word about this defect! And that when

* I forgot to notice one statement: that Zöllner himself apprehended insanity. Of course he did, being a nervous man, and having seen it in his family. But I believe it is just the people who apprehend insanity who never go mad.

he was actually intent on reducing the value of his testimony! In 1879 he regarded his own evidence of what he saw in 1877 as insufficient, not, for anything that appears in his deliberate and published statement, on the ground of any visual defect, but because the sittings at which he was present "were not among the most decisive," and because he was rather "a mere looker-on" than "an experimenter." It may be conceded that his testimony to the phenomena is not of very high importance; but it is not unimportant that Professor Fullerton should have disparaged Weber's testimony to Zöllner's sanity, partly because Weber failed to notice a defect in Fechner's sight which could hardly have been discoverable at that date if it then existed at all, except by an oculist's examination. Professor Fullerton, of course, did not know of Fechner's published statement in 1879, and the omission of any mention of the cataract then; but it might surely have occurred to him that the cataract could not have been observable by Weber, if it had made so little progress that Fechner himself was willing to take a spectator's part in an investigation of this character. Now, we can gauge an inquirer's disposition by his neglect to probe certain testimony, and by his willingness to make use of certain arguments, to clutch, as it were, at such straws of contention as this desperate attempt to reduce the force of Weber's testimony to Zöllner's perfect sanity, far better than by his general professions of entire fairness and impartiality.

It is, of course, quite conceivable that in 1886 Fechner may himself have antedated his infirmity. But it is impossible to deal seriously with notes of evidence, liable to be supplemented by long subsequent memory of particulars requisite to give them any value, on a point which has been called in question. With the suggestion at the close of the letter, that such a fact as the existence or non-existence, in 1877, of Fechner's cataract, should be capable of establishment, I quite agree, and it seems to me that Professor Fullerton ought to include decisive evidence on this point in the new edition of the Seybert Report. A literary man would be nearly certain, at the first symptom of disease of the eyes, to consult an oculist, who would have a note of the date, even if the patient had not. But Fechner himself could probably say, from some memorandum more reliable than mere recollection, at about what time the disease became so observable, or so notorious, that another person would be aware of it. For that is the point.

But when we are told now of a couple of professors who spoke to Professor Fullerton of Fechner's cataract and Zöllner's mental disease "as generally known," I do not put the objection to this sort of gossip on the ground that Professor Fullerton did not take a note of it at the time, for had he done so it would only have increased my surprise at his extraordinary notions of evidence. These two gentlemen, in common with half Germany, hear from the party of prejudice that Zöllner was mad, that Fechner's cataract dated back to 1877, &c., and they accept these statements as evidence of "generally known" facts, and, of course, are therefore not to be impressed by the investigation of phenomena by these men. *Voilà tout.* But it is not without significance that Professor Fullerton was impressed by this sort of hearsay, or that he should talk of it as "general admission."

Professor Fullerton's letter is partly occupied by a vindication of his fair and scrupulous publication of his notes of evidence, without regard to their bearing on one side or the other. I have not impugned this, nor has a doubt of it ever occurred to me. Any suggestion against Professor Fullerton's good faith would, in my view, transgress the limits of decent discussion.

What has actuated me in making, perhaps, rather too much of this matter is the sense that the reception and criticism of evidence are regulated by altogether different standards, according to the bearing of the evidence, as for or against the recognition of occult phenomena. To illustrate this fallacy of the public judgment, which has been loud in its proclamations of the value of Professor Fullerton's report about Zöllner, is perhaps not altogether useless.

September 17th.

C. C. MASSEY.

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.

JOTTINGS.

There are many interesting and curious facts in *The Spiritual Philosopher* which will be new to our readers. Some of these we propose to extract, for the generations of Spiritualists are short, and the records of even a much later date than 1850 are little known.

* * *

We believe, though we are not sure, that the first paper dealing with psychical matters was published in America for a few months in 1838, by Dr. Underhill. It was called *The Annals of Magnetism*, and was succeeded by *The Magnet*, published in New York in 1842. *The Spiritual Philosopher* was begun in July, 1850.

* * *

The first traceable spiritual manifestation in Boston, U.S.A., is said to have been made to Mrs. Dickinson, in Fayette-street. The raps occurred in the presence of herself and daughter, on the doors, on the sides of the room, in different parts of the house. This occurred soon after the ladies had read the account of the "Rochester Knockings." They were much frightened, and at their request the manifestations ceased.

* * *

The Spiritual Philosopher contains in its first number an account of a case of clairvoyance which took place about 1788. It is recorded by Mr. N. Moody, who had the case under his personal observation. The patient, who was a natural somnambulist, no art being used to put her to sleep, was carefully watched during three months. She was able in absolute darkness to read a book or tell the time by a watch as well as in full sunlight.

* * *

These early records contain also some interesting excerpts from the *New York Tribune*. Its editor (Horace Greeley) was at this time (1850), and till his death, a convinced and firm Spiritualist. "The facts stated rest on authority that cannot be questioned, and no evidence could be more direct and satisfactory," says Mr. Greeley.

* * *

It is curious to note what is probably the first review of Andrew Jackson Davis's *Great Harmonia*. This appeared in August, 1850. (The early issues of *The Spiritual Philosopher* are not dated, and appeared monthly.) The reviewer is a little critical, but generally laudatory.

* * *

About the year 1800 there lived in Coleraine, in the North of Ireland, three sisters who kept a boarding school. These ladies were persecuted by persistent knockings under the table at which they sat. The door of the room would fly open, and while people were looking to see how this happened, the door would as immediately close. Sounds as of heavy weights being rolled over the floor were heard: loud laughings, as of some one jeering and mocking, vexed them: all was confusion and disturbance till the ladies abandoned the house in despair. No efforts of "learned doctors" who sat up at night to watch, or of "inhabitants who volunteered to surround the house," discovered anything. This is a case not unlike that of Dr. Phelps's, and very similar to hundreds of others of more recent date.

* * *

Very funny in these early days were the papers started by men whose only object was to get into print their opinion of some rival publicist. For instance, the Rev. J. Litch, of Philadelphia, published in 1850 a periodical called *The Spiritualist*, or *The Pneumatologist*—the notice does not make it very clear which is the exact title—for the purpose of expounding "Second Adventist" doctrines as against the Rev. G. Storrs, who had a paper called *The Bible Examiner*, whose cheerful mission it was to show that most men have no conscious existence after death. And these two apostles seem to have made matters very hot for each other.

* * *

"An Account of a late Conversation with the Dead. Boston, U.S.A. Printed by Nathaniel Coverly, jun. 1807." This pamphlet purports to give an account of an interview between one Mrs. Thankful Alexander, and the spirit of her deceased husband, on August 3rd, 1807. He had departed this life December 16th, 1806. There were various noises of an unaccountable nature in the house. The spirit seems to have

talked nonsense, but that does not militate against the reality of the occurrence described.

* * *

The *Spiritual Philosopher* of September, 1850, publishes an account of an examination of the Fox sisters by a committee of matrons to ascertain whether the knockings were produced by machinery concealed about the person. A thorough search negated the idea. Moreover, the ladies, after being disrobed and thoroughly searched, "were placed in a variety of positions, and still the sounds were heard, while the most careful watching failed to detect any physical movements which could account for their production." Seybert Commission please notice!

* * *

The first pamphlet published on the so-called mysterious knockings in Western New York was by Eliab W. Capron and Henry D. Baron. This was in the year 1850.

* * *

The earliest account of the Rochester knockings bears the name of D. N. Deney, Arcade Hall, Rochester, N.Y., and is dated in the same year, 1850.

* * *

Apropos of these Rochester knockings a letter to *The Spiritual Philosopher* gives an account of similar occurrences about the beginning of the century. The letter is signed "S. Howe," and dated Athens County, September 6th, 1850. They occurred near Fall River, Massachusetts, and the rappings seem to have been of a very violent nature. The two young women who were the mediums are described as "becoming delirious, a state which lasted six months," and which was probably obsession. It is interesting to note, in connection with the Seybert Commission's remark that the sounds are always near the Fox mediums, that in this case "the sounds were heard directly under them." They were separated, and taken several miles apart, but the rappings were heard with each one. Finally "priests and members of various churches" exorcised the spirits, and the persecuted mediums got relief, and prosaically married, and "raised respectable families."

* * *

Some of the facts recorded in connection with this obsession recall the stories of the *convulsionnaires*. They were so frightened at the rappings that they tried to get away "by climbing up the side of the house, almost with the agility of a squirrel."

* * *

It is incidentally stated that at the time of the manifestations in Dr. Phelps's house there was an epidemic of these knockings in Bridgeport, Rochester, Auburn, Syracuse, and in New Jersey and Ohio generally. Two hundred instances are referred to as having been known to have occurred in these last named States. It is very important that these early records should be noted.

* * *

If anything more than another goes to show how really these phenomena are the product of spirit power, it is the spontaneity of their occurrence in various separate places, and their equally spontaneous dying away. We cannot produce them, we cannot keep them when we have got them. There are signs that the general prevalence of physical mediumship during the past forty years is wearing itself out. What a cautious inquirer once described in writing to us as "a good daylight psychic"—a term oddly recalling the "daylight route" on the Metropolitan Railway—is becoming more and more scarce.

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUALISTS' SOCIETY, WINCHESTER HALL, 33, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—We were favoured with two excellent addresses on Sunday last, especially that in the evening by the guide of Mr. J. A. Butcher, on "Some of the Aspects of Spiritualism." There was a good attendance.—W. E. LONG, 9, Pasley-road, Walworth.

THE LONDON OCCULT LODGE AND ASSOCIATION FOR SPIRITUAL INQUIRY, REGENT HOTEL, 31, MARYLEBONE-ROAD.—On Sunday next, September 25th, our third course of lectures will commence. In the morning, at eleven, there will be a meeting for the study of occult phenomena and teachings; and in the evening, at seven, sacred music and introductory address by the secretary, after which I shall read a short paper on "The Religion of Spiritualism," to be followed by a trance address by Mrs. Wilkinson (subject to be chosen by the audience), with clairvoyant descriptions of spirits. We hope that many of the readers of "LIGHT" who have helped us in the past will attend. On the following Sunday Mr. Wilkinson will give a lecture on "Phrenology."—A. F. TINDALL, A. Mus. T.C.L., President, 30, Wyndham-street, Bryanston-square.

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.]

"Jacob Boehme and the Coming Race."

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I was much pleased with the article of Mrs. A. J. Penny in a recent issue of "LIGHT." As a student of Böhme it seems to me that the great central truth of his writings is the elaboration of an arch-natural body in the human frame, both of man and woman. This arch-natural body is not the magnetic form that is often seen at seances for materialisation, but one composed of the spiritual primates—or first atomic forms—of all nature. He calls it the body of Christ. I gather from his writings, that Christ (the Divine Man) passed through each degree of nature, from inmosts to outmosts, clothing His form with the primates of the world of each degree. That if the members of the human family will place themselves *en rapport* with the Divine Man, He will clothe them with this form, by causing the *new creative law*, evolved by Him in His descent, to operate from soul to body, bringing them, in this way, into conscious *rapport* with each and every degree of nature and spirit, thus clothing them with their house from heaven, as St. Paul puts it, and giving them an orderly *law* of communication with the spirit-world. If this is true, it follows that when a man and woman, both clothed with this *arch-natural body*, come together in marriage, the children of such parents will be born inheriting the arch-natural form and *controlling the powers of nature*. These children, it seems to me, will not be mediums in the sense of being controlled, but will be positive to spirit and magnetic forces. Here we have the law of a *new race* emerging from the old one, on our planet. Acting through the *arch-natural* creation—in their flesh—they will be able, not by statuvolism or magnetic control, but in their own spiritual, uncontrolled range of arch-natural senses, to see the creative *thought forms* (human) of God, and thus to see *qualities* as well as handle spiritual forms. If Mrs. A. J. Penny would kindly give her valuable opinion on this, I think it will interest a great number of the readers of "LIGHT." Böhme seems to me to penetrate above the magnetic science—above the planetary powers—into the triangle and through that into the Tincture of the Fire. Can we follow him in the spirit law?—Yours respectfully,

Crosby, Isle of Man.

W. C. LOCKERBY.

[Is our correspondent sure that these views are those of Böhme and not of T. Lake Harris?—ED.]

Prevost Paradol and Haunting.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—There is really nothing to reply to in the letter of your correspondent. All is vague and inconsistent. He was residing at Paris in 1870, and he says, "I knew the cause of Paradol's suicide as asserted to be what Mr. Haughton says it really was, but I never *fully accepted* that doctrine," which surely means that he felt strongly inclined towards it, though he could not quite make up his mind. And why not? He says he "was so impressed by the spirit of falsehood that animated all parties" that he did not believe it. He found so many discordant statements that "he got gradually to *lose faith in all of them*." He arrived at the conclusion that all alike were false, and that all men were liars. I do not admire the logic. He argues in the strangest manner that he was justified in not accepting the current version of the cause of Paradol's suicide by some of the stories in *Moss from a Rolling Stone*.

Let me tell him that it was the report of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses at Washington, who were present with him during the last days of his life, and who recorded his sayings and witnessed his anguish, who bore the tale of his remorse to Europe. All his sayings and wild exclamations related solely to the War, the one result of which appeared to him certain.

Your correspondent further says that "my statement in no way controverts M. Noel's theory, but affords an excellent illustration of the theory itself." Why, then, is he angry with me? And yet his irritation is very apparent, for it has confused his perception. He makes me apply the term "noble soul," to Paradol, whereas I applied it to Victor Hugo. This is

more than ordinary carelessness. He was hard driven for an argument for the purity of Paradol's motives, and, therefore, he says, "you admit that he had a noble soul." I did not admit it; but the reverse.

My use of the figure "Nemesis" as an equivalent of "retribution," was perfectly legitimate and customary. Why raise such a quibble?

The last thing I have to remark on is his objection to my describing the theory as "shallow, depressing, and base." He admits that it is depressing, but disowns the other two epithets. But the term "depressing," in my philosophy, carries the other two along with it. Every true and profound doctrine is also cheering and exalting. And why is it so? Because the system of the universe tends always to Good—to universal and eternal Good. It is my cheerful creed that all things which we behold are full of blessings.

If, on the other hand, a doctrine is depressing, be assured that it is also false. For it is necessarily founded on the opposite or pessimistic view of the universe. If we despair of the universe itself, how can we be otherwise than sad? This would be a just cause of the depression which leads either to madness or suicide.

There is yet one more inconsistency in my opponent's letters. In the first he attributes the suicide to some physico-moral distemper which attached to the walls of the house which Paradol inhabited at Washington; and the suicides at Paris to the same mysterious distemper attaching to the wood of the sentry-box at the Invalides. This is surely Materialism of the very lowest type. If the soul of man is so enthralled to these base conditions—and to make it all the worse he tells us "the purer and better the soul" the more likely it is to succumb to such vile influences—what then becomes of the supremacy of the soul? It is nowhere; it is non-existent.

Then, in his second letter, he gives altogether another doctrine. He dismisses the mural distemper theory, and gives us instead that of St. Paul in that grand passage in the Ephesians about "principalities and powers." But these great spiritual agents have equal access to us everywhere, and are not attached to the walls or furniture of a house, or to the wood of a sentry-box. G. D. HAUGHTON.

Successful Treatment of Blindness.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I desire to add a few words to my letter concerning the effective and marvellous cure of the authoress, Miss Owens Blackburne, by the influence of Mr. Milner Stephen.

She came to me on Sunday; I questioned her closely, and then tested her condition. My nurse-attendant carefully bandaged the "well" eye (I can find no other term), and pressed her fingers on the eye so covered, leaving the "blind" eye free.

I send you the result: seeing only by the eye by which she had never seen a spark of light for more than twenty years, she wrote to me, in a good round hand—the lines being even and straight—the following letter:—

"I thank God I am able to write you this letter with the eye in which I have had no sight for upwards of twenty years.

"ELIZABETH O. BLACKBURNE CASEY.

"S. C. Hall, Esq.

"September 18th, 1887."

I think the case is so clear and conclusive that more words would do more harm than good.

There can be no doubt about the matter. By a mysterious power conferred on Mr. Stephen he has cured this lady of long-endured blindness; and what he has done for her (for which she "thanks God") he can do for others.

He has, and will show, the reports of many other cases as strong; but I humbly hope, and think, this to which my name is affixed will be accepted as evidence beyond suspicion by any person to whom that name is known.

24, Stanford-road, St. Alban's-road,
Victoria-road, Kensington, W.

S. C. HALL.

Another Sitting with Mr. Eglinton.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Although, perhaps, a hundred statements of sésances with Mr. Eglinton have been given in "LIGHT" by half as many sitters with him, I desire to add one more to the long and amply sufficient list. I lament that he, with his very charming wife, is about to leave England for Peru. I doubt their

wanting him there; but we certainly need him here—greatly need him. I fear his absence from us will be for a long time. Surely his departure will create a vacuum which there is no Medium to fill up!

But to the purport of this letter; the message conveyed to me through him is as true as that night follows day. I desire to explain. When I entered his drawing-room on the 5th July, I knelt and offered up a prayer that God would permit to influence us only good angels and pure spirits. It is to that my beloved wife refers, and her reference to the term "darling" is this: When she was "dying," *i.e.*, leaving earth, I bent over her and said, "Do you know me, darling?" She nodded. I said: "Then say darling." She moved her hand and touched my shoulder. She murmured the word into my ears and was in Heaven.

How often I have seen her, and received written communications from her, since her departure I have recorded in "LIGHT."

I might write at greater length on this subject but I have written enough. The message, which was written between two slates in less than two minutes, was as follows:—

"MY DARLING,—When you prayed to God on your knees I was by your dear side, and tears of joy and gratitude welled from my heart to the Master who has so graciously permitted this beautiful communion. You do so well to thank Him, my darling, for all His loving grace and care. From the moment when I passed on, whispering the word 'darling' into your listening ears, I have never been absent from your side, and it is given to me that I should come to you in the stillness of the night, when I place my arms round your neck and tell you I am your wife in Heaven as I was on earth. I am waiting to usher you into the beautiful summerland of rest and joy. The heavenly paradise we so often pictured to ourselves will then be ours. Do not shed tears, dearest, unless they be of joy and thankfulness. We are *not separated*, we are ONE. Humbly I thank God for this vision of light. God bless you, darling.—Your own
"MARIE."

I shall—please God—be with her soon in that summerland of which in this message, as in so many other messages, she speaks. We are, as she says, "*not separated: we are one.*"

S. C. HALL.

"A. Major."

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I notice in "LIGHT" of September 17th, under the head of "Jottings," a statement that "A. Major has sent us *A Few Objections to Spiritualism*," &c. As the name is somewhat like my own, I shall be much obliged if you will spare me a few lines in which to mention that I am entirely ignorant of and unconnected with the matter in question.—Yours, &c.,
51, Holland-road, Kensington. A. E. MAJOR.
September 19th, 1887.

A Benefit Séance.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

,—Please insert as under. Miss Marsh will give a Séance for the benefit of Mrs. Ayers on Sunday next, September 25th, at the above address. To commence at 7.30 p.m. One Shilling admission. Will friends kindly assist one who has worked for the cause and is now in straightened circumstances?—Yours, &c.,
218, Jubilee-street, Mile End, E. E. and W. MARSH.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

6 p.—You do not enclose card. Please do so.

J. E. J.—No, thank you; no good end would be served.

What is the world? tell, worldling, if thou know it;

If it be good, why do all ills o'erflow it?

If it be bad, why dost thou like it so?

If it be sweet, how comes it bitter then?

If it be bitter, what bewitcheth men?

If it be friend, why kills it, as a foe,

Vain-minded men that over-love and lust it?

If it be foe, fondling, how dar'st thou trust it?

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

TESTIMONY TO PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

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

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

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

*Professor F. Zollner, 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 Caithness and Duchesse de Pomar; the Hon. J. L. O'Sullivan, sometime Minister of U.S.A. at the Court of Lisbon; M. Favre-Clavairoz, late Consul-General of France at Trieste; the late Emperors of *Russia and *France; Presidents *Thiers and *Lincoln, &c., &c.

WHAT IS SAID OF PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CAMILLE FLAMMARION, THE FRENCH ASTRONOMER, AND MEMBER OF THE ACADEMIE FRANCAISE.—“I do not hesitate to affirm my conviction, based on personal examination of the subject, that any scientific man who declares the phenomena denominated ‘magnetic,’ ‘sommambule,’ ‘mediumic,’ and others not yet explained by science to be ‘impossible,’ is one who speaks without knowing what he is talking about; and also any man accustomed, by his professional avocations, to scientific observation—provided that his mind be not biassed 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 any legerdemain, or fraud, in these physical manifestations. He is aware, even from recent experience, of the impossibility of convincing anyone, by a mere narrative of events apparently so out of harmony with all our knowledge of the laws which govern the physical world, and he places these facts on record rather as an act of justice due to those whose similar statements he had elsewhere doubted and denied, than with either the desire or hope of convincing others. Yet he cannot doubt the ultimate recognition of facts of the truth of which he is so thoroughly convinced. Admit these physical manifestations, and a strange and wide world of research is opened to our inquiry. This field is new to the materialist mind of the last two centuries, which even in the writings of divines of the English Church, doubts and denies all spiritual manifestations and agencies, be they good or evil.”—From a letter by Dr. Lockhart Robertson, published in the *Dialectical Society's Report on Spiritualism*, p. 24.

NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR.—“No one can doubt that phenomena like these (Phrenology, 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.”