

Light:

A Journal of Psychical, Occult, and Mystical Research

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

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT!"—Goethe.

No. 401.—VOL. VIII. [Registered as a Newspaper.] SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1888. [Registered as a Newspaper.] PRICE TWOPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Influence of Spiritualism on Religious Thought	441	Re-incarnation	446
Dr. W. B. Carpenter	442	Animal Intelligence	446
Psychical Attraction	442	Thought-reading	447
The Wild Hunt-man	443	Puritanism, Mysticism, and Ritualism	447
Pulpit Spiritualism	445	"Scientific Religion"	448
Dr. Shipman on "The Great Hereafter"	445	Writing with a Psychograph	449
		Re-incarnation Problems	449

NOTES BY THE WAY.

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

Mrs. R. S. Lillie has delivered an excellent discourse on "The Influence of Spiritualism on the Religious Thought of our Time," at the San Francisco Camp-meeting. The *Carrier Dove* reports her in full. It is a topic on which I have repeatedly enlarged. The first effect of Spiritualism, says Mrs. Lillie, was to excite wonder. Then came the question to those who communicated, "Are you happy?" The response was unvarying, "According to our deserts. We made our home by our lives, and have gone to our own place." "Any hell?" "Yes, within the wrong doer's own bosom." "Any Heaven?" "Yes, when you are fit for it." That is the gospel of Spiritualism. A man makes or mars himself. He is in the next state just what he makes himself by his life on this earth. Sometimes people ask us what effect this gospel has on our lives. It ought to have a most potent effect. Practically it has very little. That is the problem that stares us in the face. We hear a great deal about our "facts." But "facts" are only what we make of them. And we may be as certain of the objective facts of Spiritualism as we are of the most obvious fact in daily life, and be none the better for the knowledge. If it were not for the iteration with which some Spiritualists talk of "facts" as the one thing needful, it would seem unnecessary to insist on the necessity of their rightful interpretation.

Do not all the controversies of Spiritualism cluster round this plain question, "What do your facts mean?" Assume the facts as proven. They are proven, though prejudice or ignorance deny it. But, then, what do they mean? There are students of psychical problems who deny the conclusion of the Spiritualist that communications made through a medium are all proven to be from the source assigned to them. Are these communications so coherent in themselves, so conclusively, in matter and in form proceeding from their claimed source, as to warrant us in accepting them without question? This is a momentous question, and Spiritualists have so generally rejected the hypothesis of diabolic inspiration—and quite rightly in my judgment—that it is incumbent on them to be sure of the ground on which they elect to take their stand. They have no right to pass by the evidence propounded by any critics without being sure that it is unworthy of attention. The powers of the incarnate human spirit, for example, have to be taken into account. The infinite possibilities of the disruption of the personality after death are not to be dismissed without due consideration. Some people have thought about these things before us. What have they to say? In the name of long-suffering patience, what is the use of crude fact divorced from its interpretation?

I quoted recently some cases of the apparent instinct of death in animals. I add another letter from the same source, the *North American Review*. The subject is interesting as bearing on the speculations that the columns of "LIGHT" now teem with. "Nizida's" letter in the present issue may be profitably read in connection with the subjoined:—

"In a recent number of the *North American Review* the question is suggested whether animals are subject to premonitions of death.

"Years ago I was staying at a farmhouse where it was the custom every evening to drive a small herd of cows from the pasture to a lot near the barn. It was decided one day to kill one of the number, a yearling, whose mother also belonged to the herd. The calf was accordingly left in the lot, while the rest were driven as usual to the pasture. No sooner had the butcher slain his victim than there could be distinctly heard from the pasture, half a mile away, the mournful lowing of the mother, the other cows occasionally joining in what could be described only as a wail. The circumstance interested me very much, and I walked over to the pasture. Through thirty years that pathetic picture of maternal grief has remained with me! It seemed to me that there was the actual sobbing of a bursting heart, and to my childish eyes there were tears moistening the face of the poor, gentle, sorrowful creature before me.

"Years afterwards my children had a pet cat which it was discovered had now and then violent convulsions. We asked a young lad to shoot her. I went with him into the garden where puss lay on the grass in the sunshine; the lad walked behind me with a parlour rifle. She was always gentle and rarely shunned anyone, but so soon as she saw me she stretched herself backward with a most unearthly cry and looked straight into the mouth of the weapon which ended her life.

"We owned also a magnificent St. Bernard dog, which became in time a wonder to many in the way of what I must call mental development. He was accustomed, summer and winter, to come into the sitting-room after tea and lie for a while on a rug under the gaslight. At a given signal he would retire at once to the back yard. One night, however, he was reluctant to go—reluctant even to resistance. I coaxed, then forced him, and went to the door with him. He stood outside in a hesitating way, and as I closed the door, turned and looked me full in the face with an intense expression of mingled reproach and affection which communicated to me an inexplicable sense of foreboding ill, and the remembrance of which still brings a pang to my heart. When the door closed I heard him leap over the low front gate, and we never saw him again. Some boys out hunting on the following day became frightened at meeting him in the woods, and shot him.

"L. H. CRAIG."

So we are going to have a real good time. "The day will increase and the night will decline." Good news for workers; though I have my doubts whether the day is not long enough already for us brain-workers. "All the diseases of men will be cured." That is a distinctly genial prediction, and most prophecies are of a very gray or neutral tint, if not altogether black. It is news to me that "the age of man is established at 100 years." I thought most of us stopped short of that terminus. And now it is to be worse for us. The span of life is to be 125 years. Alas! But perhaps it is not all true. Gold plates used not to be manufactured in Heaven.

This is the prediction, from a recent issue of the *Queen*:—

"A strange tale of a gold plate with inscriptions printed in Samil and Telegu having fallen from Heaven is in circulation in

India. This mysterious tale, says the Hindoo *Patriot*, is as follows: 'A plate, which was made of most beautiful gold, with the following inscription, accidentally fell down from Heaven on the Temple of Casi Viswanath, at Benares:—"From the month of November, 1888, God Himself will rule as Emperor over Hindustan, incarnating Himself in human form. From this time there will be justice all over the world, and the Munis—that is, sages—will be in a very prosperous condition, and will be worshipped by the people. On March 6th, 1889, at Aswani Nakshet, the sun will rise on the 45' in Mena Lunga. The day will increase and the night will decrease till the day becomes fourteen hours and the night ten hours. All the diseases of men will be cured, and the age of man, which is at present established as 100 years, will in future be 125 years.'"

De mortuis nil nisi bonum. When Dr. W. B. Carpenter was alive, I hit him severely for what I considered to be his disingenuous and prejudiced treatment of Spiritualism. He was a man who had pushed himself into notoriety, and many people would accept Spiritualism at his estimate. He is dead now, and I am concerned with him no longer. But the following letter addressed to my old friend Benjamin Coleman by a scientific correspondent is worth reproducing, and may raise a smile:—

16, Woodland-terrace, Plymouth.

February 16th, 1872.

DEAR MR. COLEMAN,—The next time you have to deal with Dr. Carpenter, take him upon his own ground. If we are not to believe the evidence of our senses, what becomes of his elaborate "revelations" of the microscope? There you see green vegetables running about like wild animals, poking their noses into everything (*Volvox* and *Vorticelli*). Then you see a veritable animal (animalcule) turning itself *outside-in* (*Hydra* and *Amaeba*), and many other things impossible to believe, because you know they are contrary to the laws of nature. Whoever saw a tree walking, or a horse turning itself outside-in like a stocking? Therefore, the microscope is a dangerous delusion, absurd on the face of it, because "common-sense" is the only standard of reason. It is an optical delusion, caused by imagination partly, and greatly mixed up with fraud and delusion on the part of those who, by excess of science, have gone beyond the bounds of plain reason. They *think* they see what they do *not* see, and we all know how such delusions have spread in all ages. If these wonders are true, why can't they show them *without* the microscope? If they will do it we will believe at once. They say they want certain "conditions" of glasses and lenses, and also a very peculiar "condition" of light. It must be upon the object itself, and nowhere else, and also it must be modified to a nicety, or else it won't show the wonders they so vainly imagine. Of course what won't stand the full blaze of day must be a humbug. The fools say this wonderful "new world" opened up by the microscope is open to everyone that likes to investigate it. But who would encourage such nonsense? The microscope is what they call a "medium," and unless a medium be present (and it must be a good one, there are many bad) nothing on earth can be seen, and the impostors then say that the "see-wonders" has been a failure. They go so far as to say that they can see an animal with a good beating heart moving about by its *wheels* (*Rotifer*). The Bible speaks of *treading* the earth, but says nothing of *wheel's* in animated nature—therefore the whole thing is not only a pernicious delusion, but is contrary to revelation.

So you may go on throughout his whole work, and I wonder much at the foolishness of the man who has seen so much, and yet can't take in a little more.—Yours sincerely,

JOHN TAWSE.

MR. LAURENCE OLIPHANT.—Mr. Laurence Oliphant's state of health has lately caused his friends very considerable anxiety. At the time of his marriage he was looking wretchedly ill. Since then he has been suffering from an attack of pleurisy, from which he is happily recovering. No doubt the life of excitement that Mr. Oliphant has necessarily led, the demands upon him from those to whom he has a message, and the activity of his brain, have combined to prostrate him. He is resting more and sleeping better, and there is fortunately no reason to fear that nature will fail to repair the damage of the past. Our best wishes attend him and Mrs. Oliphant in this anxious time.

LIVE near to God, and so all things will appear to you little in comparison with eternal realities.—M'CHEYNE.

PSYCHICAL ATTRACTION.

No. III.

THE NATURAL PROBABILITY OF PSYCHICAL ATTRACTION;
ITS CONSCIOUS CONSTITUENTS; INSTINCT; THE
THEORY OF SPIRITS.

When we consider the similarity in form and habits existing among the beings constituting each species and portion of species, we need not think it an extravagant idea that nature, as a whole or great unity, is always transmitting energies of a combinative and interactive kind among them, energies which, while they maintain all classes of beings in the order and variety proper to each, separate one class from another by reason of their distinctive destinations. Some such opinion as this is spoken of by Virgil in the fourth book of the *Georgics* as known in his time. Many, however, might accept the idea of a power of this kind permeating through all things, and yet reject as absurd the idea that human beings can speak to each other across vast distances by means of it. And it must be owned that unless in moments of quietude and self-possession voices of this kind were heard enunciating ideas and circumstances apart from the previous consciousness of the hearer, none would excogitate the possibility of such communications. The only possible explanation of such is by means of the gravitation of psychical powers corresponding in their nature to the quality of acknowledged sensation and thought.

A not unlikely token of the presence amongst us of a state of psychical attraction may be found in the multitude of strange beliefs, current in one age, rejected in another, popular in one part of the world, uninfluential in another, which have sprung up among men. Lucretius, in the fifth book, *De Rerum Natura*, ascribes the common belief in the gods to majestic apparitions whose proud speech and singular movements impressed the seers, both while waking and sleeping, with a sense of the divinity of the phantoms. Thus, perhaps, well known superstitions concerning fairies and other semi-corporeal spirits, magicians, witchcraft, &c., arose. All these beliefs might have a certain phenomenal reality underlying them, without possessing truth as to the nature of the very subjects or the personal character ascribed to them. The state of psychical attraction exhibits numberless natures ready at any moment to give any account of themselves to which the interest or the fear of a percipient may incline, accompanied, moreover, by a multitudinous kind of speech which only needs the prior belief of a hearer to appear to accord with his thoughts and to amplify and otherwise modify them far beyond his prior expectations.

To an impassive and disinterested observer the chief conscious and active constituents of the state seem to be no other than those simple persons, designated by the term *ιδιώται* among the Greeks, as distinguished from the *σόφου*; persons who, it has been said, "arrived at the conclusion" of the old pagan Hades, with its phantasmal denizens, its rivers, its penal settlements, and its Elysium; a statement which, I think, may be found verified in the account of Greek mythology given in *Edward's Greek Reading Book*. Such persons would, probably, in forming their views, yield to the pressure of mere instinctive perceptions, and refrain from reasoning about them, or drawing abstract conclusions in consonance with the nature of things. Such an idea is probably sufficient to withhold the learned from any serious investigations into such subjects; but I may remark that it is one thing to admit the conclusions of observers concerning objects of which they speak, another to deny that they have really seen anything. It is quite possible that the ideas of the Greek common people concerning Hades had a real origin in something beyond themselves, although the notion of a sub-terrestrial world

to which these ideas led them was totally devoid of truth. The truth as it seems to me is that psychical attraction is no other than the manifestation of the fact that animal instinct is a quality not so much derived from immediate inheritance as from universal nature by means of inheritance. By instinct I mean the root-power of actual movements, of passion, and of reason. If, as I formerly remarked, there exist powers of nature impregnating with life, in the forms of germs and spores, the formative matter destined to receive it, there will, in the case of the inception of animals, be included the property of instinct, later on to be evolved in various other inclusive powers. If this property were engendered by a communicative power of nature, the mark of its origin might always be maintained, constituting that electric-like condition within us which we call conscious individual life, and simultaneously making known to many its generic and true native form by psychical attraction. Nature, as everyone may see, is rather exhibited in species than in individuals. Now, from my experience of this state, I should say that instinct was usually the prevailing power in it; reason or the sense of knowledge acquired by induction, as well as from the external influence of surrounding life, being only exceptionally discovered in it.

To many, I believe, the state which I have called psychical attraction is no other than a sort of spirit-world with which they think they are intimate, and which they regard from a solitary point of view, without considering the other human beings who are in the same predicament. On numberless occasions I have heard such proclaim that they thought that they were talking with spirits when some peculiar phases of ordinary human life, brought to their notice, suddenly caused them to discover the action of beings like themselves. Some who speak think themselves hallucinated; many seem in a state of perplexity whether the beings with which they are brought into contact are mortals or immortals. There are others, perhaps the minority, who seem instinctively to see pure humanity in the entire state. Without regarding remote causes, there is every reason why an unbiassed critic should come to this last conclusion. The so-called spirits turn out constantly to be human beings who esteem themselves spirit-powers or mediums, and who, from their peculiar bent of mind, have neither the opportunity nor the inclination to give their attention to an assemblage of human beings. Over all there is that character of nervous excitability, that continual exhibition of perplexed inquiry, not to speak of that constant reference to subjects of ordinary human experience, which undoubtedly indicate the agency of mortals. Besides, how is it possible to conceive without implying a standing miracle, the reverse of that of transubstantiation, and perhaps exceeding it, that beings destitute of a larynx, tongue, palate, and lips should pronounce syllables composed of the mutes, labials, and gutturals of the English and other languages? It is also the undoubted quality of speech that it is precisely by that means that persons invisible to each other would make themselves known as human beings; and it is by speech, and speech alone, that any man can become cognisant of such a state as that which I am describing.

SCRUTATOR.

THE *North American Review*, which contained the triangular duel between Gladstone, Ingersoll, and Field, has always something of interest to Spiritualists. The August number has "The Open Door of Dreamland," and "Death Instinct in Animals."

"Is Marriage a Failure?" Prentice Mulford has his word on the subject, and he would astonish the Philistines of the *Daily Telegraph*. "Your real wife, your complement or complement (for the divinely wedded man and woman form the complete whole), is, if not now by your side physically, in existence somewhere, either in the material or spiritual world." That is "a large order." We wonder, mildly, what the letter-writers of the *Telegraph* would say to the query, In what proportion of cases is the real "inexpressive she" by his "side physically"? Mr. Mulford is wholly right in his remarks on this topic of the wife as the best partner in business.

THE WILD HUNTSMAN.

The following paper, written between twenty and thirty years ago, was intended for a periodical of the time. It did not appear in print, being returned by the Editor, who desired to have it altered and enlarged. The writer was unable, or perhaps unwilling, to make the changes required, and the MS. remained in its original state, in the possession of her dear friend A. M. H. W., among whose papers it was found.

Very much might be added to this paper on the same subject, and perhaps its appearance may suggest the publication of similar narratives. It would, however, be almost as easy to write a new and enlarged essay on the subject as to alter and modernise the writing of this. There is much to be learnt of the origin of wood and mountain spirits. The Erl King of Denmark, Arlechino (Harlequin), the Spotted Spirit of the Woods, and all the tribes of sirens, Lureleys, and sea-spirits, will repay a more thorough investigation than they have yet undergone.

The Wild Huntsman.

Every region not yet trodden down to regulation level by the steps of the schoolmaster has its *Demonia*, which, like its natural Flora and Fauna, disappear in the "civilising" process. The railway, cutting direct through a mining country, dashes away the hammers and pickaxes of the mining elves, and silences the little underground voices held oracular by the country folks as to the presence of ore or metal. In like manner the Wild Huntsman, like the Red Indian, must find another place for his and his spectre horses' diminished heads, as the trees of his old forest are felled and he loses their shelter. But before the old shadows vanish before the new lights, we may describe a few of their manners and customs; so that when the scientific demonologist wishes to examine the native spectre of a place, he may have his specimen ready. Perhaps when examined with the help of a natural lime-light or local magic lantern, the Hunting Spirit may take his place as an optical delusion beside the Spectre of the Brocken. He is, however, more difficult to deal with than that apparition, inasmuch as he impresses the sight and hearing alternately, and though echoes afford an explanation in the case of the noisy huntsman and pack, his personal appearance precludes his being resolved into the aerial reflection of spectators, cast by sun, moon, gipsies' fire, or Jack o'Lantern. There are well authenticated tales of his appearance in both kinds—the sounding and the visible. The following instance of a ghastly huntsman, seen but not heard, is given as I received it, from the eye-witness, a relation of my own, whose good faith and trustworthiness as a narrator was, I felt, proved by the manner in which he told the story:

This gentleman, an engineer, was engaged in making the railway from Newry to Enniskilling. Arriving one evening at Monaghan, he stopped for dinner at the principal inn of the town. His groom, who had accompanied him in a dog-cart, heard from the old crones at the inn tales of the dangers of the next stage, the road being, as the women said, haunted by the ghost of a neighbouring squire who was in the habit of showing himself to travellers after dark. Neither master nor man, however, feared any roadside adventure, ghosts least of all, but as at that time (November, 1843) there had been rioting in Armagh, they carried pistols, and the dog-cart was furnished with three powerful lamps. Having changed the horse for a fresh one which had been sent on from Armagh the night before, the travellers started about nine o'clock in the evening for Clones. They had proceeded about twelve miles when the gentleman saw a horseman approaching, and believing him to be a highwayman touched his groom, who was seated behind, telling him to have the pistols ready, as they would probably have to use them. The groom stood up at the back of the dog-cart, and leaned over his master's shoulder, both awaiting an attack. To their astonishment, however, the horseman passed them slowly, showing as he turned his face to them the face of a ghastly skeleton. He was mounted on a lean cadaverous steed; his clothes, dun coloured and ragged, hung about him as if dripping with wet, and both travellers noticed that one foot was covered with a boot, the other with something which might have been a shoe. The groom exclaimed; "Good God, sir! what's that?" The horse in the dog-cart showed the utmost terror and trembled

This frightened the King and his suite so that they galloped home as if the enemy of mankind were at their heels. On another occasion the Duc de Sully, hearing the noise, and believing it to be the King and his courtiers returning from the chase, went down to meet them, but found that the sounds proceeded from the ghostly hunt. Boagars says seriously that *Le Grand Veneur* was the spirit of a huntsman who had been killed in the forest in the reign of Francis I. Sully, after giving some of the above details, says, "It is still a question what was the nature of this prodigy (*prestige*) seen so often by so many eyes in the forest of Fontainebleau." "There are not wanting persons," says Mathieu, "who would readily have classed this tale with the fabulous histories of Merlin and Urgan, if the facts had not been attested by so many eye and ear witnesses. The neighbouring shepherds say that it is a demon who hunts in the forest, and whom they call *Le Grand Veneur*, but it is believed by others to be St. Hubert's hunt, a prodigy which is also met with in other parts of France. Demon, Spirit, or what you will, he was really seen by Henri IV. not far from the City, and in a cross-road which still bears the name of *La Croix du Grand Veneur*."

We may readily believe with Scott that the strange noises heard in a forest at midnight are convertible into the horns, halloos, &c., of the hunt, though how Henri Quatre and his Prime Minister can have lent themselves to such a delusion is a question—but how about the apparitions? Can Professor Pepper and our other scientific friends* who analyse a ghost as cleverly as Dr. Taylor does a poison, tell us what conditions are needful to bring to view such a dismal figure as the mounted skeleton who paid his respects to my relation in Ireland? Whatever foundation there may be for the French and German tales this Irish story is well attested by two persons, neither of them inclined to indulge in fancy nor to believe in ghosts. There is one circumstance connected with the spectres and their habitats which may be noticed, the extreme horror and depression attending them. My relation, one of the coolest and most fearless men I ever knew, and who would have disposed of a fair proportion of highwaymen very quietly, was quite unnerved by the sight of the ghostly squire, and he need not have been ashamed either, as the fearless Henri Quatre was not proof against the terror of the Fontainebleau huntsman. Of the neighbourhood of the Odenwald Jäger, Mr. Howitt says Mrs. Howitt begged that we might hasten out of the place, for it affected her beyond measure with awe and apprehension.†

Can it be that some electrical or atmospheric condition exerts a depressing influence on the nervous system, quite independent of any action upon the mind, and that this same electrical state may contribute to produce the spectral phenomena? Some people are excited, some distressed by the approach of thunder. It is curious that the Wild Huntsman should be so generally recognised an individual, having everywhere nearly the same specific character, and being always labelled with a legend or tradition of some terrible dare-devil long since gone to his account.

S. E. D. M.

LINES WRITTEN THE NIGHT BEFORE HIS EXECUTION.

E'en such is time ; which takes on trust
Our youth, our joys, our all we have,
And pays us back with earth and dust ;
Which in the dark and silent grave,
When we have wandered all our ways,
Shuts up the story of our days :
But from this earth, this grave, this dust,
My God shall raise me up, I trust."

—SIR WALTER RALEIGH.

MR. HENRY TERRY sends us particulars of the International Congress of Spiritualists to be held at Barcelona, commencing on September 8th, at 8.30 p.m., in the Hall of the Calle de Ronda de San Pedro, No. 25. It is desired, we learn, that delegates from all countries should be appointed, and papers are invited from representative Spiritualists. The platform is to be wide and comprehensive, but chief honour is to be paid to the man whom Continental Spiritists know best, Allan Kardec.

* Written long before the Psychical Research Society was founded.

† And this too is remarkable, as at the time Mrs. H. felt thus mentally affected, neither she nor her husband were aware that they had actually reached the precise spot in the forest connected with the legend. They at the time imagined themselves at some distance from the ghostly locality.

PULPIT SPIRITUALISM.

The following extract is copied from a letter which I recently received from a friend—a widow—and by her permission I send it for a corner in "LIGHT."

F. J. THEOBALD.

"I heard, lately, a very severe cut at Spiritualism, from the pulpit, and I could not help thinking how very ignorant of the whole subject the minister must be if he could speak of it as he did. He seemed to think that the influence of Spiritualism must necessarily be counter to Christ's influence, or rather that it would supersede His influence, and that Christ ought to be sufficient for us, without any such thing as intercourse with the spirits of those who have passed on. If so, I want to know whether Christ ought not to be sufficient for us without our seeking for inspiration for our lives in the words of good ministers and preachers, whether in the pulpit or in books ; or, indeed, from any other source. And why should a few loving or helpful words from my husband, or from any other dear and good spirit, do me harm now, any more than they did in letters written while they were still here? I can truly say that I firmly believe that God brought me to the knowledge of Spiritualism in order to enable me to realise Himself and Christ, as I never did before ; and, that having believed in it for twenty years, I do not find myself, therefore, separated from Christ, but rather the contrary. Is it not curious how people who believe fully in the omnipotence of God do limit His ways and His dealings with us, His children? I think that one cause of this fear, that Spiritualism tends to lessen or interfere with the influence of Christ, is, that people who do not investigate the subject for themselves, and who, therefore, are not in a position to judge of it impartially, are very apt to attribute to the communicating spirits, I might almost say, omniscience, forgetting that though they must necessarily come to a fuller and larger knowledge than they could attain to while on earth, they are still finite, and that the spirits simply give us their present views on any subject that may be the topic of conversation, just as they would have done when on earth. How often do I long that all could derive the same blessing and help from Spiritualism that it has brought to me."

REV. DR. SHIPMAN, of Christ's Church, Fifth Avenue and Thirty Fifth-street, New York, in a lecture reported in *The New York World*, gave his views as follows on the "great hereafter." "That the spiritual world is perfectly natural, inhabited, and with all things necessary for its welfare, I do not doubt, but not to us is it visible. We cannot see each other, but gaze only at the body. This body is unconscious of death simply because it was never conscious in life ; it is the soul which has it all, and when it leaves nothing remains. The different formations of each man's body are not accidental, but the soul influences and organises the body. Memory, reason, and personality belong not to the body but to the soul. As to the question of this earthly love, the death of the body is not the death of the heart. We are told that in Heaven there are neither marriages nor giving in marriage, and the reason is given. Marriage is to cease, but the Bible does not teach that the love will be lost. No ; we shall love the same there. There is, I believe, a fervent love in Heaven. Heaven is represented as an end of all work—a sort of hospital for old superannuated souls to find rest. Men will be employed in doing God's pleasure and in deeds of good. They are mistaken who think it will be an idle life. Again, we ought not to think that the soul will be compelled to soar and soar up until it reaches some material heaven. The spirit-world is not far away, and when the last trumpet sounds we will be there. Death is no journey but a revelation. Heaven is very near to us ; the veil of mortality is only between us. As to the happiness of Heaven, that is left to us to picture according to our own imagination. We speak and think of death as simply going from one world to the next. Could we wish our loved ones back it would be wishing their death in Heaven, the loss of their everlasting crown. Why should you weep for another star in Heaven, another gem in the crown of God? Think how gently we are introduced into this world. There are thousands who think not of this. They are here and do not wonder. By what marvellous arrangement are we brought here? Just as gently will God deliver us into the next world. Not abruptly, but gentle, well-known, loving voices will greet us when we open our eyes, after our last long sleep."

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

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

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

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

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

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

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

ADVERTISEMENT CHARGES.

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

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

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

Light:

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 8th, 1888.

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

RE-INCARNATION.

"LIGHT" has given free vent to speculative opinion about Re-incarnation. Correspondents have shown an unwonted vivacity of opinion which more than justifies the space that we have assigned to their letters. It used to be said of Delane, late Editor of the *Times*, and perhaps the best and most judicious conductor of a newspaper that we have ever had, that he made the extent of the correspondence sent to him on a particular subject, the measure of the interest in it and the space he should give to it. That is probably a fair standard: and judged by that, Re-incarnation must possess for our readers very considerable attractions as a disputatious question. No subject has elicited the interest of our readers in any equal degree.

Perhaps all has now been said that can be profitably set forth. Are we any the wiser? Opinions will vary, but a consecutive perusal of the letters is not illuminative. From July 14th onwards the stream of correspondence has been unceasing. Space failed to accommodate the writers. Yet we have published an extraordinary series of letters to the exclusion of much other matter, and we might have filled the paper with the lucubrations of our many correspondents.

This is a phenomenon, and needs accounting for. What was the origin of all this ink-shed? Mrs. Hardinge Britten, at the close of an address delivered before the London Spiritualist Alliance, was asked if the Re-incarnation theory accounted for "any of the unfinished problems of creation." Her reply was in effect that there was no sort of evidence for Re-incarnation; that we are "standing in an entirely new dispensation, founded upon well-proven facts. Re-incarnation has no fact to show; not one." It is a sort of survival of metempsychosis: "first, a thought, then secularised among the people until it grows from a belief into an accepted truth."

That, it must be confessed, is not very clear. What is "a secularised thought among the people" that ends by being an accepted truth? Who started the thought? How did it get "secularised"? And how did it become "an accepted truth"? The lady who addressed the St. James's Hall meeting gave us no information beyond an asseveration that the controlling spirits who used her for the time being knew nothing about the subject, and did not accept

the theory. That is not surprising, for most spirits, we believe, in this country deny the theory of Re-incarnation, almost as unanimously as on the Continent of Europe they affirm it. It would seem that belief in this subject is as much a question of geography as it is in more serious matters. If I am born in France, I am a Re-incarnationist. If I see daylight in England, I am not. Just so, if I am born in India, I may be a Buddhist; if in England, a Christian.

But what have we learned by these columns of correspondence? Very little. We have learned that some students accept the theory, and that many Spiritualists, some of whom are and some of whom are not students, do not. We become aware that communications from the other side are as various as opinions on this. We have no authoritative declaration, and are thrown back on presumptive evidence. If a spirit, incarnated on this earth, has failed to get the benefit of the training school, is it likely that it will be again relegated to what has proved a failure? If it has got all it can out of the school, will it be sent back again? Is this poor little earth all that the universe furnishes for training? Is that poverty-stricken conception really the outcome of our best thought?

It may be that some souls return to earth and gain by a repeated incarnation some experience that was denied them in their first. It may be; Mr. Maitland tells us that it is so, that some advanced souls remember these previous existences, and the lessons learned in them. One cannot say. One cannot differentiate the idea of prepossession from the communicated thought, without great care.

It remains that communications from spirits most carefully sifted do not encourage belief in the theory of Re-incarnation—at least in this country. It is a theory which may be held or abjured at the pleasure of the theorist: and no sort of fear need be entertained (as one of our correspondents seems to do) that it will be insisted upon as an article of faith on the part of any Spiritualist.

It may, perhaps, be noted as an advantage that our prolonged correspondence has thrown some light on the value of opinion loosely held, if it has not been very illuminative on the evidence for Re-incarnation.

ANIMAL INTELLIGENCE.

At a certain theatre in the city of New York a troupe of trained monkeys is performing in so-called theatrical representations—not theatrical representations of a high degree, but rather a performance which reminds one irresistibly of the dramatic performances which certain tribes in the interior of Africa are reported to produce for the entertainment of explorers. No one can witness the performance of these monkeys at the Star Theatre without being at once struck with the vast difference that exists between every act of the monkey tribe and every act of the human player. No matter how ignorant and absurd the man may be upon the stage he displays at least a certain power to originate, while the monkey convinces the most obtuse spectator that it is acting by rote. Yet no training could produce such results as these monkeys produce, if in the monkey mind there did not exist some latent germ of mental development. There are few people who have not seen, at some time or other in their lives, performances by trained dogs, horses or elephants; but between such performances and the acting of the monkeys a difference is easily perceptible. In the monkey there is at least a glimmer of the light of reason, while in the other animals we can see nothing but the darkness of mental obscurity. The difference is not great, but the fact of its existence is perceptible. As the monkey is supposed to approach nearer to man, so we may note an improvement over the other animals. Some of the gestures, and I may even say some of the facial expressions of the monkeys, are wondrously human. We know that the gestures have been taught to these animals by years of careful training, but it is difficult to realise that the facial expression is not spontaneous. Those persons who are interested in the possibilities of animal intelligence may find profit and pleasure in the study of these monkey actors.—J. S. SCHNEIDER, *North American Review*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

1 Passing Examination by Thought-reading.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Some years ago Dr. George Wyld was unkindly criticised because, having told at a meeting a story of a girl passing an examination in a subject of which she knew nothing, he refused to give the name of his informant. He had promised me not to divulge it, lest it should attract attention to the young thought-reader; and he kept his promise in spite of considerable annoyance. In justice to Dr. Wyld, and also as a small contribution to the literature of the subject, I propose now to tell the whole story. It was told to me, first, by Mr. Eyre, organist of the Crystal Palace, who professed himself utterly unable to account for the scene he had witnessed. I wrote Mr. Eyre's narrative down from memory, and sent it to him for his correction. It was then sent to Dr. Wyld. Some years afterwards, the young girl being in better health and less sensitive about her peculiar powers, I asked her to give me her version of the tale narrated by Mr. Eyre. Her account agreed exactly with Mr. Eyre's, except in one particular. The one discrepancy between the objective and subjective narration will appear presently.

My daughter Ethel went to spend some months with Mrs. Eyre. Mr. Eyre began to teach her harmony, of which, till then, she knew nothing. She learned to harmonize in three parts, but had not a single lesson in four-part counterpoint (which is, I am informed, a totally different branch of the subject). The lessons were occupied chiefly in the correction by Mr. Eyre of work done, during his absence, by Ethel. He knew, therefore, only what she could do *while he was away from her and occupied with other pupils*. After some months, Mr. and Mrs. Eyre escorted Ethel to Berlin and entered her at the Hoch-Schule. The Professors paid the English composer the compliment of inviting him to be present at the examinations. When his pupil's turn came to be examined in harmony, she stood facing the blackboard, and Mr. Eyre at some distance behind her. The examiner wrote a line of melody, and asked Ethel if she could harmonize it in four parts. Mr. Eyre thought that she could not; and expected that she would not attempt it. She looked, at first, as if she had not the least intention of attempting it. He began to harmonize the melody mentally. To his surprise, Ethel seemed to go off into a dreamy state, and took up the chalk. (Ethel's own version is: "I felt dreamy, and the chalk was put into my hand.") Ethel wrote down the notes that he was mentally writing, following him steadily at about the interval of two bars, and writing (*almost*) the very notes he had thought of. (Mr. Eyre was careful to tell me that he was perfectly sure nearly all the notes were identical with those he had thought of; he was not sure of one or two.) When I asked Ethel about it, she said: "I don't know why or how I did it. I *saw* some notes before my eyes, and I wrote them down. If they had set me an exercise in a thing I knew about, I should have tried experiments; and rubbed some notes out and put others instead. As I didn't know what I was doing, I wrote just what I saw in the air before me; and rubbed out nothing."

The examiner's comment was that he had not expected a girl of eighteen to compose in so elaborate a style; he had intended something much simpler. A student said to Ethel afterwards: "I suppose you know you have made a sensation by your harmony examination?" "And a great nuisance it was," added Ethel (in telling me the story), "for they put me into the top class, and I couldn't do the work." During all the first term Ethel struggled with the difficulties of a class for which she was unprepared. The second term began in the same unhappy manner. Then suddenly a change came. She took up to class one day an exercise she had just written. "That is not bad," said the master, and took the exercise out of the room. On returning, he told her that the head of the composition school wished to see her. The class into which poor Ethel had been so unfortunately lifted was the highest class for pupils whose chief study was in some branch of execution. With the actual composition school the piano students had nothing to do; and therefore she was much puzzled to guess what the head master of it could have to do with her; but of course she called, as requested. It seemed that he had been shown her last composition, which he considered so striking that he wished her to come to him for private lessons! "If they think they are going to make a musical genius

of me" (said Ethel, in writing to me) "they will find themselves disappointed." In the same letter she told what, to me, accounted perfectly for her renewed success. A few days before writing the unlucky exercise which attracted the composer's attention, she had called on a lady musician whose acquaintance she had lately made, and to whom she felt strongly attracted. She found her new friend suffering from horrible restlessness and sleeplessness. In order to show sympathy without fatiguing the patient, Ethel sat by her for an hour, silently *stroking her hair*, and then left her. Ethel had, that night, an extraordinary attack of restlessness and of some incomprehensible sort of brain-suffering. She described herself as walking up and down the room, wondering what could have happened to her, for hours during the night. On calling to ask for her friend, the latter greeted her with, "What did you do to me? I went to sleep directly you left me, and never woke till morning. I think you must have mesmerised me." Ethel had, in fact, exchanged consciousness with her friend (temporarily), and had given to her a night's sleep; receiving in exchange a day of musical genius. Her prediction was fulfilled; the professors were again disappointed in the pupil who had twice shown a *genius* for musical composition!

The art of exchanging consciousness with those whom we wish to understand or to benefit, is one that I cultivated at an early age; having been taught it by my father, who learned it from old occultist books. My children all inherited it to some degree, without having been taught. Its early development in Ethel was so remarkable that a medical man advised me to let her educate herself by her own instincts. "Any ordinary teacher," he said, "would kill that child or drive her mad." She is now in very good health, and fast gaining hold on her own personality; but for many years the tendency to exchange personality, involuntarily, was a source of much trouble to her.

One feature of the story should be noticed, in justice to professional mediums. Ethel told me about the examination in all good faith, in answer to my questions, and rather reluctantly; yet she asserted that the chalk *was put into her hands* by somebody. Mr. Eyre says that he *saw her take it* from the table. She was entranced (by Mr. Eyre's strong tension on the desire that she should do well at the examination); and, in her momentary trance, *felt* as though the chalk were being put into her passive hand. Had a similar deviation from fact appeared in any statement made either by a professional medium or by an earnest propagator of Spiritualism, it would have been supposed by non-believers to prove a desire to deceive. The moral is that we don't know yet all about the trance-condition; and, therefore, should do well to suspend our judgment, when statements are made about which we fancy that the utterers *must* know them to be untrue.—I am, sir, yours truly,

MARY BOOLE.

"Puritanism, Mysticism, and Ritualism."

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I do not pretend either to follow or to understand the drift of your correspondent, "R. N.," who writes under the above heading, but there is one thing in his letter which is clear to me, and this is of such a nature as to call for correction. I allude to his misuse of the term "Mysticism." It is chiefly to what he calls "Mysticism" in Christianity that he ascribes the failure, in so far as it is a failure, of that religion, and the monstrous abuses which have prevailed under its name. Whereas on the contrary, the fact is that it is not "Mysticism" at all, but its negation and opposite, *materialism*, that is responsible for the evils in question. The founder, Himself, of Christianity, is credited by His biographers with positively asserting the mystical character of His doctrine. For the saying, "My Kingdom is not of this world," implies that it has no reference to persons or events which are physical and historical and of the senses, but deals only with those realities which are spiritual, eternal, and of the soul. And the mystic, and the mystic alone, is he who receives Christianity in this sense, and accordingly devotes himself to the culture, not of the things of sense, but of the things of the soul, using persons and events as but symbols and parables to express these. And it is precisely because mysticism has been dethroned in favour of materialism in things religious, and the worship of Principles superseded by that of Persons, and the Spirit ignored in favour of the Letter, that Christianity has been degraded to the monstrous fetish it has become. "R. N." has evidently contracted a prejudice against the word "mysticism," through mistaking it as representing the cause of the evils he, in common

with myself, deplores; but I am confident that a careful reconsideration of the matter will enable him to see that only by a return to mysticism is the true Christianity to be realised. Firmly established upon Principles, the mystic can recognise and use all that is good in both "Puritanism" and "Ritualism" without stint and without prejudice, and is secure against falling into the monstrous, because physical, interpretations of the spiritual allegories concerning "Eve" and "Christ," the Fall and the Incarnation, which have prevailed in the Church from the "Fathers" to the author of *Scientific Religion*, and are by the writer of the Appendix thereto, reiterated in all their grotesque and repulsive monstrosity in your last number. E. M.

"Scientific Religion."

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Warned by your gentle hint as to the liberty taken by correspondents with the space devoted to them in your journal, I will compress my remarks regarding the reply of my dear and old friend "C. C. M." to my former notice, which appears in your last issue.

It is quite true I have not read *Scientific Religion*, and it might appear absurd, if regarded as a critique, or an attempt on my part to apply the same to the work in question. It was not this, but a notice of general principles, or axioms, which, as so clearly delineated by "C. C. M.," form the groundwork of the system elaborately amplified by its gifted and, in other departments, brilliant author. Anyone conversant with T. L. Harris's writings will easily recognise the relationship.

My object was to show that "Scientific Religion," like every other branch of scientific research, must be based on facts that are demonstrable. Lacking this, I am justified in asserting that the title "scientific" is misleading and inappropriate. It appears "that the claim to a scientific character is limited to the conception and exposition of the 'higher possibilities of life and practice by the operation of natural forces.'"

Who wields these "natural forces" to make them productive of such alleged results? Is "C. C. M." aware that there are what are called, in medical parlance, false conceptions? Will he charge me with egotism if I pronounce the work in question as one of these on the mental, or metaphysical plane. The falsity—to my view, and from my standpoint—consists in the audacity of a mortal to call in question the wisdom of the Maker of the Cosmos, of which this planet Earth is a part, and who dares to assert that the original design has been a failure, &c.

In contradistinction to this, I maintain that any declaration involving such a suggestion resolves itself into an exhibition of human arrogance. For instance, "C. C. M." says: "The contention was that man's present embodiment is the result of a lapse into a materialistic condition for which he was not intended, and to which his complete human constitution was not adapted."

Leaving other planets out of the question, we can deal with our own; for what conceivable purpose was it made and formed as it is, other than that which it actually fulfils? viz., as a residence for human beings and all other forms of existing and existent life. By the time we have learnt the necessary relationship actually existing between man and his temporary dwelling-place—this planet earth—we shall arrive at the scientific knowledge that it is exactly in accord with the "original design"—not of nature, for nature itself is phenomenal, but of the Great Supreme, who infinitely transcends all human thought to grasp.

Again, *Scientific Religion* teaches that "the conception of the fall is that of a moral catastrophe, very gradual in its process and effects, but eventually resulting in the physical degradation of man." This atrocious fallacy is again the resultant of the primal false conception. What proof can the author of such a statement adduce to verify its actuality? Was there not, is there not, a purpose to be attained, and which alone—so far as we know—is exactly fitted for the attainment of that purpose, viz., the projection of life atoms into conditions which physical existence affords? Does this grand fact resolve itself into "a moral catastrophe and physical degradation"?

I may not now follow "C. C. M." into the physiological domain as touching the structural masculine and feminine forms, each with a distinction and characteristic of its own, so beautifully adapted for the enjoyment of a reciprocal affection, &c., by the two differentiated forms, that indefinitely surpasses our conception of what it would or might be if bisexuated in one structural organic form. To apply the terms "physical degradation" to the constituted order of things in the physical world is an exhibition of human weakness, if not of folly. If religion is to be

"scientific," then adopt scientific methods for its discovery and working, which are the tabulation and verification of facts which are patent and verifiable to all. To my view sacerdotal religion is based upon beliefs, but scientific religion—to be scientific—must be based upon known facts, otherwise it is simply speculative, and such, I maintain, is the proper term to apply to the work in question.

Referring again, for the last time, to the alleged physical "Incarnation of (the historical) Christ"—indispensable to the schemes of sacerdotal religion, which boldly and roundly declares that man has fallen from the original state in which he was created on this earth, &c., &c.—science declares that all the evidence ("C. C. M." knows the value of evidence), cumulating with an astonishing rapidity, proves the direct contrary, viz., that, instead of a continuous falling, there are proofs of a continuous ascension from the zero of his first appearance on this earth, as palpable as the ascending scale of organised life forms from those discoverable in the oldest strata. The question is—Is the alleged Incarnation an actual fact? The alleged fact is long antedated in now well known history. The land of Egypt, to this very day, swarms with monumental and other descriptions of alleged facts of precisely the same kind. Was the Egyptian Madonna, Isis, the actual mother of the Saviour and Redeemer, Horus? Or, coming nearer to the physical plane, was the boasted paternity of so many of their kings, claimed as being divine and not mortal, an actual fact? The temple walls at Luxor antedate, in pictorial form and representation, substantially, if not identically, the incidents recorded in the Gospel narratives regarding the conception and birth of the Christian Jesus. Which is true? On what logical principle is the vastly earlier record to be rejected as fabulous, and the later—but not latest—one to be accepted as an actual "scientific" fact? More I cannot and may not say.

A word on the hypothetical question of Re-incarnation, and I have done. "C. C. M." tells us he believes "the true doctrine on that subject has been so luminously expounded, &c., &c., by certain specified ones; and that I have an apparent unconsciousness of Mr. M.'s explicit and lucid correction" regarding current misconceptions, &c. To "C. C. M." such expositions may appear explicit and lucid. Not so to me. To my view they present a *lurid glare*, which those who have not sufficient insight may easily mistake for lucidity; but the spiritual scientist—and there are some—will not be deceived by such plausible appearances. Appearances are one thing, but realities are quite another, and to my view Re-incarnation theorists, and even the author of *Sympneumata* and *Scientific Religion* not excepted, have much to learn. They one and all base their theories and speculations upon—appearances! The apparent possession by human beings of what is termed "free will" they believe to be a reality; and the author of the Appendix to *Scientific Religion* takes up the myth, fable, and legend of *fallen angels*, and invests "Adam Cadmon" with the headship of the primal universe by the "insane, unbridled licence of his free will," &c., &c.

All such Rip Van Winkle class of teachers seem to be quite unconscious that a new state of human mentality is in course of being evolved into activity, for which the teachings of bygone ages and states are utterly unsuited. Men, women, and even children are now questioning their teachers, If I die, shall I live again; and if so, where, and how, and in what conditions? This is the question of the age we now live in. To meet it the Author of our being (the Source and Fountain of life, which we are the continuous recipients of) has supplied the need of verification, in a self-evident mode patent to all, that the man, woman, or child *does* survive the process of physical dissolution, and the very I, the identical Ego, which enables every one to know that I am what I am, which built up the wondrous structural organism that we term the physical body, repeats an analogous process in the state beyond the grave.

This is a scientific fact demonstrable and verifiable—no longer speculative; and yet in face of all this, we have an order of would-be teachers, attempting to resuscitate the dying form of past "religions," and declaring that such demonstrable evidences of a future continuous conscious being and life are "temporary survivals of the recent incarnation," are shells; in fact, anything but what they actually are. When Occultism, as represented by its modern professors, with its fraudulent claims to the possession of absolute truth, has become a thing of the past, mankind will wonder how they succeeded in cajoling and mystifying their votaries when actual, demonstrable, and scientific facts in

abundance were within the reach of all who would study the laws of the physical, mental, and spiritual Cosmos.

I sum up all my philosophy—and challenge denial—in the proposition: There is only one Life, and one Substance, by which the one Life is made manifest in all worlds and spheres. He, or she, who masters this will cease to be troubled with the task of attempting to reconcile the irreconcilable, or of selecting one out of the thousand and one competing and conflicting systems of thought and life that go by the name of religions.—Respectfully yours,

Higher Broughton, Manchester.
September 1st, 1888.

WM. OXLEY.

Writing with a Psychograph.
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I am much interested in everything which comes to us through "LIGHT," especially in Mr. Haughton's translation of the passage from Job xix. 25-27. Why have not the revisers of the Old Testament used the word "Avenger" or placed it in the margin, instead of "Vindicator"? Alas, there may be many such blunders, and if we cannot all read the Hebrew text for ourselves, how can we tell whether the right or wrong meaning is given?

I do not believe in Re-incarnation a bit. Theories are interesting to study, but my idea is that the spirit is always ascending to higher spheres as it progresses towards purity, and at the last, whenever that may arrive, it will be absorbed into the Great Spirit, our Father, and that God will be All in All.

I have been brought up in the Church of England, but without bigotry, believing that no matter what the creed, the love of the Father must work in each to make a good soul.

I have tried writing with a psychograph, with the aid of another person, and have had some wonderful (I use this word because it was so to us) revelations and communications, but my friends got frightened, and many thought it wrong, and so my writing came to an end, excepting one girl, my niece, who returned to her home at some distance. I believe this girl was a medium, for when we asked the spirits to whom they addressed themselves, the answer was "L." "How does she have more power than others?" "It is hereditary." "Whom does she inherit it from?" "Her father's father." I may say here that he could find water with the divining rod. I think the young people who were staying with us used to get nervous from telling ghost stories and creepy tales, so on one occasion, with my hands on the psychograph, I remarked that I had been told if I went on getting answers so I should be seeing and feeling spirits, and that I did not want to see anything or have any tricks played on me. The answer came directly, "We won't do that."

I have never tried to verify the names and information given by some of the spirits, from a feeling that, if true, there may be some relative who would not like it. On two separate occasions two spirits separately gave me information of themselves which I knew was correct, but I had no thought of either at the time. Another time I asked if the spirits communicating knew any of mine who had gone before. The answer was, "They are in too high a sphere." Very good advice and warnings were often given, and, strangely enough, the words on one occasion, "Something strange will happen in your world soon." I could not elicit the nature of this, whether moral, physical, or political, but I was told the effect would be, "We" (the spirits) "shall mix more with men." All questions to learn more were met by, "I may not tell," or "We cannot say more, be ready." I think there was an extract from Laurence Oliphant's writings a few weeks since in "LIGHT," in which he speaks of some strange things to happen soon. And I have also noted a like prophetic utterance in some of the addresses lately published on the great social problems.

HOPE.

Re-incarnation Problems.
To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—In view of the interest we all take in our sublime faith, will you allow me to express my regret in seeing your valuable columns so taken up with argumentative letters, which seem to me to have no result in persuading your readers either to accept or reject the subject of them—Re-incarnation—but rather to lead to an acerbity of feeling, which is surely the very last result that can be desirable, in view of the teachings of our beloved Master, Whose whole mission was one of love, and Who Himself declared in the simplest but most emphatic language, that there was but one thing needful to us to reach the Kingdom of Heaven—irrespective of all creeds and beliefs—and that one was, "Love to God and our neighbour"?

Surely, therefore, in view of such paramount authority we can well afford to wait for the time when our minds will become further enlightened upon topics not necessary to salvation—remembering that "what we know not now we shall know hereafter"—and rather concentrate our energies upon that beautiful but simple way to eternal happiness, pointed out by our Great Exemplar, and agree to sink our differences of belief in mutual sympathy and respect for each other's convictions; knowing that God sees all hearts, and that if they are attuned to love of Him and our brother, all else will follow in due time.—Faithfully yours,
August 25th.
"LILY."

[We have no prejudice in favour of Re-incarnation, but it is evidently a subject that excites interest in our readers, and that has governed us: that and nothing else. But we refer our esteemed correspondent to a note at the foot of "Nizida's" letter.—ED.]

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Your correspondents who uphold or sympathise with the Re-incarnation idea, seem to have very vague ideas about the spirit of a man. Surely there can be no intelligent progress made towards a satisfactory understanding, unless there is attained and held a clear conception of the nature of a spiritual person, or individual, as some would say. Over and over again words that mean qualities or attributes are used as if they signified independent existences. Love, wisdom, goodness, mercy, power, are only attributes of a concrete being in whom they exist. They have no existence without the being. No being can exist who is not at the same time substance and form. God Himself, as He is a spiritual Being (not Being in the abstract, which is nothing at all), must have or be substance and form. If God is not this He is nothing. A being to be moral and intelligent must be organic. All the substances of existences pass in alternation from the inorganic to the organic state. And the organised or concreted ethers, in the forms of animated beings, are co-eternal with inorganic or fluid ethers.

There may be a universal Spirit, that is, ether, however sublime, but that, strictly speaking, is not God. It may be the atmosphere of God; the spirit off, or emanation from, Him; a luminous sphere, or sea of light, shed by, or from, His Person, as the centre of it all, and the focal font of the universe. Where there is no cerebral organ there is no intelligence and no love, and there must be a cerebellic organ for motion and power, and all the other organs follow as a consequence. Now a natural man is a man solely because of his body being in the human form and shape. A human soul is a soul because of its human form, and existing in the interior plane; a spirit is a spirit because it is in the human form, and exists in the still more interior plane. No being, spiritual, psychical, or material, can transcend the human as to form. Any individual existence or being that is otherwise than the human in form, is less than the human, for the human is the highest. All this will surely be clear to an intelligent mind.

A man no doubt is a very composite being; he must, as some Theosophists teach, involve many forms in his structural personality, according to the degrees or planes there are in nature. Let it be that the spirit is the inmost or highest, living at the verge of the divinest sphere; still that spiritual man, however exalted in virtue, is not necessarily immortal in himself; he is only a form and can exist only continually by the Divine providing. What is called the "Divine life" or "Divine spirit" in a man or angel is simply the life in them, their affections, their mentalities, their bodily vigours, derived from the foods that they partake of in their Father's house. They breathe continually the airs of heaven; they partake of its manifold varieties of fruits, and live through the eternal years. It is true that some conceive that the Divine lives in every spirit being, as an "entity," "monad," or spirit "atom." What is this entity? Is it in the centre of the brain, and what size is it? I do not deny that there may be, or is, a central organ in the centre of the brain into which an influx from the Divine sphere is received, and thence proceeds into the general structure. In this central entity or organ the Divine life may dwell and hold the whole body polarized to itself, thus preserving the spiritual being in his solid consistency. I can accept of this conception as an essential fact of structure. This spirit entity may be considered the germ of the personality or individuality, and pre-exists. The germ descends into nature, clothes itself with the various substances, and elaborates in the

maternal form the embryo in its threefold degrees, spirit, soul, and body, for the future man. The germ evolves the man in the image of itself, not in the image of a previously existing spirit individual, as a re-incarnation. The body, the soul, and the spirit forms, form within form as one, are developed together, and form one man until death doth them part, when the spirit form (which is the essential man) goes to the place it has made for itself by its desires and its deeds, and the spiritual germ is held in it, and, I should say, abides in it for ever if he, the spirit, is immortal. Although a spirit lives by breath and food, yet if the spiritual entity or germ was taken from it, it would dissolve away into its primal elements. Now, I believe that the germ never leaves any spirit, unless such spirit has by vicious habits, and through evil living, wholly corrupted itself, and is past redemption. In this case dissolution is its doom, which follows the withdrawal of the Divine germ into the Divine sphere. A spirit partly evil and partly good cannot descend again and re-enclose himself (or herself) in a parent's body. No such spirit would desire to do so, for the virtue in him (or her) would cause him to aspire to Heaven (or perfection) continually. It is against the law of spiritual humanity to descend and be re-enclosed by way of human birth. So long as an entity abides involved in the spirit form, it, of course, cannot be involved in a maternal womb, but, for this purpose, if it did forsake the spirit form, that spiritual structure would at once fall into dissolution with all its memories. Let us bear in mind that the only one condition for a human evolution is the presence and activity of the spirit entity (an exceedingly minute form, a living "atom," so to speak), and not the presence of a spiritual individual, which is a thing inconceivable. If I am wrong here, and any Re-incarnationist can show my argument to be away from the mark, he should do so for truth's sake. Above all things, let us have clearness, and use terms with a well understood meaning. My aim in the foregoing statements has been chiefly definition.—Yours respectfully, J. S.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Your able correspondent " π " takes me to task as well as others for discussing spiritual matters in terms of earth. But as tongues are the only means by which we men are able to converse, and convey, however defectively, our ideas to our fellows, it seems to me unreasonable to object that Re-incarnation and spirit identity are always discussed in such terms. If we are not to use our ordinary means of communication, we must of necessity cease to write at all. Further, the more plainly we speak the more easily do our hearers grasp what we intend them to understand. Again, "all the people, angels, geniuses, and the rest" are certainly as much human as we are, but with the following addition: that they are humanity plus many years, sometimes many thousands of years, of development.

Again " π " objects to my opinion that the guide is responsible for the moral training of the individual; and that for the reason that morality is a human product. Both his assertion and mine are quite true; there is no incompatibility between them. Man's work on earth is the development of morality, *par excellence*. It is for that purpose that he has to return to earth-life time after time, until the required standard is acquired. But he is not left to himself, a charitable provision is made by which he is warned and exhorted to do one thing, or to avoid another. Again, when he is in doubt as to whether he may do any particular thing, he "asks himself" the question, is it right or wise? This asking of self may end in one of two things: either his own soul is highly enough developed to perceive for itself what is the proper course, or the guide steps in and impresses him with the idea of right or wrong; the result to normal human states is apparently the same, namely, that the person learns by intuition, although in reality it may be either intuition in the former case or impression in the latter.

Again, " π " states that Re-incarnation is generally taught by external means, "if not always."

This is, perhaps, true, but it gives a wrong impression. I have been struck with the numbers of persons that I have come across who perceived at once not only the truth of the re-birth theory, but its necessity. I know of several instances of persons, knowing nothing of spirit teachings, who either felt as an original intuition that each individual has lived before and will live again; or who, when they first heard, in this life, of the idea, seized it, and maintained that they felt that it contained a great truth. If that is not knowing by internal means, I am afraid I don't know the meaning of the term. An old officer who had

seen much service in India once told me that a brother soldier and teacher used to say, "S—, you have lived and you will live; I don't know how, but you have lived and you will live." This was at least twenty-five years ago, before the subject was one of contention among Spiritualists.

No one pretends that the absolute truth is reached in this matter, with, perhaps, the exception of Mr. Sinnett; we are at the beginning of a new era, and are gaining, day by day, clearer insight into "the things of God." Re-incarnation contains a great truth; it is our duty to thresh it out, and separate, by means of argument and discussion, the grain from the chaff.

We can certainly get on without using the words atoms, molecules, &c., and even the word monad. But the latter term was not the product of my pen; it was borrowed from writers who, in my humble opinion, have found an excellent term by which to concisely indicate what they mean, viz., the soul and spirit of an *individual*, man or beast. It is extremely useful to distinguish that principle when individualised, which individualisation is a step of development made in that portion of the invertebrate sub-kingdom of nature that is represented by the polypes, corals, &c. In the vegetable kingdom there is no true individuality. 1ST M.B. (LOND.)

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—Mr. Haughton tells us, in reference to Job xix. 25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth," that the word "Redeemer" ought to be "Avenger." To me it is immaterial whether Job, who was living before Moses, and "knew nothing of any expected Redeemer," looked forward to a Redeemer or an Avenger. It is sufficient for me that he expected one then alive would stand upon the earth at some future time. That is the *point*, not the particular quality in which he would come; my sole object was to argue *pre-existence* by the Bible assertion that one then living "would stand at the latter day upon the earth." And no one can rob Job of that sentiment, while side issues are of small importance. With regard to Job xix. 26, "Though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God," which I gave as an argument for his personal belief in his own future re-incarnation, it is surely a great stretch of imagination to interpret the above words, as Mr. Haughton does, and to talk of the actual *destruction* of the body as meaning only "a dreadful plight just now." This looks certainly like what he calls himself, "doctoring to suit a purpose." He surely must have had his own argument in his mind's eye for personal use when he took to such "doctoring" as that.

Job was certainly not a Jew, as Mr. Haughton remarks. The writers of the first five books of the Bible ignored a future life, or something very like it, though Moses was learned in Egyptian lore and must have heard about it. But Job had no reason for ignoring a future life; while India and Egypt teemed with Re-incarnation doctrine at that very time, so we need not be surprised at Job's teaching it.

Then, again, as regards Psalm xc. 1, 3, Mr. Haughton says:—"T. W.'s fancies 'come again' means coming again to be re-incarnated. It is just the reverse. It means, unto dust shalt thou return."

This is surely a very far-fetched idea for any one who has ever heard anything about Re-incarnation to indulge in; for it is at the time when a man is "turned to destruction" that he is turned into dust, not when, long *after* having returned to dust, "God again says, Come again, ye children of men." The dust phase treads close on the heels of death, and has nothing to do with the "thousand years which in God's sight are but as yesterday," years passed, perhaps, by the soul in the spheres. So, when we come to "naïve criticisms" we need not find them one-sided.

Then, again, Mr. Haughton, referring to John the Baptist saying of himself, through ignorance, that he was not Elijah, asks me if "I know better than John the Baptist"? I answer: Most assuredly I do know better than John the Baptist, because a "greater than John the Baptist" has told us that he was Elijah. John did not know it himself, but Christ did know it. He who said of Himself, speaking of His own pre-existence: "Before Abraham was I am," says of John the Baptist: "If ye will receive it this is Elias which was for to come." (Matt. xi. 14.) And again: "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of Man suffer of them. Then

the disciples understood that He spake unto them of John the Baptist." (Matt. xvii. 12.)

Here is a typical re-incarnation, in which *the subject knew nothing of his future existence*, notwithstanding Mr. Haughton, in "LIGHT" of July 21st, 1888, calls "a total forgetfulness of all past existences . . . a most insane and malignant provision." If this be the case, neither Mr. Haughton nor I are answerable for it. I myself doubt its malignity.

Then, as regards my observations on Gautama Buddha, Mr. Haughton thinks, contrary to myself, that Gautama's revelation being the latest, "was also the wisest and most complete."

If Gautama's revelation was "the wisest and most complete," being the latest, then the denial of God, laid to his charge, is the wisest and most complete revelation. If Mr. Haughton thinks this an improvement on the following revelation of earlier date then I differ from him:—"Lord, Thou hast been our refuge from one generation to another. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were made, thou art God from everlasting. Thou turnest man to destruction, again Thou sayest, Come again, ye children of men, for a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday." T. W.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—I trust you will allow me space for a few words in answer to some of your correspondents who oppose Re-incarnation. First, regarding Mr. Haughton's remarks; those who accept the doctrine do so because they feel it is the only possible explanation of the problems that Spiritualism brings with it. They do not pretend to understand every detail of the process or to be all in accord on minor matters. My belief is that the spirit about to be re-incarnated knows nothing of the process, but as the personal characteristics of the last incarnation gradually fade out, a period of unconsciousness supervenes, during which the soul gravitates, through its affinities, to its new parents. Mr. Lowe has asked us to explain how it is done. I should like to ask him if he can explain how the spirit is created by the act of the father. Even Christians are in advance of his idea, for they think that the soul comes direct from God. To maintain that a physical act can create a spirit is manifestly absurd. Mr. Harpur tries to be funny. But if Re-incarnation is susceptible of ridicule, what shall be said of the ordinary Spiritualistic theory? I will quote a passage in the *Spiritual Reformer*:—

"The renowned John Smith or William Brown would first commence his immortal career on this earth. This planet would have the honour of starting him out of the unindividualised spirit ocean [or from nothingness, according to Mr. Lowe]. And his one uneventful life here, probably passed in money-getting, would be sufficient to start a personality which would last when, to quote Addison's words:

"The stars shall fade, the sun grow dim with years,
But thou [John Smith] shalt flourish in immortal youth,
Unhurt amidst the war of elements,
The crash of matter, and the wreck of worlds!"

Probably a million years hence, according to our simple Spiritualistic friends, the same relationships will exist: father, mother, children, &c.; those husbands and wives who have been divorced of course being duly separated in the spirit-world. Then, again, can anyone say what is a human being, as distinct from an animal? Wherever we draw the line in the progress up to man, the forms on the one order will differ in a very small degree from those on the other. How, then, shall we ascribe an immortal soul to the one which we deny to the other? Again, assuming that a child, when born, is an immortal soul, at what period does it become so? Would a child killed a day before the natural time of birth live eternally in the spirit-world? If this is admitted, we must, to be logical, attribute immortality to the germ at the moment of conception. This is an absurdity. These difficulties are not a tithe of those that might be advanced.

A. F. TINDALL, A. Mus., T.C.L.,
President of London Occult Society.

To the Editor of "LIGHT."

SIR,—In very few words I would reply, with your permission, to Mr. George Harpur, relative to the *mollusk* and those lower creatures which are on the road of evolution up to the highest stage of embodiment, or external manifestation of spirit. As the lower creatures have not reached the stage of responsibility, they cannot "generate Karma"; and the return of the ascending "monad" (which has not yet evolved *mind*), into earthly conditions, is regulated by the necessities of its evolution upon the especial plane it occupies, and the expansion of its consciousness as it gains more and more

of sense-life. The consciousness of a mollusk is limited, in all probability, to mere *feeling*, with an instinctive reaching out for that which is essential to its existence as a mollusk. It can do no evil, and it can do no good, beyond filling its place in the Cosmos. The "monad" embodied in its embryonic shape, when that vehicle of expression is destroyed must, following a law of nature, re-assert itself again and again in other forms (perhaps still as a mollusk). For it is from the lower material plane alone that spirit *evolves*, that is to say, *pushes off matter* by processes of psychical growth, setting itself *free from matter*, so as to reach the highest *objective* expression. More and more of Mind, of the intellectual consciousness of a reasoning Ego, is gained at each stage of ascension, during which millions and millions of years elapse (at least what we call years—those divisions of time which mark the earth's revolution round the sun). So long do these processes of evolution take, that time on our planet is not long enough for the lower embodiments, which form the *fauna* and *flora* of our earth, to reach the *human stage*. They will pass on, in the disembodied condition, to take form in another system of planets yet to come. From which it follows that the human race, which has peopled our earth during the millions of years it has been in a condition to support human life, has evolved through all the lower stages of existence, upon a system of planets now defunct.

If asked what proof I have of all this, I reply, only that proof which I discover by reasoning from analogy; a proof satisfactory to my own mind, though it by no means follows it must necessarily be so to others. Spirit works through such vast æons and cycles of time, that it is only by analogy and comparison we can judge of its processes. If I am told that these are the theories of Theosophy, I answer, undoubtedly they are, and I have discovered nowhere theories so exactly and admirably suited to the *spiritual* growth of mind as these same teachings, which, in my opinion, are the highest the present stage of our mental progression as yet enables us to receive.

"Karma," therefore, is generated by the human being alone, who alone can be held responsible for his actions, and manner of living.

The subject of Karma embraces such a very wide field that it would be impossible to enter into it more fully here. I will, therefore, end this letter by recommending those who are earnestly studying the subject of Re-incarnation, to read Mr. E. D. Walker's lately published book, called *Re-incarnation*, which may be had from Ward and Lock.—Faithfully yours,

NIZIDA.

We have felt it desirable to close the long correspondence on Re-incarnation. The unabated interest in the subject is shown by the fact that we reluctantly reject a considerable number of letters.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

RECEIVED from Bentley & Son, *Hartas Maturin*, by H. F. Lester, three vols. Will be attended to on Editor's return to town.

PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION, 24, HARCOURT-STREET, LONDON.—Last Sunday teachings were given by Mr. Dale. Sunday meetings at 3.30.—COR.

MR. GERALD MASSEY has re-written his work on *Shakspeare and the Sonnets*, with much new matter. It will be published at once by Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., under the title of *The Secret Drama of Shakspeare's Sonnets: a New Work on Old Lines*.

SOUTH LONDON SPIRITUALISTS' SOCIETY, WINCHESTER HALL, HIGH-STREET, PECKHAM.—Excellent meetings were held on Sunday with Mr. J. Hopcroft, who delivered good addresses to large audiences. On Sunday next at eleven, questions on spiritual subjects will be replied to. At seven, Mr. R. J. Lees will speak on "Spiritualism in its Relation to Christianity."—W. E. LONG, Hon. Sec.

No. 29 of the *White Cross Library*, Prentice Mulford, Editor, deals with the question, "How to Push your Business." We wish that these excellent tracts could be sold at a smaller price. A dozen sixteen-page pamphlets roughly bound ought not to cost 7s. 6d. Yet that is what the little volume sells for in this country. It may be well to state that the place of publication of these pamphlets has been changed. The publisher is Mr. F. J. Needham, of 1, Park-place corner, Broadway, New York City. There all back numbers are to be had. It would be worth while to send a few copies to our offices for sale. We have some readers who inquire for them.

TESTIMONY TO PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

The following is a list of some 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., sometime 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. Herber* Mayo, F.R.S., &c., &c.

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

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

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

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

WHAT IS SAID OF PSYCHICAL PHENOMENA.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE LONDON 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. 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,’ ‘somnambule,’ ‘mediumic,’ and others not yet explained by science to be ‘impossible,’ is one who speaks without knowing what he is talking about; and also any man accustomed, by his professional avocations, to scientific observation—provided that his mind be not biased by pre-conceived opinions, nor his mental vision blinded by that opposite kind of illusion, unhappily too common in the learned world, which consists in imagining that the laws of Nature are already known to us, and that everything which appears to overstep the limit of our present formulas is impossible—may acquire a radical and absolute certainty of the reality of the facts alluded to.”

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

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

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