

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
New Members and Associates .. .. .	369	Cases Received by the Literary Committee	376
Meetings of Council.. .. .	369	Mr. Eginton's Slate-Writing .. .. .	399
General Meeting .. .. .	371	Notes on Reports of the Society for	
Announcement of General Meeting .. .. .	374	Psychical Research by Mr. W. Davies..	400
Oxford Branch of the Society for Psychical		Reply to Mr. Davies' Criticisms .. .. .	407
Research .. .. .	375	Supplementary Library Catalogue .. .. .	416

### NEW MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES.

#### VICE-PRESIDENT.

THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF RIPON, The Palace, Ripon.

#### MEMBERS.

HUME, A. O., Simla, India.

PILCHER, R. H., East India United Service Club, 14, St. James's Street, London, S. W.

PYE, WILLIAM A., 24, Daleham Gardens, Hampstead, London, N. W.

TATTERSALL, ROBERT W., 31, New Inn Hall Street, Oxford.

TAYLOR, MISS EDITH, 9, Endsleigh Gardens, London, N. W.

WINCH, WILLIAM RICHARD, 4, Fenchurch Street, London, E. C.

#### ASSOCIATES.

CHOWNE, MRS., 17, Cornwall Terrace, Regent's Park, London, N. W.

CLAVEQUIN, EDWARD, Munster Lodge, Monkstown, Dublin.

ELLIOTT, CHARLES ALFRED, Lismore, St. Leonards-on-Sea.

HAMEED-ULLAH, M., Christ's College, Cambridge.

ISHAM, LADY, Lampport Hall, Northamptonshire.

WOODHEAD, JOHN C., 171, West Washington Street, Chicago, U. S.

### MEETINGS OF COUNCIL.

At a Meeting of the Council held on the 24th of April, the President in the Chair, the following Members were present:—Messrs. Alexander Calder, Walter H. Coffin, Edmund Gurney, Professor Oliver J. Lodge, Messrs. C. C. Massey, F. W. H. Myers, E. R. Pease, F. Podmore, Professor H. Sidgwick and Messrs. H. A. Smith and Hensleigh Wedgwood.

The minutes of the previous Meeting having been read on the

proposition of Mr. Myers, seconded by Professor Sidgwick, the Bishop of Ripon was unanimously elected a Vice-President of the Society.

Three new Members and two new Associates, whose names and addresses appear on another page, were elected.

Mr. Myers reported an anonymous donation of £1 to the funds of the Society.

It was resolved, on the proposition of Mr. Gurney, seconded by Professor Sidgwick, that any Member or Associate who desires to make use of any part of the contents of the *Journal* in any public manner, shall be at liberty to do so, if he previously obtains the sanction of the Editor of the *Journal*.

It was also resolved that the Assistant Secretary be requested to draw up a report of the substance of any discussion which may arise on papers read at the General Meetings of the Society, for insertion in the *Journal*, and that the report be sent round in proof to those who have taken part.

Mr. Gurney having brought forward the subject of the titles of certain books appearing in the catalogue of the Library, and also the question of the classification of the Catalogue, it was resolved that the whole matter be referred to the Library Committee to report, and that the Library Committee be requested to prepare a catalogue of the more scientific works.

The next Meeting of the Council was fixed for Friday, the 8th of May, at 4.45 p.m.

---

A Meeting of the Council was also held on the 8th of May, Professor Sidgwick in the chair, at which Messrs. Alexander Calder, Edmund Gurney, Richard Hodgson, C. C. Massey, F. W. H. Myers, E. R. Pease and J. H. Stack were present.

After the minutes of the previous Meeting had been read, three new Members and four new Associates were elected, whose names are included in the list on another page.

Letters of resignation were received from La Duchessa di Marino, Mr. Frederick T. Mott, and Mrs. Walsham, Associates of the Society.

Several presents to the Library were on the table, which are separately acknowledged elsewhere. These included a complete set of the volumes of "Psychische Studien," from the commencement, from the Hon. Alexander D. Aksakof.

The usual monthly cash account, for April, was presented.

It was decided that a General Meeting of the Society should be held on Friday, the 29th inst., at the rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk-street, Pall Mall, S.W., the chair to be taken at 8.30 p.m. The papers to be read will include selected portions of the paper on "Some Higher Aspects of Mesmerism," deferred from the last

meeting, and the first part of the final Report on Alleged Theosophical Phenomena.

It is intended to hold another meeting, at which the second part of the above-mentioned report will be read, in the third week in June. To both these meetings Members and Associates will be at liberty to invite friends.

The next Meeting of the Council was fixed for the 29th of May, at 4.30 p.m.

---

### REPORT OF GENERAL MEETING.

---

A General Meeting of the Society was held on the evening of Friday, April 24th, at the Rooms of the Society of British Artists, in Suffolk-street, Pall Mall.

The President, who occupied the chair for the first time, made a brief opening address. Beginning with a warm tribute to the services rendered by his predecessor, he proceeded to give a sketch of the progress of the Society from its commencement, stating, among other facts, that the number of members had reached the total of 586; that more than 12,000 copies of the *Proceedings* were in circulation; and that the Society's Library consisted of more than 800 volumes, of which about one third are foreign works. He then dwelt on the importance of accumulating experimental results, especially in the direction of thought-transference, which—once proved—would serve as a basis for fresh departures; and also of collecting and sifting contemporaneous evidence bearing on every branch of psychical inquiry. He further insisted that, while the reality of the alleged phenomena can only be proved by the strongest evidence, cases which are of less evidential strength may still be worth examining for their theoretic bearings. In conclusion, he totally repudiated the idea that the search into any department of natural fact can properly be regarded as a hopeless task, or one forbidden to the human intellect.

Mrs. Sidgwick then read the continuation of her paper on the evidence collected by the Society for "Phantasms of the Dead," dealing with phantasms having any of the following characteristics to distinguish them from merely subjective hallucinations:—(1) Correct information, previously unknown to the percipient, conveyed by the phantasm; (2) Some clearly defined object aimed at in the manifestations; (3) Such decided resemblance in the apparition to a deceased person unknown to the percipient that the latter afterwards recognises his portrait; (4) Being seen by two or more persons independently and at different times.

Including under the first head cases of apparitions after the death, but before the percipient knows of it, there were in the collection about six cases having this kind of confirmation. The second head was very poorly represented, but under the third and fourth—especially the fourth—Mrs. Sidgwick mentioned 18 narratives, all of them accounts of haunted houses.

In discussing the characteristics of these, she stated that haunting was not confined to old houses; that there was very little evidence for the appearance of ghosts on special anniversaries; not much connecting them with crimes or tragedies; and that in half the cases they are not even by rumour connected with any dead person in particular. She further pointed out that they are seen in all kinds of light, and by all kinds of people.

Proceeding to the theory of haunted houses she professed herself quite unable to form a satisfactory one, but thought it perhaps worth mentioning the only four that had occurred to her.

The first of these, namely, that the apparition is something that occupies and moves through space, and would be in the room whether the percipient were there to see it or not,—she dismissed as almost entirely unsupported by the evidence.

The second—analogue to the telepathic theory of phantasms of the living—was that the apparition is a hallucination, caused in some way by some communication without the intervention of the senses, between the disembodied spirit and the percipient; its form depending on the mind of the spirit, or of the percipient, or of both. This, notwithstanding the difficulty introduced by the local character of the haunting, seemed to her a decidedly more plausible hypothesis.

The third theory was that a tendency to a particular hallucination is in some sense catching;—that A having had a purely subjective hallucination, B is liable, being in the same house as A, to see the same thing.

The fourth theory was that there is something in the building itself—some subtle physical influence—which produces in the brain that effect which, in its turn, becomes the cause of a hallucination.

Mrs. Sidgwick concluded by summing up the evidence afforded by the Society's collection for "Phantasms of the Dead" as follows:—

Firstly.—She said that there were a large number of instances of appearances of the dead shortly after their death, but that generally there was nothing by which we could distinguish these from simple subjective hallucinations. In a few cases, information conveyed seemed to afford the required test, but these were at present too few to make it certain that the coincidence was not due to chance.

Secondly.—There were cases of single appearances at a consider-

able interval after death, but at present none which we had adequate grounds for attributing to the agency of the dead.

Thirdly.—There were numerous cases of seemingly similar apparitions, seen in particular houses, without, apparently, any possibility of the similarity being the result of suggestion or expectation, but the evidence connecting such haunting with any definite dead person was small, and the evidence for the operation of any intelligent agency in it, nil ; and until we could discover more about the laws that seem to govern such haunting, we were hardly justified in forming any theory as to its cause—except as a provisional hypothesis.

She feared that as regarded present conclusions, the result of the investigation would appear to many unsatisfactory. But she did not herself think that we ought to expect so quickly to come to a conclusion, and she said that her examination of the evidence had at any rate convinced her that the inquiry, though likely to be long and difficult, was worth pursuing with patience and energy.

Mr. F. W. H. Myers, referring to the frequent absence of purpose in the visits of “ghosts,” said that it occurred to him that taking the whole number of fairly well-attested accounts of apparitions in the past there was a larger proportion in which a definite purpose was apparent than in those which had been selected in the paper we had heard. He thought we must try and find out what the “ghost” wanted, without laying much stress on the intrinsic importance of the object. He gave the outline of a remarkable story told by Jung-Stilling, in which one of three schoolmasters having died, first one and then the other of the survivors was disturbed by noises, and by the figure of the deceased, who by its actions and gestures appeared to be desirous of conveying some special request. Endeavouring to interpret these, they finally discovered that the deceased had left various small bills of private expenses unpaid. On these being settled, no further manifestation occurred. Mr. Myers did not wish it to be understood that he believed this grotesque story represented a literal reality. But, if we did ascend higher, we might suppose that we should be desirous that even small duties should not be left unfulfilled, and these phenomena might be the result of a kind of unconscious dream. He thought that the causes might, in some cases, be of so trifling a character that it would be impossible to discover them.

Mr. Bidder, Q.C., had been most struck by the last alternative theory which the writer of the paper had brought forward. It had previously occurred to him whether in some of those cases in which a phantom was said to appear in the same place from time to time, there might not be another hypothesis ; whether it might not be possible that the phantom was neither objective nor subjective, but due to some effect having been produced on the surrounding objects, a sort of physical reminis-

cence, so to speak, which could under certain circumstances be perceived by persons sufficiently sensitive. His idea was that there might be something analogous to the property which some substances possess of absorbing light, and thus becoming luminous for a long time afterwards.

A gentleman inquired whether there were any haunted houses within easy access from London at the present time, as it would be very interesting to have the personal experiences of any of the Society who might visit them.

Mr. Podmore called the attention of the Members of the Society to the announcement in the last number of the *Journal*, and said that every facility would be afforded to any who were desirous of investigating.

The President, referring to the humorous aspect of the question, said that he should be well pleased if the result of the inquiry was that there would be one laugh the less and one truth the more. He did not think we must judge of these things as if the spirits of the departed were necessarily engaged in them. The real interpretation might be very different from this. His view was that at present we were more concerned with facts than with explanations. It was our duty to endeavour to account for the evidence before us, in the first place, by things which we knew. At the same time, we could not say there was any inherent improbability in appearances of some kind of the departed. The inquiry we were engaged in included matters of rare occurrence and of great interest, and we must not suppose that there was any *à priori* improbability, if we should ultimately be driven to accept as the real explanation of the phenomena that they were actually phantasms of the dead.

---

Owing to the lateness of the hour the question was put to the meeting by Mr. Gurney whether the second paper which it was intended to bring forward, and which he feared would occupy at least 40 minutes, should be read, or whether it should be postponed. The wish of the meeting appearing to be in favour of the latter course, the paper was postponed, and the meeting assumed a conversational character.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF GENERAL MEETING.

The next General Meeting of the Society will be held on Friday, May 29th, at the Rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk-street, Pall Mall, at 8.30 p.m., when papers will be read by Mr. Gurney on Mesmerism, and by Mr. Hodgson on Alleged "Theosophical" Phenomena.

**OXFORD BRANCH OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.**

This branch was formed in January, 1885, under the presidency of Mr. A. Sidgwick, M.A., of Corpus Christi College. The branch owes its formation chiefly to the efforts of Mr. F. Podmore, who paid a visit to Oxford in the Michaelmas term. Several meetings of the branch have been held, and committees of investigation have been formed; but so far no reports have been presented. A general meeting was held last term, at which Mr. F. W. H. Myers delivered a very interesting lecture. The rules are similar to those of the Cambridge Branch. The composition of the branch is as follows:—

**PRESIDENT :**

A. SIDGWICK, M.A. (C.C.C.)

**SECRETARY :**

EARL RUSSELL (Balliol).

**MEMBERS :**

Miss Edith Argles.  
Miss F. M. F. Skene.  
St. G. Stock.  
R. E. Baynes.  
A. R. Bonus.  
R. Castle.

H. S. Holt.  
O. Beatty.  
W. G. Arkwright.  
P. L. Gell.  
F. C. Schiller.

**AFFILIATED MEMBERS.**

F. H. Matthews (C.C.C.).  
V. W. Maughan (St. John's).  
R. C. Fillingham (Merton).  
C. R. Fraser (Balliol).  
P. U. Henn (Worcester).  
H. Y. Oldham (Jesus).  
R. F. Sharp (New Coll.).  
A. Curtois (Worcester).  
H. J. Cohen (Jesus).  
C. Y. Sturge, B.A. (Trinity).  
V. G. Plarr (Worcester).  
W. Miller (Hertford).  
F. E. Suckling (St. Mary Hall).  
C. E. F. Starkey (Pembroke).  
C. P. R. Young (Pembroke).  
D. Dunstan (The Museum).  
A. E. Rubie (B.N.C.).

F. W. Walton (Keble).  
E. A. Jepson (Balliol).  
A. H. Peppin (Worcester).  
G. Acheson (Univ.).  
C. H. Roberts (Balliol).  
S. D. Darbishire, M.D.  
S. Ball, M.A. (St. John's).  
W. S. Swayne, B.A. (New Coll.).  
S. Alexander, M.A. (Lincoln).  
A. H. Bassano (Balliol).  
J. F. McArthur (Balliol).  
J. F. Wykes (Jesus).  
Dr. Collier (M. B. Cam.).  
C. W. Peake (Hertford).  
H. Cross (Hertford).  
B. M. Allen (Balliol).  
H. M. Laurie (Balliol).

CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

(Continued.)

[It has been suggested that the use of the letters A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup> (Agent dying, Percipient normal) and similar symbols at the head of these narratives is open to objection, on the ground that it assumes a particular explanation of Phantasms of the Living which ought not to be regarded as established. It seems desirable, therefore, to explain that no such assumption is intended to be implied. By "Percipient" is merely meant the person who perceives the phantasm, and by "Agent" the person who is apparently the cause of the phantasm, whether he be so consciously or not. Thus, for example, the terms in no way *exclude* even the supposition that a "veridical" apparition is directly due to some subtle material body, usually associated with the ordinary body of the agent, but under special circumstances separating itself from it, and careering through space by itself. Our readers are of course aware that the hypothesis put forward by the Literary Committee, under the name "Telepathy," is quite different; it is that such apparitions are directly due to hallucination, but that this hallucination is caused by some communication acting otherwise than through the ordinary channels of the senses, between the minds of the person perceiving and of the person about whom information seems to be conveyed.

As there has been some misapprehension as to what is implied in the word "Telepathy," it may be worth while to quote here the passage in the *Proceedings*, Vol. I., p. 147, where the word is first introduced by the Literary Committee: "Clearly then, the analogy of Thought-transference which seemed to offer such a convenient logical start, cannot be pressed too far. Our phenomena break through any attempt to group them under heads of transferred impression, and we venture to introduce the words *Teleesthesia* and *Telepathy* to cover all cases of impressions received at a distance without the normal operation of the recognised sense organs." Again, in Vol. II., p. 118, the following extension of meaning was explained in a note: "We began by restricting this word to cases when the distance through which transference of impressions took place, far exceeded the scope of the recognised senses. But there is great convenience in extending the term to all cases of impressions conveyed without any affection of the percipient's recognised senses, whatever may be his distance from the agent." To limit the meaning of the word by making it imply any theory either as to the mode of conveyance of the impression, or as to the mental conditions required either in the agent or percipient, would certainly be undesirable in the present state of the inquiry. Ed.].



L.—1060—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>s</sup>

This narrative is forwarded to us through Miss Richardson, known to Mr. E. R. Pease.

From Miss Richardson, 47, Bedford Gardens, Kensington, W.

The writer is a very worthy wife of a shopkeeper at home, who told me the occurrence some years ago, then with more detail, as it was fresh in her memory, and her husband can vouch for the facts told him at the time, and the strange "uncanny" effect of the dream on her mind for some time after.

From Mrs. Green to Miss Richardson.

Newry, 21st First Month, 1885.

DEAR FRIEND,—In compliance with thy request, I give thee the particulars of my dream.

I saw two respectably-dressed females driving alone in a vehicle like a mineral water cart. Their horse stopped at a water to drink; but as there was no footing, he lost his balance, and in trying to recover it he plunged right in. With the shock, the women stood up and shouted for help, and their hats rose off their heads, and as all were going down I turned away crying, and saying, "Was there no one at all to help them?" upon which I awoke, and my husband asked me what was the matter. I related the above dream to him, and he asked me if I knew them. I said I did not, and thought I had never seen either of them. The impression of the dream and the trouble it brought was over me all day. I remarked to my son it was the anniversary of his birthday and my own also—the 10th of First Month, and this is why I remember the date.

The following Third Month I got a letter and newspaper from my brother in Australia, named Allen, letting me know the sad trouble which had befallen him in the loss, by drowning, of one of his daughters and her companion. Thou will see by the description given of it in the paper how the event corresponded with my dream. My niece was born in Australia, and I never saw her.

Please return the paper at thy convenience. Considering that our night is their day, I must have been in sympathy with the sufferers at the time of the accident, on the Tenth of First Month, 1878.

It is referred to in two separate places in the newspaper.

From the *Inglewood Advertiser*.

Friday evening, *January 11th*, 1878.

A dreadful accident occurred in the neighbourhood of Wedderburn, on Wednesday last, resulting in the death of two women, named Lehey and Allen. It appears that the deceased were driving into Wedderburn in a spring cart from the direction of Kinypanial, when

they attempted to water their horse at a dam on the boundary of Torpichen Station. The dam was 10 or 12 feet deep in one spot, and into this deep hole they must have inadvertently driven, for Mr. W. McKechnie, manager of Torpichen Station, upon going to the dam some hours afterwards, discovered the spring cart and horse under the water, and two women's hats floating on the surface. . . . The dam was searched, and the bodies of the two women, clasped in each other's arms, recovered.

Extract from Evidence given at the Inquest.

Joseph John Allen, farmer, deposed : I identify one of the bodies as that of my sister. I saw her about 11 a.m. yesterday. . . . The horse had broken away and I caught it for her. Mrs. Lehey and my sister met me when I caught the horse. . . . They then took the horse and went to Mr. Clarke's. I did not see them afterwards alive. William McKechnie deposed . . . About 4 p.m. yesterday, I was riding by the dam when I observed the legs of a horse and the chest above the water.

From Mr. Green, Newry.

15th Second Month, 1885.

DEAR FRIEND, EDITH RICHARDSON,—In reference to the dream that my wife had of seeing two women thrown out of a spring cart by their horse stopping to drink out of some deep water, I remember she was greatly distressed about it, and seemed to feel great sympathy for them. It occurred on the night of the 9th of January.

The reason I can remember the date so well is that the 10th was the anniversary of my wife and our son's birthday. As the day advanced she seemed to get worse, and I advised her to go out for a drive ; when she returned she told me she was no better, and also said she had told the driver not to go near water, lest some accident should happen, as she had had such a dreadful dream the night before, at the same time telling him the nature of it. As my wife's niece did not live with her father, he was not told of it until the next morning, which would be our evening of the 10th, and which we think accounted for the increased trouble she felt in sympathy with him.

THOS. GREEN.

Mrs. Green has had no other experience of the sort.

Inglewood is in Queensland, on the border of New South Wales.

*Note.*—This appears to us to be, for a dream, a very strong case, on account of the amount of detail. The fact that the figures seen were merely recognised as "two females" diminishes, of course, the force of the coincidence ; though, perhaps, one would hardly expect recognition of persons unknown to the percipient. What we more regret is that the account of the dream was not written down (as well as told) before the confirmatory news was

received. We should then have had absolutely independent accounts of dream and accident, and probably more details of the dream than it is now possible to obtain, and the narrative would then have been evidentially one of the best in our collection.

L.—1582—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup> —(Borderland).

Extract from a note-book of the Rev. T. Williams, Rectory, Aston-Clinton, Tring. (The note was made by Mr. Williams on the receipt of a letter from his sister narrating the occurrence.)

Mrs. Stewart, sister-in-law of Jane, my sister's servant, came up to ask if any news from home. She said, with her husband in bed—moonlight—chest of drawers between window—saw her mother standing—felt perfectly awake—she hid her face—a third time looked up—heard [? saw] nothing, but heard men calling up—knew exact time. She came up to my sister's and related this the same day—said dreading to hear knock at door all day—fearing to hear of something having happened to her mother. Her friends, who lived at Church Stretton, came a month after to christening of her baby; in mourning—said mother's sister, who exact image of her mother, had died at the very time of her vision—but friends did not tell Mrs. Stewart, because of her condition. This written from my sister's account, who saw Mrs. Stewart (Margaret) on the day of the vision, and heard account of what seen from herself.

The following is from the husband of the percipient, who is herself dead :—

*April, 1885.*

Mrs. Stewart, the wife of a carpenter, living in Abergavenny, Monmouthshire, and who [Mrs. S.] is since dead, was in the year 1874, in bed, and early one morning, being sure she was awake, (for she had just heard the railway men being called to their work by the call boy,) she looked up to see the time, and in one corner of her room she saw distinctly what she thought was her mother, intently looking at her. She was startled, and hid her face. On looking again the vision was still there, but on looking up a third time it had disappeared. Mrs Stewart come up that day to see a sister-in-law who was in service near the town, to ask if she had had any tidings from her home (the impression the vision had made was so great), but nothing had been heard. Time passed on, and all seemed forgotten, when some of her friends came up to Abergavenny, to the christening of a little baby, born in the meantime. They were in mourning, and inquiries were made as to the friend mourned for, when it was told that on the night Mrs. Stewart thought she saw her mother, a sister of the mother's, to whom she bore a great likeness, had died about the hour named, at some

distance off, but they did not tell Mrs. Stewart of the death until some weeks after it happened, as Mrs. Stewart was in delicate health and much attached to her aunt.

JOHN STEWART.

L—1583—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>a</sup>

From Miss Burrows, The Poplars, Normans Place, Altrincham.

*December, 1884.*

SIR,—I can furnish you with an instance of my name being called by my mother, who was 18 miles off, and dying at the time. I was not aware she was ill, nor was I thinking about her at the time. No one here knew my name, and it was her voice calling, as I was always addressed at home "Lizzy." I can give you more exact information if you require it.—Yours truly,

E. BURROWS.

The Poplars, Normans Place, Altrincham.

*March 18th, 1885.*

In regard to voice which I heard call my name on the 19th February, 1882, I recognised it instantly as being that of my mother. It was *very loud*, sharp, and impetuous as if frightened at something. Our house is detached, very quiet, and the only innates of the house beside myself were two gentlemen, aged respectively 58 and 37, and a widowed daughter-in-law [of the elder gentleman] who had lived with them five years; and not one of them knew my Christian name. I was thunderstruck, and ran out of my room to see if I could account for the voice. *I told the lady the same morning.*

I never saw anything I thought supernatural, and only once before had anything like a similar hallucination. My father and mother were not superstitious people, and a healthier family could not possibly be than ours.

E. BURROWS.

[The other occasion was 12 years previously, when Miss Burrows and her mother heard some sounds which seemed to them unaccountable.]

From Mrs. Griffiths, 31, Rosaville Road, Fulham Road.

*March 25th.*

DEAR SIR,—I am very glad to be able to corroborate the statement made by Miss Burrows, about hearing herself called by name at the time of her mother's death. I cannot remember the exact date, but it was a Sunday morning in February, 1882, and when I came down to breakfast she told me about it and said that a voice called "Lizzy"

distinctly, and it sounded just like her mother's. The next morning she had the news of her mother's death; and she had not one idea that she was ill before, so that it could not have been fancy.

H. GRIFFITHS.

[It will be seen that Miss Burrows gives February 19th as the date, and Mrs. Griffiths mentions independently that the day was a Sunday. The 19th of February, 1882, fell on a Sunday.]

L.—1584—A<sup>e</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

From Joseph Smith, M.D., Warrington.

*November 24th, 1884.*

When I lived at Penketh, about 40 years ago, I was sitting one evening reading, and a voice came to me, saying, "Send a loaf to James Gandy's." I continued reading, and the voice came to me again, "Send a loaf to James Gandy's." Still I continued reading, when a third time the voice came to me with greater emphasis, "Send a loaf to James Gandy's;" and this time it was accompanied by an almost irresistible impulse to get up. I obeyed this impulse and went into the village, bought a large loaf, and seeing a lad at the shop door, I asked him if he knew James Gandy's. He said he did; so I gave him a trifle and asked him to take the loaf there, and to say a gentleman had sent it. Mrs. Gandy was a member of my class, and I went down next morning to see what had come of it, when she told me that a strange thing had happened to her last night. She said she wanted to put the children to bed, and they began to cry for food, and she had not any to give them; for her husband had been for four or five days out of work. She then went to prayer, to ask God to send them something; soon after which a lad came to the door with a loaf, which he said a gentleman gave him to bring to her. I calculated upon inquiry made of her that her prayer and the voice which I heard exactly coincided in point of time.

JOSEPH SMITH, M.D.

(For many years leading medical practitioner in Warrington, and a class leader in the Wesleyan Methodist Church.)

Joseph Smith, M.D., dictated and signed the above in my presence.

JAMES ALEX. MACDONALD.

L.—1585—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup> —(Borderland)

From Miss Kate Jenour, 23, Belsize-square, South Hampstead, N.W.

*November, 1884.*

On the 4th May, 1883, when on board the H. M. S. Spartan, on my

way to Cape Town, I was awoke by hearing someone in my cabin, which I alone occupied, when to my surprise I saw the figure of a friend of mine standing by my berth. It then disappeared, and by the first mail after my arrival at Cape Town, I received the news of my friend's death, which took place at 10.30 p.m. on that day. I told two or three passengers on board, who made a note of it.

[Miss Jenour is well known to an intimate friend of mine, who has heard the account from her *viva voce*; but repeated letters of mine to her have remained unanswered. Unfortunately our common friend is in India.—E.G.]

L.—1586—A° P<sup>a</sup>

Mrs. Robinson (care of George May, Esq., The Warren, Caversham, Reading) reports that about the year 1871, one evening, at 7 or 8 o'clock, she had an auditory hallucination—a voice "calling the name of an old nurse three times consecutively, and twice heard." The voice was that of her son, who "was abroad, as was supposed. He returned unexpectedly next day, very ill, and died soon after."

J. R. ROBINSON.

Asked if she had ever had any other hallucination of the senses, Mrs. Robinson replied that she had not.

The following fuller account is from Miss Leete, known to our friend, Miss Porter, as a thoroughly trustworthy reporter:—

August 19th, 1884.

I have received the following account direct from Mrs. Robinson, an elderly lady, now living in Reading. One evening in the year 1871 she was sitting alone at needlework when she heard the voice of an absent son, Stamford Robinson (supposed to be abroad, but he had not been heard of for some considerable time), in the passage outside, calling loudly three times, "Nar, Nar, Nar." This was the pet name of an old family nurse, who had stood to all the children almost in a mother's place, owing to Mrs. Robinson's constant attendance on an invalid husband. She rose and opened the door, fully expecting to find her son in the hall, but seeing no one, resumed her work, and concluded the sound was due to her own imagination. No sooner had she done so than the same cry was repeated three times as before. This time Mrs. Robinson *felt* that it was due to some exceptional cause, and a strong conviction that her son was in some trouble, which conviction she expressed to more than one person in the house. The next day her son arrived home, suddenly and most unexpectedly, in an almost dying condition, and after a three weeks' illness died at a very early age—about 25, if I remember rightly.

JESSIE LEETE.

L.—1587—Ad Pa

This case was first described to us by a clergyman, as follows :—

*March 5th, 1885.*

Some 18 or 19 years ago, I remember calling on a working maltster, whose employer was living at Lincoln. His employer was ill at the time, and I asked the man if he had heard from him lately. "No," he said, "but I am afraid he is dead." And on my inquiring why he thought so, he replied that on going out that morning early he had seen his employer standing on the top of the steps that lead up to the kiln door, as plainly as he ever had seen him in his life.

It was as he expected; the first news that came reported his employer's death.

I have no doubt the man I speak of either saw this appearance, or *believed* he saw it.

In answer to inquiries, this informant says :—

*March 12th, 1885.*

Since receiving your letter I have had the curiosity to look over my old diaries, thinking I might have made a note of the occurrence, and under the date of Thursday, the 22nd of October, 1863, I find the following: "Report of Mr. W.'s death. **A** M. saw his 'wraith' on Tuesday morning about 5 o'clock."

This differs somewhat from what I told you in my last letter, for I said that the man had seen the appearance that same morning, in which I spoke with him. Here it seems it was two days before. But still he had told me *before* it was known for a certainty that Mr. W. was dead. For you observe the word "dead" put in over the **A**. This I know from my own habit was put in afterwards. There is no communication between this place and Lincoln, except on the market day, Friday. At that time of year, moreover, the carriers who go to Lincoln would not get back before night, and consequently I should most probably not have learned the certainty of the report until some time on Saturday. Then instead of making a new note of it, I simply put in the word "dead," to show that the report was true when I first heard it. Moreover, I used the Scotch word "wraith" instead of "ghost" or "spirit," as I had an idea that the former word was applied to appearances before death.

I observe that the man said "about 5 o'clock." Of course, this would be a vague expression for any time up to 5.30, or thereabouts, when the morning would not be very clear perhaps, but sufficiently so to enable one to see an object some 10 or 12 yards off, and I am not sure it was quite so much.

I cannot say that Mr. W. was dead at the time M. saw the appearance, but he was certainly dead at the time he told me of it, otherwise I should not have inserted the word "dead" where I did.

I may add that Mr. W. had formerly lived in this village, and I had known him well. He had gone to live in Lincoln only a short time before his death. His malt kiln was his only means of providing for his wife and family—five or six young children—and he had been in the habit of coming over to see how things went on, twice a week. There is nothing more natural than that his thoughts, and they must have been very anxious thoughts, should have been fixed on that one place.

The following is the percipient's own account :—

Ridley's Yard, North Gate, Newark, Notts.

*March 16th, 1885.*

I have received your letter asking me to forward to you what I said about my dear Mr. Wright, for he was a very good master. I said I saw him standing on the steps with one hand on the handrail ; my light went out, and I saw no more, and he died, and I hope he is at rest. That was at 4 o'clock in the morning, before he departed from us.

J. MERRILL.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Merrill adds :—

Newark, *April 6th, 1885.*

SIR,—I am very sorry to let you know that I do not remember the date that dear Mr. Wright died, but I think it was the latter end of 1863. I looked my old books over, but with the trade being carried on in the same way, I have nothing to go by. I saw him as plain as in the middle of the day, for he stood just the same as he did when he came at noon, looking on to the house for me to go to him. I never saw anything before, to my mind.—Your humble servant,

J. MERRILL, Maltster.

---

L.—1588—A Pa

From Mrs. Muir, 42, Holland Park, W.

*April 7th, 1885.*

In the year 1849 I was staying in Edinburgh. One Sunday as I was dressing my second boy (aged five years) for church at about 10.30 a.m., he looked up at me and said, "Mother, Cousin Janie is dead." I asked him which Cousin Janie he meant, and he answered, "Cousin Janie at the Cape, she's dead." I then tried to make him explain why he thought so, but he only kept repeating the statement.



This "Cousin Janie" was a girl of about 16 who had been staying in Edinburgh, and had gone out to the Cape with her parents some months before. She had been very fond of my boys and had often played with them. I was rather struck by the way the child kept repeating what he had said, and wrote down the day and the hour, and told my mother and sisters. Some time afterwards the Cape mail brought the news that the girl had died on that very Sunday. She had been badly burnt the night before, and had lingered on till a little after mid day.

ALICE MUIR.

In answer to questions:—1. The child was not in the habit of saying odd things of this kind. 2. As to the kind of impression I could discover nothing. 3. I have no record in writing, but it is possible that my mother and sisters may remember the occurrence.

---

L.—1589—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

From Mrs. Walsh, of The Priory, Lincoln.

*February 18th, 1884.*

Some time in the year 1862 (I think) I was living with my husband and family of little children, accompanied by our English nurse, in apartments in the city of Brussels. The house we occupied was a large one, and we rented the drawing-room and the floor above. The ground floor was occupied by the owner of the house, a Belgian, and his wife and little children. We had no intercourse with this family; we had our own kitchen on the drawing-room floor, and the upper floor consisted of nursery, with nursery bedroom opening from it. We had a Flemish general servant, who went home about 9 every night. Our English nurse was a very clever girl, about 22 or 23 years of age. She read a good deal, and taught herself French. She was very matter-of-fact, and handy and useful in every way. She had been with me 5 or 6 years. Her parents were labouring people in the neighbourhood of London, and by reading and culture she had raised herself a good deal out of their sphere. We had been about 12 months away from England, when the circumstance I write of happened. M.'s mother, after having a large family—the youngest being about 9 or 10—did not tell M., nor did any of the family, that she was again expecting an addition. The wife of our landlord had been confined two days, so was in her own room, on the ground floor of the house we lived in.

One night my husband and myself had been out to dinner. On

returning, a little after 10 o'clock, my husband was amazed to find our apartments in darkness, and he ran up to the nursery floor to complain to M. of her inattention; as the other servant had gone home it was her place to light our room. My husband found the nursery lighted, but empty, and going towards the children's room he met M. coming out. She began, "Oh! I am so glad to see you; I have been so frightened that I was obliged to sit on Willie's bed till you came in." I was in the room by this time, and inquiring into the cause of fear. M. said, "After I put the children to bed I sat down in the nursery to my work, when I heard some one coming up the stairs. I went to the door, and on the first landing by your room, I saw, as I thought, Madame N. carrying something heavy. I felt that she ought not to be out of her bed, and I called to her in French: 'Je viendrai vous aider,' running down the stairs to where I supposed she was. When I got there it gave me a queer sensation to find no one. However, I said to myself, it was a shadow, and made myself go back to my work. I had scarcely seated myself when a voice called: 'May, May, May' (the name my children called her). I got up, went to the door, and seeing some one, ran half way down the stairs to meet the woman, when a terrible dread came upon me, and I rushed back to the nursery and sat on one of the little beds, feeling that being with even a sleeping child was better than being alone." My husband laughed at her, told her the *vin ordinaire* was too strong; that she had been dreaming, &c. We none of us thought much of it, till the first post from England brought M. a letter to say her mother had been confined and she and the child had died within an hour after. Then we all felt convinced that M.'s mother had been able to come and see her daughter.

HARRIET WALSH.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Walsh says:—

At the time, I am sure she did not connect the appearance with her own mother, nor did she recognise the voice. All she told us was that she thought it was Madame Nyo. May's mother was very much the same sort of person in appearance as Madame Nyo, without there being any likeness; they were about the same age, figure, and position in life. We only connected May's story with her night of terror when she received the news from England.

[The percipient of this case refuses a first-hand and signed account; she has risen in life, and is very sensitive to anything which may recall her former dependent position. Mr. J. J. Lias, who procured the narrative for us, tells us that he first heard it in the lifetime of Mr. Walsh, who "was by no means a credulous man, but a man of the world." It

is of course a weak point in the case that the figure was not recognised, and that we cannot now ascertain how nearly the hour of the apparition and that of the death coincided. They probably occurred within a few hours of each other.]

L.—1590—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>n</sup>

Mr. S. Jennings, of Westbury House, Denmark Hill, S.E., writes:—

*March 24th, 1885.*

MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your note, the occurrence [which is narrated below] was related to me by Mr. Nelson himself, since dead. He told me, as nearly as I can remember, in the year 1868, but the event itself must have taken place four or five years before.

At the time he told me he was frequently in the habit of thus writing under some external influences, some of which he describes as agreeable and others very much the reverse. He showed me a book in which these writings were made, and I was much surprised at the singular differences in the apparently various handwritings. I also remember his saying that he could recognise the identity of some of these influences.

I never had any reason to do otherwise than believe what he said, particularly as he was always very reticent on the subject, which he said concerned nobody but himself.—Yours sincerely,

SAMUEL JENNINGS.

The following is from a letter written by Mr. Jennings to Professor Barrett, on September 26th, 1882. After describing Mr. Nelson's automatic writing, he says:—

I should note that the handwriting in this [Mr. Nelson's] book was as varied as possible—sometimes in a light, delicate, pointed hand, and at other times big, black, blurred, and heavy. He said that at times he became conscious of the presence of this external influence, which he could never get rid of without providing writing materials. On one occasion this feeling seized him in the train when travelling from Raneegunge to Calcutta, and he tore a leaf out of a book and laid it on the seat of the carriage, his hand grasping a pencil resting upon it. Ordinarily, to write under such conditions would be impossible in a train rushing along; the motion would effectually prevent it. Nevertheless, a long communication was made purporting to be from his daughter, who was at school in England. It contained a simple account of her illness and death, described the circumstances under which it occurred, and the persons who were present, adding that she wished to say good-bye to her father before leaving. This threw Mr. N. into a

state of great excitement, for he did not even know of his daughter's illness. He went home and said he was very uneasy about Bessie in England. Finally, he gave this note to his married daughter, Mrs. R., to keep till they could hear by the ordinary post. The child had in reality died that very day, and under the very circumstances thus mysteriously communicated to Mr. N. I have subsequently received some corroborative evidence regarding this young lady's death from an entire stranger to the family.

L.—1591—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>d</sup>

From Rev. G. L. Fenton, Villa Carli, San Remo.

February, 1885.

SIR,—You have probably received many reports of what may be called, "apparitions *in transitu*." The following was told to me by three maiden ladies, my aunts, women of unimpeachable veracity, who were all present at the time.

Their uncle, a clergyman in London, had been obliged to give up his profession through failing health, and to return to his native town, Newcastle-under-Lyme. He was engaged to a cousin, who was herself very delicate, and when he was on his death-bed he expressed a strong desire to see the lady to whom he was attached. On receiving the message (there were no railways or telegrams in those days) she instantly started from home, but was taken ill on the way.

Meanwhile the dying man and his three nurses were anxiously expecting her arrival. Suddenly he half-rose in bed, and exclaimed:—"She is dead—at the Hop-pole, in Worcester." These were his last words. The next post informed his friends that it was even so! I believe the event occurred in 1783, when he was in his 37<sup>th</sup> year.

This gentleman and his three nurses all bore the name of yours  
faithfully,  
G. L. FENTON.

Villa Carli, San Remo, Italy.

March 18<sup>th</sup>, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—My reply to yours of 27<sup>th</sup> ult. has been delayed by reference to my eldest sister. This was well, as the result is partly a correction and partly a confirmation of my statement. I stated I have often heard the story from my aunts when a boy, and I had formed the impression that they themselves were the nurses and witnesses. You very justly pointed out a discrepancy in dates. Mrs. Clarke's note, enclosed, removes this, but of course renders the evidence less direct than before. Should you make any use of this, kindly make the necessary corrections.—Yours very truly,

G. L. FENTON.

From Mrs. W. H. Clarke to her brother, the Rev. G. L. Fenton.  
Woodville, Douglas, Isle of Man.

*March 15th, 1885.*

I have a rough, but I believe correct, copy of the "Fenton pedigree," by which it appears that this "Rev. John" was baptised 1746 and died 1783.

Our Aunt Caroline was born 1778, so that she, the oldest of our three aunts, would be but five years old when her uncle died. They, therefore, were not his nurses; probably his own sister—our grandmother, born in 1742—and her sister-in law, "Hester," [born in] 1744.

I don't suppose you, any more than myself, ever made any note of the incident. All I can vouch for is, that I have heard it spoken of at different times in the family circle, discussed by my grandmother and aunts, related occasionally by my father, and never a shadow of doubt about it. Whenever such things were referred to, this was related as a certainty by any one of that generation who happened to be present. You know that most of my childhood was passed with my aunts and grandmother, and I can't remember when this history was not engraven on my memory, hearing about it so very frequently.

[If Mrs. Clarke's grandmother was present, then the evidence is as good as second-hand; for she was cognisant of the impression *before* the news confirming it arrived. Cases where the agent and percipient are both dying are necessarily rare, otherwise we should hardly print an account of an incident recorded a hundred years after its occurrence.]

---

L.—1592—A<sup>e</sup> P<sup>n</sup> —(Borderland)

From a gentleman residing at Tynemouth, who will allow his name to be published after an interval of a few years.

*December, 1884.*

On December 29th, or 30th, 1881, about 1 a.m., I awoke hearing my name called. Nobody was in the house, the servants being away for a holiday. I recognised the voice of my father.

Next afternoon I received a telegram saying he was unwell, and on arriving I learnt from the doctor that my father had been unconscious, and had repeatedly called for me during the night in question. I had no idea of his illness at the time, and believed him to be perfectly well. The attack was very short and severe. He was in Dumfries, and I at Tynemouth, Northumberland.

In answer to inquiries our informant says:—

*December 27th, 1884.*

I paid no attention to the "auditory experience," although the thing

came to my mind while dressing, and probably should never have given it further attention if I had not been struck by the fact that apparently at or about the same time my father, although unconscious, had been calling for me. I had no means of comparing the exact times, as neither the doctor (whose name I forget, and who is now dead) nor I noted them. This curious coincidence impressed the fact on my mind, the more so as I have never been able to find any reasonable explanation of the case; and as the tendency of my education has been to believe nothing that can't be accounted for logically I have almost come to doubt the fact, and in consequence have kept it to myself.

I never have had, either before or since the case I mentioned already, any hallucination of the senses. It may perhaps have some bearing on the case, so I add this postscript to say that at one time, when in sound health, my father was one of the most skilful amateur mesmerists I ever knew; his power over some people being quite extraordinary, and sometimes it was exerted almost unconsciously by him.

---

L.—1593—A<sup>e</sup> P<sup>s</sup>

From Mrs. Drummond Smithers to Miss Porter.

Bridge House, Crookham, Farnham, Hants.

*November 22nd, 1884.*

DEAR MADAM,—My father [Mr. Thomas Pickerden] was an architect and builder, which obliged him to be about very early of mornings; and on Monday, the 19th January, 1857, at 7 a.m., whilst on his way to see some of his men, he fell, in a fit of some kind. That same morning I perfectly well remember not falling asleep until after 2 a.m., having counted the clock up to that hour, and wondering why I could not sleep, as I always slept well at that time. As we breakfasted at 10 a.m. in those days, we were not early risers, so probably it might have been 8 or 9 o'clock before I woke. I cannot make a nearer statement, as I am not positive as to the time; but my dream was between the hours mentioned. It was that my father had been taken suddenly ill in the streets of Hastings, that he was put into a fly by two men, and taken home—when I woke. The dream seemed to impress me very much. I tried not to think seriously of it; having dressed and breakfasted, still the dream haunted me. I could not shake it off. When I spoke to my sisters-in-law, with whom I was staying (my then husband was their brother) they advised me to tell him, which I did, and he at once granted my request of going on to Hastings. He left me at Etchingham Station, and going direct to our home, Hawkhurst, he found a telegram there to the effect that my father was ill, and that I

was to go at once. I had by this time reached Hastings and found my dream verified.

The event occurring so many years back, not one witness is living.—I remain, dear madam, yours truly,

ANNIE SMITHERS.

In the same letter Mrs. Smithers says :—"The dream preceded my father's sudden illness some few hours ;" but the account shows that there is no reason to suppose this.

29th December, 1884.

DEAR MISS PORTER,—In my dream I did not actually see my father fall, but was at the spot just as the fly was going off, and saw distinctly there were two persons inside the fly, but the back of one man who was holding my father prevented my recognising him ; the man on the box I distinctly saw and knew him as a flyman of Hastings, and he was the man who drove my father on that fatal morning—for so it proved, as he never rallied from that illness, never was out of his bed more than to have it made a few times. He died 5th March, 1857. I never knew him to have an illness previous to that, nor fit of any kind ; he always appeared a healthy strong man ; a well-made man, too, tall, well-proportioned, not stout or short-necked—such figures are more liable to sudden death or fits, I think. I am generally so free from dreaming that this one made a great impression upon me at the time.—Believe me, yours truly,

ANNIE SMITHERS.

---

L.—1594—A° P<sup>s</sup>

From Mrs. Walsh, of The Priory, Lincoln.

February, 1884.

The gentleman who teaches music in my house tells me that if anything sad or terrible happens to any one he loves, he always has an intimation of it. He does not know what it is, but he says that he writes off to his own or his sisters' homes—"What is the matter? there is something wrong,"—and the return post brings him the history of either dangerous illness or accident.

He is a young man of a very highly strung organisation. Possibly, his education in music, for which he has a passion, put him out of ordinary spheres. He reads books on art, music, drawing, poetry, and he is deeply interested in all religious studies. About young men's pursuits, games, athletic sports, and his own affairs, money matters, &c., he seems indifferent. So much for the medium. Now for my story, peculiar, because though a fact, I see no good in it.

I am very fond of Mr. —, and I know he looks on me as a very

true old friend, and one of my sons, now in India, is the dearest friend he has.

I went out one morning about 9 o'clock, carrying books for the library, and being very busy, took the short way to town. On some flags in a very steep part of the road, some boys had made a slide. Both my feet flew away at the same moment that the back of my head resounded on the flags. A policeman picked me up, saw I was hurt, and rang at the Nurses' Home close by, to get me looked to. My head was cut, and while they were washing the blood away, I was worrying myself that I should be ill, and how should I manage my school till the end of the term. I told no one in my house but my daughter, and no one but the policeman had seen me fall. I asked my daughter to tell no one. I had a miserably nervous feeling, but I pretended to her it was nothing. The next morning, after a sleepless night, I could not get up. It was my habit to sit in the drawing-room while the music lessons were given, so my daughter went in to tell Mr. — that I had had a bad night, and was not yet up. He said, "I had a wretched night, too, and all through a most vivid dream." "What was it?" she asked. "I dreamed I was walking by the Nurses' Home, and I came on a slide, both my feet slipped, and I fell on the back of my head. I was helped to the Home, and while my head was being bathed I was worrying myself how I should manage my lessons till the end of the term, and the worrying feeling would not go."

From Mr. J. J. Hoare, 12, St. Nicholas Square, Lincoln.

*March 3rd, 1884.*

I shall be very pleased to relate, I hope lucidly, the account of a dream, as described by Mrs. Walsh most accurately, which took place on a Tuesday evening early in November of 1882. The dream consisted of this: I supposed I was going down the stairs, when I had a fall at the first flight, was picked up, and helped by a policeman to the Nurses' Institute, about 20 yards from the imaginary fall, being there attended by a nurse. I was much perplexed as to how I should manage to finish my work during the term. This was followed the next morning by a severe headache in the region of the imaginary blow.

On seeing Miss Walsh the following morning, I was told by her that Mrs. Walsh was unwell, but not the cause. I replied I too felt unwell and accounted for it through the dream. Mrs. Walsh related to me the same evening her own adventure, which in every detail exactly coincided with my dream, as happening to myself. I in no way knew of Mrs. Walsh's mishap till the evening after, when told by herself.

In another instance, whilst staying in Devonshire, I received an impression, or felt a conviction, that something had happened to Mrs. Walsh. I think I wanted to write, so confident was I of something



having taken place, but desisted because I had left Lincoln through an outbreak of small-pox in the house next my rooms, only the previous week, so was unwilling to correspond. On my return here, I found out that both my day [*i.e.*, the day of the impression] and the accident—a fall—were true.

In many other instances have I received similar experiences, and so confident have I been always of their accuracy that I have written to the persons and places, and always received confirmation of my impressions. I might add that the impressions have always been of persons whom I dearly love or greatly honour. If the dream is of an evening, I see always the person or persons. If the impression be received during the day, it makes me excessively restless, with a consciousness of something happening. I hope I may have made myself understood. I have given only a few cases. I have had, I think, 10 or 12 impressions. I should add that the events have always been at a distance, without any previous knowledge of even antecedent occurrences in cases of illness, and, on my word of honour, there has never been any collusion. I shall be quite ready to answer any questions bearing on myself. I have never thought about these occurrences afterwards, but if it may advance science, or be of service to yourself, I shall do so with pleasure.

J. J. HOARE.

12, St. Nicholas Terrace, Lincoln.

*March 11th, 1884.*

Although I have never taken any note of impressions, still, certainly, in every case have they been followed by corresponding events. Whilst attaching importance to them and belief, till my correspondence with yourself [Professor Sidgwick] I never thought seriously of the cause of such impressions. They are quite unlike fits of low spirits and indigestion, and I can easily distinguish them from such, as in every case I have been most conscious of outside action. I will keep notes when occasion may arise, as you suggest.

J. J. HOARE.

---

L.—1595—A° P°

From Miss R., a Member of the S. P. R.

*March 5th, 1885.*

Two friends of ours, Mr. X. and Mr. Y., lived together till the marriage of Mr. X., and were, therefore, intimately associated in our minds.

It happened that though Mrs. X. and I had exchanged cards we had not met, and I merely knew her by sight at the time when Mr. Y.

also married. But as I had found Mrs. Y. at home I was slightly acquainted with her.

It was a few months after Mr. Y.'s marriage, on the night of May 14th, 1879, when my dream occurred. I was staying at Bristol at the time. It seemed to me that I was making my first call on Mrs., Y., and that she proceeded to show me her trousseau—a thing that would never have occurred to her in actual life, or to any but very intimate friends. A variety of dresses were displayed, and as I was looking at a black-net evening dress, with crimson trimmings, thinking it was very like one of my own, a sudden transformation took place. Mrs. Y. had changed into Mrs. X., and the dress was a widow's dress complete. I woke very strongly impressed with the dream, and mentioned it to my father the next morning. It haunted me till, on May 15th or 16th, I saw the *Times* announcement of Mr. X.'s death.

Afterwards I learnt that, on the afternoon preceding my dream, Mr. X. had returned home, apparently in his usual good health, only rather tired, but within half-an-hour had died of quite unsuspected heart disease.

My father was ill at the time of my dream, and does not remember the circumstance. But my sister remembers it clearly and testifies to the fact.

A. E. R.

J. T. R.

[The name of Mr. X. was given in confidence.]

In answer to inquiries, Miss R. says :—

My sister was not with me, so I could not speak about it to her. I cannot find any of my letters written after May 14th, so do not know if I wrote to her on the 15th or not. But she came to me (as my father was taken seriously ill about that date) and heard of the dream and of the death at the time [*i.e.*, she heard of the dream at the same time as she heard of the death]. I am *quite certain* that the dream was on the night of the day of death, May 14th, as the sister-in-law's letter [*i.e.*, the letter in which Miss R. received the news] proves it to have been.

---

L.—1596—A<sup>d</sup> P<sup>a</sup>

From Mr. Ridley, 19, Belsize Park, N.W.

March 5th, 1885.

Whilst staying at Mrs. M.'s in June, 1867, on the night either of June 3rd or 4th, I had a vivid dream that I saw an old friend [name given in confidence] lying dead with a wound in his head,

noting the colour of his hair and other particulars. I told Mrs. M. of this dream, and later in the day we heard that the friend I had seen in my dream had actually been killed by a blow on the head, in a fall from a conveyance, on the night before the dream. The wound was on the *opposite side* of the head from that seen in my dream.

The scene of the accident was some miles from the house where I was staying.

J. R.

Mr. Ridley's daughter adds, in a postscript :—

There is some uncertainty whether the dream was on the same night or on the night following the accident.

It was certainly before any news of the death reached the dreamer.

Question put by Miss R. to Mrs. Mawson, of Ashfield, Gateshead, with whom Mr. R. was staying at the time of the dream.—Can you remember anything of a dream of my father's at your house, of which he told you, in the morning, of the death of J. M. before the news came? And can you remember the cause of death?

*March 3rd, 1885.*

Answer.—You ask if I can remember about your papa's dream before J. M.'s death. I remember very distinctly his telling me his dream, and how strongly it impressed me at the time. I remember that your papa had the dream, and spoke of it before the news of J. M.'s death reached him, but I cannot call to mind exactly what was the cause of death—in the dream I mean; but I think your papa thought he saw him injured by a fall from his horse or conveyance. I think he told me that he saw him lying on the ground injured, and his wife mourning and weeping over him, but I cannot be certain of the exact particulars, only I know that the dream was singularly like what in reality took place on the very same night. E. M.

Question put by Miss R. to Miss C., a resident in the village where J. M. lived.—Can you find for me the exact date of J. M.'s death? We cannot remember it, and I wish to verify an occurrence which I know took place at the time. Can you get any information about the accident?

West Boldon,

*March 4th, 1885.*

Answer.—To-day I saw E. M. (now Mrs. H., the daughter of J. M.). Her father died June 4th, 1867. On the morning of that day, as Mrs. M. M. was on her way to Hylton, she found him lying insensible at a turn of the road. He was in the habit of driving

furiously, and it was supposed that he had not managed the corner, and so was thrown out. He never recovered consciousness.

A. C.

Miss R. adds :—My father has not had any other dreams of death that have made any impression.

A. E. R.

1597—A° PP<sup>s</sup>

From Mrs. Muller, 8, Bevington Road, Oxford.

*January, 1885.*

I dreamed that I was at Hastings, on the shore. I saw my friend, Miss Adams, running towards me. She passed me by, and then took off her hat and bent her head down into the sea. I tried to grasp her by her clothes, but she cried out, "Don't stop me, for my mother is dying." In the morning I jumped out of bed on hearing the post, and said to Marianne Varah, "Have you had a letter from Miss Adams? There must be something the matter with her mother." Miss Varah answered: "I have a letter, but have not opened it. I have had a very strange dream, but I thought nothing of it, because Mr. Adams is so ill." Miss Varah then opened her letter, and called out, "You are right." There were a few lines, "My mother is dangerously ill: doctors say no hope. We will send a telegram." The telegram came during the morning of February 24th, 1876, saying she was dead. She had been in perfect health the day before.

Neither Miss Varah nor myself are at all given to dreams, and had not till then believed in them at all.

EMILY E. MULLER.

Mrs. Giles, of Cherwell Lodge, Oxford, a friend of the parties, says:—

Mrs. Adams died at 11 o'clock on the night of the 23rd February, and the two ladies, Mrs. Muller and Miss Varah, are not certain of the exact time of their dreams, but they must have been between 11 and 12 or very soon after 12.

From Miss Varah, 40, James Street, Cowley Road, Oxford.

A friend of mine, Mr. Adams, was seriously ill, and we were expecting his death. I had a dream that I saw the corpse of his wife laid out upon a bed, though we had no reason to suppose that she was even ill. A friend with whom I was staying also dreamed that she saw Mrs. Adams a corpse. [This is not accurate.] The morning's post brought news of her dangerous illness, and a telegram during the morning announced her death. My friend and I told each other our dreams

in the morning at breakfast. My friend had called for her letters before coming down in the morning, fearing bad news.

MARIANNE VARAH.

---

1598—L.—A<sup>e</sup> P<sup>s</sup>

From Mr. A. W. Orr, Kingston Road, Didsbury, near Manchester.

*January 2nd, 1885.*

Some 40 years ago my father was house-surgeon at the City of Dublin Hospital, and one day a young man, a sailor, was brought in who had fallen from one of the yards of the vessel on which he served. He was badly injured, and in about three days he died. Late in the afternoon of the day on which the man died, an old woman, very poor and fagged, came up to the hospital and asked to see the surgeon. My father saw her and inquired what he could do for her; when she inquired whether a young sailor had been brought to that institution, and if so, could she see him. My father told her of the man above mentioned, and that he had died that morning.

It turned out that the old woman was the young man's mother, that she lived in the Co. Carlow, and that three nights previously she had dreamt that her son had fallen from the rigging of the vessel and had been taken to an hospital. So vivid was the dream that she could not rest till she got to Dublin (where she had never been before), and the moment she saw the hospital she recognised it as the building she had seen in her dream. Her dream was only too true, for she found that her son had died from the effects of injuries occasioned by a fall just as appeared in her dream.

The old woman had walked a distance of over 60 miles, and entered the city by the road which passed the front of the hospital.

A. W. ORR.

*January 7th, 1885.*

In a second letter Mr. Orr says:—

You may rely upon the facts being as I have stated them, as I have frequently spoken to my father on the subject, the case being of such a very remarkable character.

---

L.—1599—A<sup>n</sup> P<sup>s</sup>

From Bishop Courtenay (formerly Bishop of Kingston, Jamaica).

L'Ermitage, Hyères, France.

*January 28th, 1885.*

Some years ago I had young children who were allowed, when in the drawing-room, to amuse themselves with playing with a set of red

and white ivory chessmen. They were not allowed to take the chessmen into their nursery.

It was their mother's constant habit to visit her nursery almost immediately on rising in the morning.

One morning she dreamed that she had received a letter from a brother in a distant part of the world, in which he enclosed the upper half of the head and neck of a red ivory chess-knight, saying that he thought it must belong to her. On waking, and going as usual into the nursery, her eldest little boy ran up to her, saying, "Oh, mamma, see what I have found," and holding up the head of an ivory chessman—a knight.

A good instance of the sympathy on which all true thought-reading must depend. Probably, into a dream about a letter from her brother intruded the idea of the red knight's head, and was blended with it.

REGINALD COURTENAY.

In answer to inquiries, Bishop Courtenay says :—

Hotel de L'Ermitage, Hyères.

February 7th, 1885.

The dream was *not* related to me by my wife before she went into her nursery. Except for what followed, there was nothing remarkable in it. To me its special value lies in its trivial and commonplace character.

[The case may conceivably have been telepathic ; but it would be impossible at this distance of time to make quite sure that the detached head, or the stump from which it had been broken, had not been seen, perhaps unconsciously, by Mrs. Courtenay, shortly before ; or, if the head belonged to one of the set of chessmen that the children were in the habit of playing with, the fact that one of the knights was *minus* a head would probably be a nursery commonplace which might easily have come to her ears. This would of course have been sufficient to account for the feature in the dream.]

## MR. EGLINTON'S SLATE-WRITING.

The following account of a séance with Mr. Eglinton is sent by a gentleman whom we have reason to regard as an acute and careful observer :—

“ I bought a three-leaf book slate on the way, one that had three loops and could be fastened with a stick of pencil, as small pocket-books are often made. The first trials Mr. Eglinton made were with his own slate, which I had previously cleaned, and marked with my name to avoid changing. With this nothing occurred. He then took my slate, I having inserted a crumb of pencil and seen that it was all secure. It was then placed on the corner of the table, and we both rested our hands upon it. Shortly, in answer to my question, ‘ Are the conditions favourable ? ’ the pencil could distinctly be heard writing inside the slate, and when the three taps indicated that the message was finished, I unfastened the slate, and on one of the leaves found, ‘ Yes, the conditions are very good.’ ”

“ Then followed a few trials, for which Mr. Eglinton held a slate under the table, with one hand, and writing was thus obtained, in answer to casual inquiries. The slate was always cleaned by me ; it had my name on it ; the writing was always on the surface *next the table* ; it was always found on the extreme edge of the slate farthest from the medium ; always *upside down* with regard to him ; and the pencil could always be *heard* writing. Moreover, a great part of his hand, and all his wrist was in view, and the slightest attempt at movement could not, I believe, have passed undetected.

“ However, the most satisfactory experiments were these. Mr. Eglinton has a strong mahogany book slate with a Brahma lock. On this I was requested to write the name of a deceased relation, mentioning the relationship, and asking a question. To make the thing as conclusive as possible I took the slate into the adjoining room, stood away from all mirrors, windows, etc., and wrote, ‘ Mrs. D——,—grandmother—are you present, and able to communicate ? ’ I then quickly locked the slate, put the key into my pocket, and went back to Mr. Eglinton, never once letting the slate leave my hand. He then placed another slate half under the table, closely pressed against the under-surface ; in a few seconds writing commenced, and the following was found :—‘ Your grandmother, Mrs. D——, is not able to write, but she sends her love.’ I then, for the first time, unlocked the slate, and showed him what I had written. At this point Mr. Eglinton was called away to two ladies, and I seized the opportunity to write on the Brahma slate : ‘ Frank G——,—cousin—are you present, and able to write to me ? ’ Then I locked it, and waited for Mr. Eglinton to return. Upon hearing what I had done, he took a slate—the one marked with my name—thoroughly cleaned it, with my help, threw a crumb of pencil upon it, covered it with another clean one, and gave me the two to hold with him. We were then sitting opposite to each other, each holding the two slates, and right away from the table. In a second or two I could not only hear the pencil, but could feel it writing, and could localise the sound and vibration as undoubtedly issuing from between the two slates. *In one minute* at the most, the signal of completion was given, and the underneath slate was found filled with writing, in three

directions, and signed 'Frank.' I have the slate now, with the writing on it.

"I forgot to mention that I always made a point of engaging Mr. Eglinton in conversation during the time the writing was taking place. I may also add that the communication purporting to come from 'Frank' does not strike me at all as being the sort of thing he would write."

---

## NOTES ON REPORTS OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

---

[We have received the following criticism on the narratives published by the Literary Committee and the Haunted House Committee, from an Associate of the Society, Mr. Davies, of Kingsbridge. It was not compiled with any idea of publication, and it is only in consequence of the request of the Committees concerned that Mr. Davies allows it to appear in the *Journal*. We were anxious that he should do so, because as the object of the Society for Psychical Research (like that of any other scientific society) is not to plead a cause, but to discover the truth in its own department of investigation, whatever that truth may be, intelligent criticism of its publications, as well as new facts or arguments on either side, are welcomed.

We are glad to print it for another reason. There has always been cause to fear that some of our informants—even some of those who have been most kind in helping the Committees to obtain corroborative evidence, and details as to dates and other matters—may have thought their desire for this excessive, troublesome, and even offensive. If this should be so, we are glad to have an opportunity of showing them the need of it, if the narratives are to be of value to persons who have no prejudice against the investigation, but have not the advantage of personal acquaintance with the narrators.

Some reply from members of the Committees to Mr. Davies' remarks is appended.—ED.]

---

In reading through the transactions of the Psychical Society I have noticed in many cases quoted as authorities or examples of the subjects dealt with in the various reports, that the dates given are rather remote, and in a few instances the anecdotes are dateless. Now it may be fairly urged that however honest the witness to a bygone fact or occurrence may be, yet his impressions of that fact or occurrence must of necessity undergo a certain amount of change, or lose a certain amount of vividness, by the influence of time, especially where the occurrence was not noted down in writing at the time, and there is, as time elapses, less and



less chance of trustworthy corroboration. I illustrate my remarks by a few examples taken from the reports.

In Vol. I., page 30, is an anecdote, which the writer dates back to 1848. There is no evidence supplied that the incident on the battlefield really happened at all, as Colonel L. is not called in to corroborate, and there is nothing to indicate that the incident was duly recorded in writing about the time. In the next example, page 31, there is no date whatever given to the occurrence, and no evidence of any record in writing. In the same page, another dateless example is given, and on second-hand evidence. On page 107, there is a story dated 1852, and the report on it conveys the impression that the occurrence was written down for the first time in 1882. The story has a considerable amount of "hearsay" in it. On page 108 there is a story dated 1862. There is no evidence here that the occurrences were noted down, and on page 110, T. M. B.'s letter, paragraph 3, there is evidently a doubt experienced by the narrator as to the genuineness of the apparition. It may be noted that if the presence of a ghost is once suspected in a house, nearly every one will anticipate its appearance with nervous apprehension, and thus a ghost is evolved sometimes out of "inner consciousness," and sometimes out of very solid materials, such as clockcases, old trees, &c., &c. At the foot of page 111, it may be observed that Susan Taylor was evidently a common-sense sceptic, to whom ghosts would not deign to appear. If these stories related to events which occurred last year or the year before, and were *now* open to investigation by a scientific committee, I should be inclined to place more reliance upon them; but I do not see that any of the Society's inquirers have *as yet* unearthed a ghost. It is strange that the houses mentioned do not seem to be open to the examination of competent men, nor do the servants and their antecedents appear to have been inquired about. On pages 121 and 122 there is a story of what the narrator's grandmother had heard respecting the great grandmother, and without impugning the good faith of the parties, I consider the story should not be cited as evidence. On page 122, Commander Aylesbury may be quite correct in stating that he actually saw the matters stated in his vision, but what evidence is there that the family were engaged *as* he saw them, or that they heard his voice coincidentally? On the same page is a story open to the same objection of age. On page 124, Mr. Symonds relates a story dated 1858. The statements are not verified, and it is open to the objection of age. In the same page there is a story of a schoolboy told with every appearance of truth, but it certainly must be difficult for Mrs. Hope to name the 8th or 9th September as a date, unless a record had been kept of the matter at the time, or unless the date was adopted by innocent but leading suggestion. The question appears to crop up as to the *certainty* of the tale of the apparition being related before the boy had news of the

manner of the death, as he would probably when (and after) he knew of the death, dream of it, and innocently tell his dream a short time *after*, as happening *before* the event. On page 126 is another dateless grandmother's story, the narrator testifying to a number of matters of which she had no possible personal knowledge. On the same page we have the first story within a reasonable date, and it is a fair example of the theory treated of. Mr. and Mrs. Keulemans are probably living, and the matter is only too fresh in their memory. On page 127, the story is second-hand, and open to the objection of date. On page 128 the objection to date obtains, with a suggestion that the child Sarah, *after* the death, said she had seen the ghost. The other story on the same page is dateless, and subject to the objection that no inquiry was made as to the time of death. On page 129 Mrs. Hunter tells a story of what happened in 1857, to which date the same objection of age obtains. I may remark that possibly the child had been frightened by her mother's telling the queer story of the coffin in her hearing. On page 130 the story is open to the objection of age, and, further, how could the narrator identify the date (he says "same evening." What evening?) when he was only five or six years old? The narrator may have been told the story often in his childhood, has perhaps dreamed it once or twice since, and now believes it really occurred. The next story on the same page is open to the objection of age, and the reader is left to imagine that Liston was dead, but there is no mention of the matter. On page 131, Mr. Berthon's story is third-hand as to the important fact, and dateless. On the same page Miss Peard's story is second-hand, practically dateless, and has no corroborative evidence. On page 132 the date is more recent, but it may be suggested that the two young gentlemen and the boy *did* come into the avenue gate, and were seen by Miss Eyre, who has unconsciously post-dated the appearance. Did she make a note of the date when the news of the accident reached her, or was the date put down some time after? There is internal evidence in the Canon's letter that the date was fixed in his mind by the regatta, and consequently could be fixed by after reference. The mother's account is wanting to corroborate the narrative, but she could be interviewed unawares by a stranger who should not suggest facts and dates. On page 133 the story of Bishop Wilberforce, provided the occurrence *is* noted in his diary, dated 13th (February, probably? even here the date fails), may be taken to be fairly cited in support of the report of the Committee. I presume the letter of 4th March, 1847 and the diary, are still in existence, and could be verified. On same page Mrs. Gates' story is dateless, and the feeling may have been unconsciously suggested by her son's rather leading letter. As the lady is subject to this sort of thing, the Society would do well to persuade her to keep a diary. On page 134 the story is a fair example, but Mr. Fryer, for fear of mistake, should get his brother's testimony that

the two occurrences were simultaneous. Probably a record was made of the occurrence immediately on the brother's arrival at home. On page 134, the second story is open to the objection of remote date and was probably not recorded at the time. The next story is open to the same objection as to date, and the point of the whole story is gone, by the admission that the dates of the apparition and illness cannot be shown to be identical. On page 135 the story is dateless, but evidently ancient, and consequently, although it may be believed in by the narrator, should not be accepted by a scientific inquirer. The narrator also supplies hearsay evidence of words spoken by the boy. The next story is also dateless, and the evidence of Mr. and Mrs. Owen and Mrs. Jones should have been taken. The narrator cannot possibly tell what they saw, or what they did not see, especially as by his own evidence he was not present. On page 137 is a fair recent example, and could probably be corroborated by the diary of the writer. It is possible, though, in this case that the writer may have predisposed his mind, but even this could not detract much from the value of the evidence. On page 137 is a story dateless and second-hand, but the materials for making it good seem to exist. Would it not be better in these cases to verify *first* and publish afterwards? The date of the pilot's death could be ascertained, as there *must* have been an inquest. The story on page 138 is recent as to date, but the subject-matter is purposely obscured, so as to prevent any opinion upon it. On page 139, documentary evidence being forthcoming, the story would be a fair one. On page 141 is a recent story, but from my knowledge of the yarns of Devonshire fisher-folk, I should not place implicit reliance on any wonderful tales. I suspect that the tale was fitted to the death. Dates of the drowning could easily be supplied by newspaper evidence, and Mrs. Strong and others could be cross-examined as to the statements made by Mrs. Barnes. The next story is open to the objection of remoteness of date, and is a narrative of what someone else said. The next story is too remote. On page 142 there is a story not very recent and certainly not very extraordinary. The superintendent of police had been informed of the disappearance, and having found no traces of the girl, naturally concluded she was concealed in the house, and said so to Miss Phillips. The only portion of the story that bears on the supernatural or on the work of the Committee is a little bit of hearsay. Mr. Strefford, jun., did *not* hear his father say, in the middle of the night, to his mother that the girl was in the chimney. I question, also, whether the statement is correct that the superintendent of police had not been in the house prior to the time he found the girl. It certainly is highly improbable, as, if the girl had been reported missing, he would have inquired at the house first.

I now pass on to Part VI., page 122. Mr. James Wilson narrates

certain circumstances. There is evidence in the first sentence of an effort to remember. There is no date assigned, and it is only by guessing the age of the narrator that it can be approximated. There is no evidence that the unusual circumstances were recorded either by the narrator or his friend. In pages 122 and 123 the same remarks as to dates, remoteness, and want of corroborative evidence apply, and as to the letter on page 123 the evidence of the sister-in-law is wanting, the date is remote, and there is no evidence of any record at the time. On pages 124 and 125 the same objection as to remoteness of date obtains in Mrs. Harland's experiments and Mr. Skirving's case, and no date is given in Crowther's case. On pages 126 and 128 are very fair cases not open to objections. On page 129 is a case to which remoteness applies, but this is fairly cured by an entry at the time by the narrator, who says he can produce his diary. Subject to the inspection of the diary by the Committee, showing the incident is entered properly, and also subject to proofs of the intelligence having arrived subsequently to the entry, being forthcoming (say by a certificate of death or American newspaper notice thereof), this may be considered a good case, and it is remarkable that it is almost the only one where any trouble was taken to make a contemporaneous record. On page 130, the case on the face of it seems a good one, but the best witness who had all the opportunity of personal intercourse with the Count Giunasi doubts the mesmeric or clairvoyant power, and I think if the Committee call evidence, and their own witness discredits them, that the case is considerably weakened. On page 132 the objection to remoteness of date obtains. In the next case (Mr. Castle's case) the same objection obtains, and here unfortunately there was no record kept, and all persons whose evidence would be valuable are dead. On page 133 Mrs. Davy should have not only asked her husband the time, but have told him the reason for asking; this then would have been noted down, and the evidence rendered more valuable. Proof of the death of Mr. C. on that date should be supplied. In Mr. Keulemans' case it is not quite clear that the Herr did not see the newspaper.

I next take the second report of the Haunted Houses Committee, page 137, and notice in passing that the Committee themselves acknowledge that they can get no present manifestations of abnormal occurrences. No houses are stated to have been examined by them personally, either in reference to manifestations which are recorded by others to have taken place in the past or otherwise. Also a remark is made that phantoms appear at very irregular times, but this is open to the rejoinder that these manifestations were just as irregular in the past as now, and yet there is plenty of testimony to the past, but little to the present. This alleged irregularity is also in part practically contradicted by an example quoted at length on pages 144 *et seq.*

I now analyse the story on page 141. In the first place, the same objection as to remoteness of date occurs, and for the first time I find evidence of what the Committee consider "a recent occurrence," and find that something happening eleven years ago is classed as such. I rather differ in this estimate, for I think that eleven years is a long time for the memory to tax itself with recalling small details, and it is the recollection of small details that generally give the story a value. The story on page 141 is remarkable; but the particulars of the murder mentioned on page 143 are wanted in order to identify the alleged apparition with some actor or victim in the murder. The date of the murder should be obtained in order to ascertain if the style of dress of the apparition corresponded with the style of dress at the date of the murder, but this evidence being wanting does not detract from the statement that a "woman" was seen. Passing over the evidence of the brother, which seems to confirm the second appearance, I dismiss the child's statement as worthless, as it is quite possible that the talk of the family and servants may have influenced his imagination. The other informants are very circumstantial, so much so that it is only fair to assume that these matters were recorded at the time. The next story on page 144 I cannot say leaves so favourable an impression on me as the one just criticised. In the first place the narrator is dead and cannot be examined on his statement. His widow having had this statement in writing for some time is unconsciously, to a great extent, influenced by it. It is open to the objection of remoteness of date, as the document is undated and relates to matters supposed to have occurred 18 years prior to the time when it was written. There is one very remarkable point as to the statement about the countrywoman on page 145. The narrator need not have troubled himself to have called her "honest," as his readers would else not have suspected otherwise, but he attempts *twice* in two lines to predispose in favour of her honesty. When such trouble is taken unnecessarily to stamp a character with "honesty" I must say that I should begin to suspect, especially as her subsequent behaviour and her reticence on the matter are not encouraging. Would not the theory be tenable that this "honest countrywoman" was, to use a common phrase, "on the prowl" by night, and upset some of the not yet arranged furniture or the fire-irons, and hurried back to bed to escape detection? Her confused manner the next day lends a strong colour to the suspicion that she knew more about the matter than she chose to tell. Was not it her suggestion in the first place which connected the noise with the past? and was that suggestion made *bonâ fide*, or to throw the inquirer off the scent? Also this class of noise never occurred when the master and mistress were alone in the house by night, and with the exception of

some noises like footsteps, but which may have been the regular creak, creak of a rat's tooth (singularly like the creak of a boot, especially where there is an echo), there is no noise or sound until after the arrival of the new servant, who had every opportunity of being instructed by the "honest countrywoman" as to the supernatural reputation of the premises, although the narrator [blindly] states that she had no acquaintances in the village. Then came the next manifestation, which it may be reasonably suggested was referable to the literal fact that the boxes in the lumber room were insecurely piled up. Of course they were quite still when examined, but probably the narrator had no knowledge of the actual positions they were in when last left, and there seems to have been a large number of things piled up in the room. Then came more manifestations, and this time in the more orthodox manner of knockings. The narrator then chaffs or speaks loud, and with the remarkable result that the knockings become more hurried. This is what would probably happen in the case of rats being disturbed by a human voice and hurrying off. Then on page 148 the new servant seems to have been inoculated with ideas of nocturnal noises, but for some unaccountable reason her testimony is not taken. This omission detracts from the value of the story, as a rigid cross-examination of this servant might have brought out the truth. Then on page 149 comes a young lady visitor, a near relative of the wife, who was not to be told anything. I rather doubt the probability of the secret being kept from the near relative, because if ladies won't tell they will hint and warn, and if only *hints* were thrown out, it may account for the lady (who was not prejudiced in favour of any particular noise) hearing what nobody else in the house had ever heard. The lady speaks to the footsteps in the passage, and then comes the grand Sabbath coincidence in which she also hears a great crash, and fixes the time at 2 o'clock. It would be interesting and more satisfactory to get the lady's own account of this, as the evidence is merely hearsay, and may have been led up to by suggesting questions. As to the boy's evidence it is second-hand, and bears such evident marks of embellishment as to be utterly untrustworthy. The next evidence of the good old Christian lady is also second-hand, and the narrator tries to create a prejudice in her favour by continuous testimony to her good qualities, and by his own assertions as to belief in her truthfulness. In summing up the narrator's experiences I may say that the record was written afterwards from recollection, as appears from the last sentence. There was no record made from time to time as these things occurred, or evidence of it would be produced. The whole narrative is "written up" with sensational remarks, and the most trifling matters are highly embellished. It is not a plain statement of facts, but arguments and explanations are suggested and extraneous

matters inserted. It bears evidence of studied effect and resembles an article intended for publication in a magazine. No evidence is forthcoming of any other persons having had like experiences, although as the house was occupied at least 12 months there must have been ample opportunity for corroboration. Nor is corroboration forthcoming by recent inquiries in the neighbourhood; the Committee must know the place referred to, and could make an investigation on the spot.

In writing these remarks I must not be considered in any way to throw the slightest doubt on the good faith and honesty of the various narrators, but I simply wish to record my protest against stories being admitted as evidence to support important theories, which rest mainly upon second-hand statements, or which are dateless, or too remote in date for proper inquiry, and without sufficient pains being taken to verify facts stated in the narratives. For instance, a narrative states that John Smith died at Manchester from an accident on a certain day. This can easily be verified at a cost of 3s. 6d. by a copy from the register of deaths, or by writing a polite letter to the coroner. I would also earnestly suggest that no story more than five years old be printed or cited in evidence, except the statements in the story were proved to have been written down at the time of occurrence; and in the case of a short date story it should not be cited and printed unless an opportunity has been given for some competent officers of the Society to examine witnesses and documents. Such examination should be by strangers to the parties, and great care should be taken to avoid leading and suggestion.

WM. DAVIES,  
Bellfield, Kingsbridge, Devon,  
Associate of the Society for Psychological Research.

---

#### REPLY TO MR. DAVIES' CRITICISMS.

On behalf of the Literary Committee, I am instructed to say here that we cordially thank Mr. Davies, in the first place for the care which he has taken in studying and criticising our work, and in the second place for permitting his letter to appear in the Society's *Journal*.

His criticism is just of the kind which we desire to elicit,—a detailed exposition of points of evidence which appear to him defective in our narratives as they have thus far been given to the world. Before proceeding to an equally detailed reply, in the preparation of which we have had the advantage of the kind assistance of Mrs. Sidgwick, who has kept in memory the various pieces of evidence which have accrued

since the publication of the cases,—I may briefly state the general way in which we wish to meet Mr. Davies' criticisms.

As regards the really important question,—what constitutes the evidence which should be aimed at in the presentation of cases like these to the world,—there is really no difference between our own views and those of our critic. It will be seen again and again in our detailed reply that we have, in fact, in many cases, attained,—in others have tried in vain to attain,—precisely the pieces of information which he desiderates.

At the same time we are quite willing to admit that we have not refrained from publishing cases evidentially imperfect as tried by the standard which we shall agree with Mr. Davies in applying; and we will frankly confess that this is partly due to the fact that in the course of our investigation reflection and experience have led us to be somewhat more exacting in our view of the kind and degree of attestation required, in order that a narrative may have any considerable evidential importance. Partly, however, we were led to the publication of cases which we admit to be, in some respects, open to attack, by a consideration which we still think important—namely, by a desire to lay before the readers a completely illustrated and systematic classification of the phantasms of the living, arranged under the heads that appeared to us to be suitable to the somewhat novel view that we had formed of them.

The judgment of the public on the total value of the mass of evidence cannot, of course, be formed until after the appearance of our book on "Phantasms of the Living," which we hope to bring out this year—after a period of preparation which, though long in comparison with our original programme, is certainly not long in comparison with the length of preparation which books so laborious generally need.

In the Second Report of the Literary Committee (*Proc.*, Part V., January, 1884), it was calculated that over 10,000 letters had been written during 1883 in the course of the collection and verification of evidence. The number written during 1884 was somewhat less, but not very much less; and although now the work of arranging and commenting is occupying a larger proportion of time, from 15 to 20 letters *per diem* are still going forth in quest of just such "further and better particulars" as Mr. Davies demands. And in this respect Mr. Davies' letter will decidedly strengthen our hands. It will enable us to impress on some well-disposed but tardy correspondent (say when we are writing for the fifth time to ask for a date which he could find for us in 10 minutes) that it is not a mere fancy of our own to wish to know in what year something happened which he merely localises in bygone time by saying, "when I was a gay young man;" but that the



narrative is exposed to serious criticism for want of just this kind of fact, which our correspondents must manage to find out for us themselves, since it is not to be discovered in the Annual Register.

However, we have no desire to find fault with our correspondents, and in fact my next remark must be that some of them are very much more to be depended upon than the published narrative gives us any opportunity of showing. I am thinking specially of Mr. Roberts, the shopman who was seen when absent at dinner by Mr. and Mrs. Owen and Mrs. Jones—a case where Mr. Davies naturally desires that the evidence of some of these persons, or of Mr. Roberts' aunt, who was cognisant of the occurrence at the time, should be obtained.

Mr. Roberts cannot get this testimony. His aunt (who is very old) thinks it impious so much as to discuss any occurrence so plainly withdrawn from mere human knowledge; Mr. and Mrs. Owen are unenlightened, unfriendly, and unapproachable; and Mrs. Jones is no longer traceable among her homonyms throughout the Principality. But Mr. Roberts himself is a witness whom I would gladly make an effort to enable Mr. Davies to meet. I spent several hours of the afternoon of December 27th, 1882, in talking to him, he having consented to devote a day of his brief Christmas holiday to a long journey in order to meet me at the Worcester station. He made, in fact, a pure gift to the Society of a good many hours of writing, talk, and travel, with no personal motive whatever, simply because his mind had been strongly impressed by an inexplicable incident in his own experience, and he had the good-nature to think that we should be glad to know of it. At the end of our talk I felt no doubt that his recollection of the facts that he narrated was substantially accurate, and that his narration was in precise accordance with his recollection. Under these circumstances I did not think it right to let his narrative drop altogether for lack of corroboration; though I should, of course, have been glad if other persons could have shared my personal impression of Mr. Roberts' evidence. And in this respect the case is a thoroughly typical one. For the small group of us who are actively engaged in this task of collecting evidence, constantly feel the need of more help—the need to increase our numbers and divide our responsibility. From time to time we have appealed to our Members to give more active help, and help of considerable value has been afforded to us. But much more is needed still, and we would again appeal to our Members and Associates (many of whom have joined us since our last appeal was made) to collect cases for us from their friends and acquaintances, or to offer help (to Mr. Podmore especially) in conducting the correspondence which weighs somewhat too heavily upon all of us.

F. W. H. MYERS.

We will now deal, in detail, with some of Mr. Davies' objections to particular narratives, and omitting those which are met by the general reply already given, we will take first the cases of phantasms of the living, and then the haunted houses.

*Proceedings* Vol. I., p. 30.—General Richardson's corroboration has now been obtained.

Page 31.—Mr. T. W. Smith left the address given some years ago, but we are endeavouring to trace him, in order to make further inquiries.

Page 121, No. IV.—The evidence in this case is undoubtedly weak. It is, however, second-hand, not third, as regards the important part, namely, the apparition; though, as must be admitted, from a child of five years old. And here we may remark that as regards narratives which from age or want of corroboration must always remain comparatively weak, we do not think them so entirely without value as Mr. Davies seems to do. By themselves they could not afford satisfactory evidence for veridical phantasms, since the inference would be inevitable that if these things were true there would be at least some recent cases and some cases carefully noted at the time. But combined with such recent and carefully observed cases, we think the less well-evidenced ones give a cumulative force to the argument, and meet the objection that such phenomena, if genuine, would probably not be very rare. This would not, of course, be so if the errors liable to occur were of a constant kind, so that if one case were plausibly explained away, all the others would be so too. But we do not think that the errors introduced by mal-observation, &c., are of this kind. We do not think it so likely that 20 people should have made a mistake as to dates as that one should, or that 20 people should mistake arrangements of clothes for a human figure, and afterwards feel sure that it exactly resembled their friend as that one should.

Page 122.—Commander Aylesbury has now obtained his sister's account of what occurred at his house, and this is no doubt the most important part of the evidence, as it testifies to a collective auditory hallucination. We do not think that much importance can be attached to the drowning boy's vision of his home, as the scene pictured was probably a familiar one. The exact hour of the accident, and of the hearing of the voice, are not now remembered, but their coincidence seems to have been looked into at the time.

Page 124, No. VII., Captain Colt's story.—We cannot agree with Mr. Davies that there is not here good evidence, that the account of the apparition was given before the news of the storming of the Redan was received. Probably Mrs. Hope's date is not an independent one, but founded on the knowledge of the date of her brother Oliver's death; but she can hardly be mistaken as to having heard of the vision before

the news came, which is the important point in her evidence. Again, some reason must have been given by Captain Colt for the unusual proceeding of leaving his room and sleeping on a sofa in a friend's room—and his memory can hardly have played him false as to this fact. Perhaps, however, the strongest confirmation is afforded by a detail which has been learnt since the story was printed. Captain Colt tells the Committee that when the news of the storming of the Redan arrived, he with a large party were just starting in the drag on an expedition. He was sitting on the box next his father, who remarked that it was well that he (the father) had told him to say nothing about the vision to his mother, and that he hoped he would forbid its being mentioned by anyone to whom he had told it, as it might doubly alarm her now, since this news. This, again, seems to us to be a point on which his memory can hardly have deceived him.

Page 128, No. XI.—We agree with Mr. Davies that this may have been a dream of no extraordinary kind which impressed the child's imagination afterwards, only because of the death. It is one of those cases which do not seem to us to be of much value in proving the existence of veridical phantasms of dying persons, but which if they exist are probably cases of them. At the same time it must be observed that the children were not extremely young, and that Miss Sarah Jardine's recollection that she had awakened her sister, and told her their grandmother was in the room, suggests that some impression was made before the death was known.

Page 130, No. XIV.—Owing to the youth of the first-hand witness the second-hand evidence in this story is, perhaps, of more value than the first. Probably Mr. Colchester is not speaking from his own knowledge when he says "the same evening," but from his recollection of what he was told. Very likely his own experiences may dwell in his memory more from having been afterwards narrated to him than from actual first-hand recollection. But why should it have been told to him if nothing of the kind occurred?

Page 131, Nos. XVI. and XVII.—Mr. Berthon has been asked for further evidence as to his narrative, and a first-hand account of Miss Peard's case has been received.

Page 132, No. XVIII.—Inquiries made as to this narrative have hitherto remained unanswered, and it is doubtless weak as it stands. But we hardly think Mr. Davies' explanation a plausible one, for if it were really the two young gentlemen whom Miss Eyre saw entering the avenue gate, what became of them afterwards? Why did they not come to the house? It seems more likely that it was a case of mistaken identity. Miss Eyre was apparently looking out for her friends, and seeing three persons enter the gate may have concluded too hastily that they were the friends expected. It must be remembered in cases like

these that we cannot compel evidence, but are obliged to depend entirely on the kindness and courtesy of our informants.

Page 133.—Further inquiries are being made about Bishop Wilberforce's experience also. There is no reason to suppose from the narrative, as we have it, that the note was made in the Bishop's diary or that it has been preserved.

Page 133, No. XIX.—Mrs. Gates has been urged to keep a diary, but we think Mr. Davies has overlooked, in the case of the particular experience here recorded, that she told her daughter of her feeling at the time, before the letter from her son came, and that her daughter has confirmed the fact.

Page 134.—Mr. Fryer has been asked for his brother's testimony in this case.

Page 135, No. XXIV.—This case has been discussed in our prefatory remarks. (p. 409.)

Page 137, No. XXV.—This case seems to us weaker than it does to Mr. Davies, because watering of the eyes on looking upward is not a rare phenomenon. Still, the coincidence is curious and worth noting.

Page 137, XXVI.—Technically this narrative is not even second-hand; but it is actually evidenced in a way which leaves hardly a possible doubt as to the main fact reported; for Dr. Goodall Jones was made aware of the vision within a few minutes of its occurrence, and saw the percipient while she was still under the influence of the impression; and his evidence is probably better than that of his patient would be. An independent account of the death of the pilot is being inquired for.

Page 139, No. XXVIII.—There is an apparent discrepancy as to dates in this narrative, which will, we hope, be cleared up; but it is, as Mr. Davies says, a fair one.

Page 141, No. XXIX.—This narrative will probably be dropped on the ground that dreams of relatives at sea must be assumed to be not uncommon. Moreover, the coincidence of time between accident and dream is not clear. It must be observed, however, that the narrative can hardly be regarded as altogether without weight. The loss of the boat and the manner of it, are believed to have been dreamt of, and Mrs. Barnes' son seems to have had an auditory hallucination connected with his father at the same time. Mr. Elrington vouches for the fact that the occurrence was described hours before the news of the loss of the boat came, and it is to be presumed that he examined Mrs. Strong and other neighbours.

Page 142, No. XXXII.—Of course this narrative has never been ranked above second-hand as regards the important point, but we fully agree with Mr. Davies' criticism on it, and do not intend to use it in the book.

Part VI., p. 122.—Mr. Wilson took his degree in 1859. The evidence for this incident, has, of course, most of the weaknesses pointed out by Mr. Davies. Doubtless, could Mr. Wilson have known at the time that his experience would some day be of value in a scientific inquiry, he would have taken care that more complete evidence should be forthcoming.

Page 123.—Mr. C.'s sister-in-law resides in a remote part of the world, and there has been delay in obtaining her corroboration, but we are still hoping to receive it.

Page 129.—We cannot but think the internal evidence, confirming Mr. Juke's belief that the phenomenon occurred before the news came, very strong in this case. However, Mr. Jukes has promised to show us his diary, and evidence is doubtless forthcoming of the entry in the diary previous to the knowledge of the deaths.

Page 130.—We do not think that Count Guinasi's power was in this case mesmeric or clairvoyant, but regard it simply as a case of thought-transference. Mr. Browning's remark is, of course, given simply *because* it may be thought by some, as it is by Mr. Davies, to weaken the case. We do not ourselves think it does so to any material extent, because, with all respect to Mr. Browning, it seems to us improbable that he can, unintentionally, have conveyed the idea "murder" by his face or eyes, in such a connection. We should even prefer to this hypothesis that of a guess, right by pure accident.

Page 134.—We have here to rely on Mr. Keulemans' conviction that Herr Schell could not see the paper. His own evidence cannot be obtained.

We now proceed to Mr. Davies' criticisms on the Reports of the Haunted House Committee.

The first case, that of Mr. X.Z. (given in Vol. I. p. 107) is doubtless, as Mr. Davies points out, 30 years old, and allowance must be made for this in estimating its value. Perhaps the weakest point in the narrative, however, (next to the fact pointed out in the Report, that we have at present the first-hand testimony of one witness only, a weakness which we are trying to remedy) lies in the length of time, four years, between the vision and the recognition of the portrait. Four years is a long time to keep clearly in mind a face seen only once, and at some little distance, even under very impressive circumstances. But there is, of course, great difference of power in this respect between different individuals.

As to the narrative (Vol. I. p. 108) of the repeated appearance of the supposed ghost of Miss A., we entirely agree with Mr. Davies as to the weakness of T.M.B.'s evidence. The same criticism on it is made in the Report itself (p. 113), and Mrs. B. herself feels it (p. 110). We also quite agree with Mr. Davies that expectancy is a con-

dition that should always be taken account of in investigating a ghost story, as it certainly does sometimes produce illusions, and may produce hallucinations. At any rate we do not know that it cannot, and there is a certain amount of evidence suggesting that it sometimes does. But the possible operation of expectancy was taken account of in the case under consideration, and the following remark made about it in the Report (p. 113): "As these witnesses in most cases affirm that they *at first took the object seen to be a living person*, their apparent visions cannot be referred to any state of expectancy." We do not quite understand Mr. Davies' remark about Susan Taylor. She was, doubtless, a sceptic, but scarcely a common-sense one, as few would agree with her argument that what she saw could not have been a ghost because when she followed it into a room there was no one there. Nor do we agree with Mr. Davies that anything would be likely to be gained in this particular case by inquiries about the servants and their antecedents (though in many cases this is of course important), because in this case the appearances seemed to vanish in a way which, if correctly described, was impossible to a human being, and can hardly have been due to trickery.

With regard to present manifestations we think Mr. Davies has somewhat misunderstood the Report. It is not stated that no information as to present manifestations of abnormal occurrences reaches us, but that we have ourselves had no opportunities of witnessing any. We do know of cases where there is no reason to think that the supposed haunting has ceased. We have also examined some haunted houses (a report about one supposed case appeared in the March number of the *Journal*). But generally little information is gained by examining the scene of past phenomena, except a clearer idea (which is no doubt important) of the exact meaning of the narrative. As to the irregular times of the appearances, this does not, of course, prevent their being observed by those who reside continuously in the house. But it would clearly be absurd to expect much from a week's residence in a house where the ghost only appears about twice in a dozen years, and then not at any fixed time which can be foreseen and prepared for, especially as it is, at anyrate, uncertain whether the faculty (if such there be) of seeing ghosts is not peculiar to certain people.

It is true that we have a larger number of narratives of frequently recurring sounds than of frequently recurring apparitions, but though sounds certainly need investigating, it is perhaps not worth while to incur a great deal of additional trouble or expense in investigating them, since the result is likely to remain inconclusive. In a brief stay in a house it is not very probable that a member of the Society for Psychical Research would discover a cause of sound which had already been

searched for by the inhabitants; and the mere fact that we have not discovered a physical origin for them will not prove that they have a "psychical" one.

Turning now to the narrative in *Proceedings VI.*, p. 141, our inquiries respecting the murder which is said to have occurred in the house have so far been unsuccessful. But even if there was a murder, it is improbable that any clear identification will be possible between any person concerned and the figure seen, since all we know of the figure is that it was that of a woman in a particular attitude, muffled up in a particular way in clothes that might have belonged to almost any period. We fear that Mr. Davies is over sanguine in his assumption that any written notes of the occurrences narrated were made at the time; certainly no hint of the existence of such notes was given to us. We hope for careful contemporary records of such phenomena in the future, but do not find them often in the past.

With regard to the last narrative criticised by Mr. Davies—that in *Proceedings VI.*, p. 144—we think he is too severe. The account was written out, as he suggests, for a magazine, but as we have no reason to suppose that facts bearing on the case have been intentionally inserted or omitted, we hardly think the mode of presenting them ought to be allowed to prejudice us against them. The narrator's widow must know whether it was written as a statement of fact or as a made-up story, and in the latter case would not, we presume, either corroborate it, or allow her memory to be unconsciously influenced by it. Mr. Davies also seems to think that the fact that the story was written down—18 years after the events, it is true, though nearer to the time of their occurrence than we are now—weakens the evidence, and that independent testimony now given by the lady would be more satisfactory than the written testimony of her husband. Mr. Davies' point, too, about the epithet "honest," applied to the countrywoman, and other remarks about attempting to prejudice in favour of the witnesses, seem to us to be a mere question of style. It had certainly not occurred to us that the narrator meant to lay any particular stress on the word "honest," or to imply more than that she was a respectable woman, whom he had no reason to suspect of trickery. We certainly agree with Mr. Davies that if we could see a plausible explanation involving the countrywoman's complicity, we should be disposed to adopt it. But we cannot say we do. We gave the story simply as an example of noises, and it is pretty certain that the noises were heard, but such cases—where the phenomena consist of noises only, without any sufficient evidence that they are produced by an intelligent agent—can never be conclusive. No examination of witnesses could demonstrate that they *were* abnormal, and it is highly improbable at this distance of time, that it could be shown

that they were normal. It may interest our readers to know that one of us once passed a night (in 1873) in the house where these noises occurred. He had not at the time heard the story, but neither his own experience, nor anything he heard from his host, suggested the idea that any abnormal phenomena were going on. But this, of course, proves nothing—not even that the sounds have ceased—though it is extremely probable that they have done so, whether they were normal or abnormal.

---

### SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

*The following additions have been made since last month.*

PRINCETON REVIEW (The) four Nos. ....New York, 1885\*

HELLENBACH (L.B.) Geburt und Tod ..... Vienna, 1885

PSYCHISCHE STUDIEN. Vols. I.--XI, and the current Nos. of Vol. XII.

Leipzig, 1874-85†

LEVEQUE (Charles) La Science de l'Invisible .....Paris, 1865

RIBOT (Th.) Les Maladies de la Personnalité .....Paris, 1885

SCHMIDT (Oscar) Les Sciences Naturelles et la Philosophie de  
l'Inconscient .....Paris, 1879

SICILIANI (Pierre) Prolégomènes à la Psychogénie Moderne ...Paris, 1880

\* Presented by Mr. J. M. Libbey. † Presented by the Hon. A. Aksakof.

---

### NOTE.

We are asked to state, that on further investigation, the evidence for the haunting of a house near the Sussex coast, referred to in the *Journal* for January, proves to be unsatisfactory.

This is *not* the haunted house about which a notice was inserted in the *Journal* for April.