

# JOURNAL

OF THE

## SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
To our Readers.. . . . .	153	Specimens of the Classification of Cases	
Meetings of Council .. . . .	153	for "Phantasms of the Living." VI.	157
Elections, October 3rd and 16th, 1884 ..	155	Mark Twain on Thought-Transference ..	166
The Committee on Phenomena connected with the Theosophical Society .. . .	156	Supplementary Library Catalogue .. . .	168

### TO OUR READERS.

Our friends will notice with interest the numerous additions to the membership of the Society which we have the pleasure to record this month. Since our last issue 17 Members and 35 Associates (including three Honorary Associates) have joined the ranks of the S.P.R. Moreover, the lively interest in the Society which the editor found existing in scientific and intellectual circles in the United States has led to the formation of American Committees of high standing at Boston, Philadelphia and Montreal. These Committees, it is hoped, will carry on the work of the S.P.R. in America, and at the same time the distinguished names they include will strengthen the Society at home. But the precise mode of co-operation with our transatlantic friends has yet to be settled, and is at present under consideration.

### MEETINGS OF COUNCIL.

A Council Meeting was held on the 3rd inst., the President in the chair, when Messrs. Alexander Calder, Edmund Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, Edward R. Pease, Frank Podmore and J. Herbert Stack were present.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read, Mr. E. T. Nisbet, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, was elected an Honorary Associate, under the second clause of Rule 8, in recognition of his services to the Society. Thirty-nine new Members and Associates were elected, whose names and addresses are given on another page.

The Council recorded with regret the death of Mr. Walter H. Browne, a much esteemed member of their body, and requested the Hon. Secretary to convey their deep sympathy to his widow.\*

A letter was received from Mr. T. O. Hastings Lees, tendering his resignation as an Associate.

\* An obituary notice will appear in the next number of the *Journal*.—ED.

The following donations to the Research Fund were announced, and votes of thanks for them were passed by the Council:—The President, £50, Mr. F. W. H. Myers, £10, Mr. H. A. Kay, £5, and Mrs. F. W. H. Myers, £5.

It was agreed that a series of Meetings should be held during the forthcoming season, and that each Meeting should be partly of a formal and partly of a conversational character. It was also agreed to hold two Meetings before the close of the year, the first to take place at the end of the present month.

---

An intermediate Council Meeting was held on the 16th, the Rev. W. Stainton Moses in the chair, when Messrs. Edmund Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, Edward R. Pease, Frank Podmore and J. Herbert Stack were present.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read.

It was unanimously resolved that Mr. Richard Hodgson, of St. John's College, Cambridge, be co-opted as a Member of the Council under Rule 17.

Ten new Members and Associates, and two Honorary Associates, whose names and addresses are given elsewhere, were also elected.

Two specimens of Psychographic Slate Writing were received from Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood as a present to the Society, and the Council passed a vote of thanks to the donor.

It was resolved that the next General Meeting be held at the Rooms of the Society of British Artists, Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, on Friday, the 31st inst., the chair to be taken at 8.30 p.m. The proceedings will include an account by Professor Barrett of the prospects of Psychical Research in America, and a Telepathic Explanation of some so-called Spiritualistic Phenomena by Mr. F. W. H. Myers.

It was directed that the series of "S" slips (consisting of evidence relating to phenomena called Spiritualistic) should be placed in the hands of the Committee on Physical Phenomena, in order that any cases which seemed to offer a chance of further investigation might be promptly followed up.

---

#### NOTE.

In the *Proceedings*, Part VI., a case of apparition at the time of death was given on the authority of Sir Edmund Hornby. This case must be withdrawn for the present, as it seems to have contained several inaccuracies. The matter is being re-investigated, and it will be explained later whether or not the inaccuracies are fundamental.

## ELECTIONS, OCTOBER 3RD AND 16TH, 1884.

## MEMBERS.

- ABDY-WILLIAMS, E. M., 8, Caledonian Place, Clifton, Bristol  
BAYNES, ROBERT EDWARD, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.  
CAITHNESS, THE COUNTESS OF, DUCHESSE DE POMAR, 51, Rue de l'Université, Paris.  
DAKYNs, HENRY GRAHAM, M.A., 3, Upper Belgrave Road, Clifton, Bristol.  
FOUNTAIN, ALFRED, Highfield, Hillingham, Uxbridge, Middlesex.  
GEBHARD, MRS., 12, Platzhoff Strasse, Elberfeld.  
GLINŶA, MADEMOISELLE DE, 1, Rue Lincoln, Champs Elysées, Paris.  
JOYCE, SAMUEL, JUNR., European Telegraph Works, Pownall Road, Dalston, London, E.  
MURRAY-AYNSLEY, MRS., Great Brampton, near Hereford.  
PORTER, MISS, 16, Russell Square, London, W.C.  
PRIM, JOSE, 188, Gresham House, Old Broad Street, London, E.C.  
RAYLEIGH, CLARA LADY, 91, Onslow Gardens, London, S.W.  
SMITH, R. PEARSALL, 4653, Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, U.S.A.  
SOLOVIOFF, WSEVOLOD, 48, Rue Pergolèse, Paris.  
WARRANTER, MISS, Bruntisfield House, Edinburgh.  
WILSON, CHARLES M., Rose Villa, North Strand, Limerick.  
WOODHOUSE, G. H., Heath Bank, Bolton.

## HONORARY ASSOCIATES.

- BRIETZCKE, MRS. HELEN KATE, 21, Applegarth Road, West Kensington, London, W.  
NISBET, E. T., 135, Northumberland Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.  
WOODHULL, MAJOR ALFRED, M.D., David's Island, Pelham, New York, U.S.A.

## ASSOCIATES.

- ALLEN, MISS MARY GRAY, 1, Florence Terrace, Londonderry.  
AMY, MISS ANNIE F., Cross Bow, Trinity, Jersey.  
BALMAIN, MRS., Basset, Southampton.  
BATESON, MRS., 8, Harvey Road, Cambridge.  
BROWN, MRS., Moorsden, Tarbolton, Ayrshire, N.B.  
DAVEY, S. JOHN, Alfriston, Hayne Road, Beckenham, London, S.E.  
DAVIES, WILLIAM, Bellfield, Kingsbridge, Devon.  
EDELSTEN, JOHN A., Latchford, Warrington.  
GIBSON, MRS. SUMNER, Shrublands, Tunbridge Wells.  
GRIFFITH, ROBERT W., M.A., The Old House, Llandaff.  
HART, S. LAVINGTON, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.  
HAYES, JOSEPH WALTON, 1, George's Street, Enniscorthy.

- HENNINGS, REV. JAMES, Duncombe House, Kingsbridge, Devon.  
 HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN, DR. T. U., 9, Alfred Strasse, Hamburg.  
 IONIDES, CONSTANTINE A., 23, Second Avenue, West Brighton.  
 JEBB, MRS., The University, Glasgow.  
 JORDAN, MRS. LUTLEY, 22, Lexham Gardens, Kensington, London, W.  
 KANE, J. G. AURIOL, Sloperton Lodge, Kingstown, Co. Dublin.  
 KERSEY, H. A., 4, Eslington Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne.  
 MARTIN, W. R., Pine Craig, South Queensferry, Scotland.  
 METCALFE, CAPTAIN HENRY, Wateruliet Arsenal, West Troy, New York, U.S.A.  
 MILLAR, ALEXANDER, Airdrie House, 19, Orlando Road, Clapham, London, S.E.  
 MOTT, FREDERICK T., F.R.G.S., Birstal Hill, Leicester.  
 NORWAY, ARTHUR H., Secretary's Office, General Post Office, London, E.C.  
 PASSINGHAM, MRS., Milton, Cambridge.  
 ROBIN, PERCY A., B.A., The Leys, Cambridge.  
 SMITH, MISS, 4653, Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, U.S.A.  
 TAYLOR, MISS MARIAN, Ayton House, Great Ayton, Yorkshire.  
 THURSTAN, FREDERICK W., M.A., Kingsley College, Westward Ho., Devon.  
 WILLETT, MRS., Bedales, Lindfield, near Haywards Heath, Sussex.  
 WITHERS, JOHN JAMES, King's College, Cambridge.  
 WORKMAN, WALTER PERCY, B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

N.B.—Members and Associates are requested to send information of any change of address to the Assistant-Secretary, 14, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S. W.

---

## THE COMMITTEE ON PHENOMENA CONNECTED WITH THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

---

### FORTHCOMING REPORT.

It will be recollected that in May last the Council appointed a Committee to inquire into the evidence for contemporary Apparitions of the Living in India—an inquiry which inevitably extends itself to certain other phenomena closely linked with the alleged apparitions.

It appears that many Members of the Society for Psychical Research are much interested in this investigation; and the Committee have thought it desirable to analyse and classify a good deal of evidence already in print, besides receiving the voluntary depositions of leading members of the Theosophical Society. They have also collected a quantity of other evidence, hitherto unpublished, and in many instances forwarded expressly for the use of the Committee by the kindness

of various English, American, Russian, German, and Hindoo correspondents.

The First Report of the Committee, which will appear, it is hoped, in November, will therefore be a somewhat lengthy document. It will be issued as a "Private and Confidential" paper, not to be offered for sale to the general public.

One copy will be forwarded gratis to every Member. Associates (as will be remembered) have no claim to the free receipt of any paper except the published *Proceedings* and the *Journal*. But any Associate who desires it may receive one copy of the Report on the enclosure of a Postal Order for 2s. 6d. to the Assistant-Secretary. No Member or Associate will be supplied with more than one copy of the Report, which will contain matter of a semi-private character, and is not intended for diffusion beyond the limits of the Society.

Before issue, the Report will be read at a Special Meeting of the Society, which will be open to Members and Associates only.

---

## SPECIMENS OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF CASES FOR "PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING."

### VI.

Up to this point the cases which we have been discussing, though, in other respects, very various, have agreed in one main feature. They have all partaken of an individual or subjective character; they have been such as one man might easily experience without his neighbour's experiencing anything of the same kind. A feeling of depression, an internal voice, the clairvoyant perception of a distant scene;—such impressions as these are eminently *individual*; they appear, in their different ways, to be operations of, or impacts upon, a single mind.

But we have now to consider a class of phantasms which are not *individual*, but which are, nevertheless, *particular*, which are, in themselves, of such a character that they would seem to be perceptible with equal ease by all the persons present, and which, nevertheless, are not perceived *collectively* but *particularly*; that is to say, not by the whole group assembled, but only by one person, or certain persons, in that group.

It will not surprise the reader to hear that these cases form a large and varied class. Probably, indeed, he will suppose (as we ourselves began by supposing) that when a phantasm appears it is generally heard or seen only by the person whom it specially concerns; that it hovers before him alone, like the ghost of Banquo, imperceptible by

those whom mere accident has brought to the same spot. Statistics, however, seem to show that this is not a true representation of the facts. In our Classified Index we have about 40 cases where an apparently objective phantasm is thus *particularly* discerned, as compared with about 100 cases where it is *collectively* or *successively* discerned; where all the persons in the group see or hear it, either at once or one after the other if they are sitting, for instance, somewhat apart.

It is, moreover, soon evident that the great bulk of our cases do not fall under either of these heads, are cases neither of *particular* nor of *collective* perception, but are *neutral* cases, occurring, that is to say, when the percipient is *alone*, and affording, therefore, no clue as to whether other persons, if present, would have perceived the phantasm or no. Against some 40 particular and some 100 collective cases, we can set some 260 neutral cases, which thus form a class nearly twice as large as the two others put together.

We shall afterwards have to discuss the possible causes of this apparent facility offered to phantasms by the solitude of the percipient. For the present, we have to consider the proportion of *particular* to *collective* phantasms; a proportion which, from the telepathic view, is certainly unexpectedly small. We should have supposed that if the apparition is evoked simply by the action of one mind upon another, then the cases where several persons simultaneously perceived the same apparition would be very few; as the difficulty of the explanation is much increased by any further transference, as it were by infection, from the primary percipient to other persons in his company. Recognising this difficulty in the background, we must not take for granted that even these *particular* cases (where one sees and others do not see) are necessarily to be counted in favour of the telepathic theory. We must do once more as we have often done already, and shall often have to do again, viz., pause and consider at the opening of a new class of cases what features in these cases would point to telepathy, and what to other possible explanations. The other explanations we have already discerned to be at least two in number,—namely, the clairvoyance of the percipient (with no necessary action of the so-called agent's at all), and that which we may call the primitive and popular explanation, namely,—that the phantasm is an objective entity, perceptible either to all persons present, or to all persons whose power of spiritual or supersensual discernment has risen to a certain level. The main points, it appears, which will need noting in discussing the causes of *particularity* of perception, will be as follows:—

- (1) Was the percipient more closely linked with the agent than the non-percipients were? If so, this tells in favour of telepathy.

- (2) Was he a person who had had many similar experiences, or who was in some abnormal state at the time? If so, this tells in favour of clairvoyance.
- (3) Or was he a comparative stranger, less closely linked with the agent than the non-percipients were? This would tell against telepathy, and in favour either of clairvoyance or of the quasi-objectivity of the phantasm.
- (4) Is it quite clear that the other persons present would have heard or seen the phantasm, had it been objective? If this is not clear the case tends to become a *neutral* one, as though the percipient had been alone at the time.

These are preliminary questions, which may be asked with regard to all the *particular* cases. But moreover, the particular cases are in other respects very varied in character. They occur throughout at least eight classes of cases which will hereafter need to be distinguished at length. But we may more conveniently defer any full discussion of the characteristics of these further classes until we come to deal with the neutral cases, where each class is represented so much more abundantly. For the present, although the *order* in which we shall cite our particular cases will be dictated by considerations as yet unexplained, we shall mainly devote ourselves in dealing with each phantasm to a consideration of the causes of its partial percipience.

First then, let us consider two cases where the object seen is vague, with no distinct resemblance to the supposed agent. In such cases coincidence in *time* is, of course, the only reason for connecting the agent's death with the phenomenon.

From the Rev. Stephen H. Saxby, Mount Elton, Clevedon. Mr. S. M. Saxby, the percipient, is now dead.

About the year 1841 I was in a room with my father in our house in the Isle of Wight, when he exclaimed, "Good God, what is that?" starting up as he spoke, and apparently looking at something. He then turned to me and said that he had seen a ball of light pass through the room, and added, "Depend upon it, Morse Simonds is dead." This was an old servant in London, to whom he had been sending money, in illness. In course of post came information that she passed away at the very time in question.

S.H.S.

Now here it seems probable, though not certain, that the son would have seen what his father saw, had it been objective. And what was seen was a kind of momentary flash, which seems an easily-conceivable result of a telepathic impact. The father's certainty that Morse Simonds was dead somewhat corroborates this view. For we may suppose that the impact from Morse Simonds upon Mr. Saxby consisted of an idea of herself, accompanied by the vague shock which, as the vulgar

saying goes, "made him see stars," externalised itself as a flash of light. This case, therefore, may fairly be counted for the telepathic theory.

In the next case the attention of the other persons present is said to have been explicitly directed to the phantasm, which they fail to see.

From Mr. H. C. Hurry, C.E., 2, Malvern Terrace, Southsea, Portsmouth.

January 4th, 1884.

Another case I give you, vouching for it on the veracity of a brother, long dead, whose word was never doubted by any who knew him, and upon whose statement I would rely as confidently as upon the evidence of my own senses. At the time of the occurrence he was a young man, about 23 years of age, in perfect health, of indomitable courage, and without a taint of superstition. Riding home from hunting, with some friends, to Cheltenham, in the looming he saw, or believed he saw, an undefinable white object keeping pace with them by the side of the road; he drew the attention of his friends to the circumstance, but they could not see the object. They changed their pace, but whether walking, trotting, or cantering, to my brother's mind's eye the object remained with them until they reached the lights of the town. Thinking this very remarkable, my brother put the time down, and this agreed exactly with the hour of the demise of a much loved aunt in the south-west of Ireland.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Hurry adds:—

I do not remember that my brother had ever had any *other* visual hallucinations.

Here it may perhaps be thought that the long duration of the phantasm tells against its telepathic origin. This is a point which it is impossible to determine *à priori*. Let us see if light is thrown upon it by any of our previous inquiries.

We have seen reason to believe that a mere *impression* of telepathic origin may last for hours, or even days—although we have always felt that there was a doubt as to how far such impression needed *renewal* in order to keep up its intensity, or was a mere prolongation or echo of the original impact.

Next to take the case of *dreams*. Have we evidence that the same dream-figure may persist for many minutes? Such evidence would probably need to be drawn from the mutterings of the sleeper, as otherwise his apparent recollection of the duration of a dream is of course, valueless. Even in dreams where a *true* and *prolonged* action is witnessed—clairvoyant dreams of a complex type—it would seem that this true action is sometimes dramatically compressed in the dream;—that the dreamer sees in a few moments what it takes his friend hours to endure—just as the spectator of a French tragedy sees whole life-histories of plot and passion compressing themselves into a few hours of concentrated conversation in a public square.

Next, let us consider the duration of mere *illusory hallucinations*.

Here we observe that the hallucinations of the insane are often very lasting ; and so are the distinctly morbid hallucinations of sane persons. But the casual or occasional hallucinations of sane persons, without any nervous derangement otherwise traceable (of which class we have made a very large collection), seem for the most part to be almost momentary, or at any rate to last only a few minutes, and to be readily dispelled by change of posture, &c. We have, therefore, no very clear analogies by which to judge of the probability of the prolonged duration of a *reflex* phantom,—provoked and sustained by mere telepathic impact. But we must remind the reader that we are offering him not *theorems* but *porisms*—not so much explanations of the cases which we collect as the suggestion of lines of inquiry which may ultimately disentangle them.

It is said that we have a reader in Thibet who describes our Proceedings as “a bag of uncracked nuts.” We accept the analogy ; and all that we claim is that we are aware—which the general public is *not*,—that our nuts have kernels inside them.

We give another case where the phantasm—seen by one person only, and that the *right* one—is prolonged for an hour or more, and is, in fact, ultimately left in possession of the field.

From Mr. Louis Lyons, of 3, Bouverie Square, Folkestone.

Some time ago my son told me that a friend of his, a rough and simple-minded fellow, had returned from Shields, and told him a curious tale. The man is a sailor, and had served with his father ever since he was a boy in a collier which trades between this port and the North. The youth, having become very proficient in his calling, went on his voyages, leaving his father, now an elderly man, at home. During a stormy voyage, and not far off the Humber, the young sailor saw his father, whom he had left in excellent health, pacing the deck, and calling out several times, as he was wont to do—

“Mind your helm, Joo !”

The young man wished to speak to his father, but could not ; some occult power prevented him. At the end of the voyage a letter awaited the young sailor, announcing the death of the father at the precise time when he appeared to his son ; but please to remark (a matter of some importance, I think) that the apparition remained on deck *some three hours*, until the vessel got to Grimsby.

I disbelieved my son's story, and requested him to ask his friend to come and take tea with me, that I might hear the account from his own mouth. He came. The simplicity of his manner, his plain, open-hearted account, and I may even say his stupidity, manifested in his peculiar diction, imparted an impress to his tale.

At our request Mr. Lyons interrogated Edward Sings more formally the next time that the latter visited Folkestone. The following is the *procès-verbal* of the examination :—

“What is your name ?”

“Edward Sings.”

"When did you leave your father last?"

"About six years ago, on a Good Friday."

"Was he in good health when you left him?"

"Yes."

"What happened on your voyage?"

"We was in a gale of wind, and we was running in the Humber; we carried the main gaff away; I was at the wheel steering her in. He come to me three or four times, tapped me on the shoulder, and told me to mind the helm, and I told the captain my father was drowned, or something happened to him. After we got in, when it was my watch, he was walking to and fro with me, and I went down below and told my mate I could not stop up, and I did not like to. My mate took my watch. I never could speak to my father, for something kept me from doing so. I heard of my father's death a week afterwards. No one else saw my father's spirit. My father stopped on deck with me an hour, and as I could not stand it any longer I went below, and my mate took my place. We cast both anchors, and were towed into Grimsby. My mother and sister were at my father's death-bed, and they told me that my father asked several times whether I was in the harbour.

"I certify this to be a true account.

"EDWARD SINGS.

"Folkestone, 29th December, 1882."

There is certainly something about this phantom which seems to suggest an individuality apart from that of the frightened boy who describes it. Its tranquil persistence, the repeated touch and call with which it meets his spell-bound aversion, and finally the boy's apparent deliverance from it by mere change of place,—all these points, though capable of being explained as mere dream-imagery clothing a reflex phantom, do nevertheless inspire a strong doubt as to the power of a telepathic impact to externalise itself so independently and for so long a time.

Our next case is a very singular one. A dying mother, if we may trust our account, appears to the child towards whom her thoughts must have turned, yet that child, while she is the only person who *sees*, is the only person who cannot *identify* the phantasmal form.

Dr. Spencer T. Hall, a well-known writer on forestry, &c., in his "Days in Derbyshire" (1863, pp. 85-6) gives this relation:—

"Philip [Spencer, of Holloway, Derbyshire] and his first wife, Martha, who was a cousin of mine, having no children of their own, adopted the little daughter of a young woman, who went to live at Derby. The child called them father and mother as soon as she could speak, not remembering her own parents, not even her mother. While yet very young, she one day began to cry out that there was a young woman looking at her, and wanting to come to her, and according to her description of the person, it must have been her mother. As no one else saw the apparition, and the child continued for more than half an hour to be very excited, Philip took her out of the house to that of a neighbour; but the apparition kept them company, talking by the way. They then went to another house, where it accompanied them

still, and seemed as though it wanted to embrace the child; but at last vanished in the direction of Derby—as the little girl, now a young woman, describes it—in a flash of fire. Derby is about fourteen miles distant from Holloway, and as in that day there was neither railway nor telegraph, communication between them was much slower than at present. As soon, however, as it was possible for intelligence to come, the news arrived that the poor child's mother had been burnt to death; that it happened about the time when it saw her apparition; and, in short, that she was sorrowing and crying to be taken to the child during the whole of the time between being burnt and her expiration. This is no 'idle ghost story,' but a simple matter of fact, to which not only Philip but all his old neighbours can testify; and the young woman has not only related it more than once to me, but she told it in the same artless and earnest manner to my friend, the late Dr. Samuel Brown, of Edinburgh, who once called at the cottage with me—repeating it still more clearly to Messrs. Fowler and Wells, on our recent visit."

This certainly seems as strong an instance as could well be found of the appearance of the agent to that person only on whom the dying thoughts were fixed. Naturally, we might say, the mother thinks of her child, and the child alone receives the impression. And yet we find that other accounts (of which we have several) of dying mothers desiring to see their children once more, hardly bear out this impression. Several of them are reciprocal cases; that is to say, not only does the child or nurse see the mother but the mother sees the child, a problem difficult of solution on purely telepathic lines. And there is a case reported by Lady Bloomfield—though on what evidence does not exactly appear—where it is the nurse alone who sees the phantom of the dying mother.

From *Lady Bloomfield's Reminiscences*, Vol. II. p. 266. "Princess Schwartzenberg perished at Paris, at the great fire which took place at the Austrian Embassy. She had left her youngest children at Vienna. The Cardinal, being then a baby of six months old, was in his cradle one night, when suddenly his nurse, an old and very respectable, but by no means either a clever or imaginative woman, fell down on her knees and exclaimed, 'Jesu, Maria, Joseph! there is the figure of the Princess, standing over the baby's cradle.' Several nursery-maids, who were in the room, heard the exclamation, though they saw nothing, but to her dying day the nurse affirmed the truth of the vision, and, there being no telegraphs then, it was not for many days after that the news of the Princess Schwartzenberg's untimely fate reached Vienna."

In this case, of course, the child would be too young to see anything itself. But the narrative suggests to us the existence of a group of cases where the percipient sees a phantom which is in no way attending to *him*, but busying itself over some one else. This would not be here inexplicable on the telepathic hypothesis, as the mother's thought might be supposed to be directed primarily to the child, and secondarily to the nurse, impressing the latter with the subconscious idea, "The Princess

wants to see her child"; which idea might be objectified with dream-like imagery in the figure of the mother actually bending over the cradle.

We give another case of a dying mother and her children, where the two points to notice are (1) that one daughter only saw the phantom, although another daughter looked in the same direction; and (2) that the child who saw the phantom did not recognise it. A failure to recognise a phantom must be considered to tell somewhat *against* the telepathic hypothesis; at least, this hypothesis becomes more complex if we have to assume that the percipient's mind fails to recognise the picture which it has, in a certain sense, itself created.

From Mrs. Richards, Spring Wood, Godalming.

About the year 1834 or 1835\* I was in a boarding school at Cadogan Place, Chelsea, kept by ladies named Horn, where, amongst other pupils, there were two sisters with whom I was very intimate. These girls came from a distance, their home being in the North of England, I believe, and travelling then being very different to what it is in these days of railways, they did not always go home for their holidays, and consequently were not impressed by the critical state of their mother's health.

We slept in a large dormitory, in which were several beds, the two sisters occupying a double bed. On a certain night, most of the girls being asleep, and myself in the next bed to one of the sisters, who was already in bed, and, like myself, anxious to be quiet, and allowed to go to sleep; but we were hindered by the frolicsomeness of the younger sister, who sat outside the bed and facing the door at the end of the room, which, I remember, was not quite dark, either owing to moonlight or the time of year. As the elder sister was urging her to be quiet and to get into bed, the younger one suddenly exclaimed, and, putting her hands over her face, seemed greatly agitated. As there seemed no cause for this sudden excitement, we, thinking it was only another form of her nonsense, and fearing the noise would bring up the governess, who also slept in the room, scolded her well, upon which she got into bed. Turning again to look towards the door, she uttered another cry, directing her sister's attention to the door; but she saw nothing, and still thought the younger one was joking. But the latter buried her head under the clothes, and I, being very tired, went to sleep and thought no more about this disturbance. Next morning no notice was taken of it, and no impression seems to have been made on my mind or that of the other girls, probably, as I now think, owing to our being accustomed to the volatile disposition of the younger sister. However, about two days afterwards, the sisters were summoned into the room of the ladies of the school to receive letters. Shortly after I was sent for, and found them in floods of tears, having just heard the news of their mother's death. Being their chief friend, I was

\* "Boyle's Court Guide" informs us that Mrs. and the Misses Horn lived at 41, Cadogan Place, Chelsea, from 1836-38. We have thus a slight correction of date, but an incidental corroboration of the external circumstances of the narrative.

excused from lessons that I might be with them, and try to console them. As we were approaching our room the younger sister stopped us suddenly, and grasping my arm with violence, she said, "Oh, do you remember the other night when I was frightened? I believe it was dear mamma that I saw. Let us go back and ask more about it," or words to that effect. We went back to Miss Horn's apartment, and on referring to the letter, we found that their mother had died, as nearly as we could calculate, at the same hour that the incident in the dormitory occurred.

This is what the girl said she saw: A tall, slight figure in white, resembling her mother, as she now thought, though she did not recognise features, who, with outstretched arms, seemed to beckon to her.

Talking it over on the same day, she remarked, "Ah, I think I see now why dear mamma appeared to me. She had often reproved me for my giddiness, and as she was dying, she wished to give me one more look and reproof. I will try and be very different. I shall never forget her warning," &c. She appeared deeply impressed, but as the sisters and I were soon parted, and did not correspond, I lost sight of them.

This is a true account, and I believe clearly remembered by me, though so many years ago. Neither I nor the sister saw the appearance, but witnessed the effect on the girl who did see it, both being quite awake.

The evidence for this case, as will have been observed, is somewhat remote in time. But if we accept the recollected story as accurate, it is interesting as showing how unpromising a hallucination may afterwards turn out to have been veridical. That a frolicsome, excited child should have pretended to see, or fancied that she saw, something which no one else saw, and which she could not even describe, might seem (as it did seem to her friend and her sister) an occurrence too trivial for recollection. Yet an event occurred which raised its triviality into tragic meaning.

On the whole, then, these *particular* cases, as we have called them;—cases where one person perceives and others fail to perceive the phantasm;—do not point to a telepathic origin quite so distinctly as might perhaps have been expected. They suggest some new difficulties; and it is plain that we must work our way through a good deal more of evidence before we can feel at all confident as to the genesis of the various forms of veridical hallucination. In the next paper we will consider some of the neutral cases,—where the percipient is alone at the time of the presentation of the phantasm.

F. W. H. MYERS.

## MARK TWAIN ON THOUGHT-TRANSFERENCE.

[The following characteristic letter from Mr. S. L. Clemens (Mark Twain) will, doubtless, entertain many of our readers.—Ed.]

Hartford, Conn., *October 4th*, 1884.

DEAR SIR,—I should be very glad indeed to be made a Member of the Society for Psychical Research ; for Thought-transference, as you call it, or mental telegraphy as I have been in the habit of calling it, has been a very strong interest with me for the past nine or ten years. I have grown so accustomed to considering that all my powerful impulses come to me from somebody else, that I often feel like a mere amanuensis when I sit down to write a letter under the coercion of a strong impulse : I consider that that other person is supplying the thoughts to me, and that I am merely writing from dictation. And I consider that when that other person does not supply me with the thoughts, he has supplied me with the impulse, anyway : I never seem to have any impulses of my own. Still, may be I get even by unconsciously furnishing other people with impulses.

I have reaped an advantage from these years of constant observation. For instance, when I am suddenly and strongly moved to write a letter of inquiry, I generally don't write it—because I know that that other person is at that moment writing to tell me the thing I wanted to know,—I have moved him or he has moved me, I don't know which,—but anyway I don't need to write, and so I save my labour. Of course I sometimes act upon my impulse without stopping to think. My cigars come to me from 1,200 miles away. A few days ago,—September 30th,—it suddenly, and very warmly occurred to me that an order made three weeks ago for cigars had as yet, for some unaccountable reason, received no attention. I immediately telegraphed to inquire what the matter was. At least I wrote the telegram and was about to send it down town, when the thought occurred to me, "This isn't necessary, they are doing something about the cigars now—this impulse has travelled to me 1,200 miles in half a second."

As I finished writing the above sentence a servant intruded here to say, "The cigars have arrived, and we haven't any money downstairs to pay the expressage." This is October 4th,—you see how serene my confidence was. The *bill* for the cigars arrived October 2nd, dated *September 30th*—I knew perfectly well they were doing something about the cigars that day, or I shouldn't have had that strong impulse to wire an inquiry.

So, by depending upon the trustworthiness of the *mental* telegraph, and refraining from using the electric one, I saved 50 cents—for the poor. [I am the poor.]

Companion instances to this have happened in my experience so

frequently in the past nine years, that I could pour them out upon you to utter weariness. I have been saved the writing of many and many a letter by refusing to obey these strong impulses. I always knew the other fellow was sitting down to write when I got the impulse—so what could be the sense in both of us writing the same thing? People are always marvelling because their letters “cross” each other. If they would but squelch the impulse to write, there would not be any crossing, because only the other fellow would write. I am politely making an exception in your case; you have mentally telegraphed me to write, possibly, and I sit down at once and do it, without any shirking.

I began a chapter upon “Mental Telegraphy” in May, 1878, and added a paragraph to it now and then during two or three years; but I have never published it, because I judged that people would only laugh at it and think I was joking. I long ago decided to not publish it at all; but I have the old MS. by me yet, and I notice one thought in it which may be worth mentioning—to this effect: In my own case it has often been demonstrated that people can have crystal-clear mental communication with each other over vast distances. Doubtless to be able to do this the two minds have to be in a peculiarly favourable condition for the moment. Very well, then, why shouldn't some scientist find it possible to invent a way to *create* this condition of *rapport* between two minds, at will? Then we should drop the slow and cumbersome telephone and say, “Connect me with the brain of the chief of police at Peking.” We shouldn't need to know the man's language; we should communicate by thought only, and say in a couple of minutes what couldn't be inflated into words in an hour and a-half. Telephones, telegraphs and words are too slow for this age; we must get something that is faster.—Truly yours,

S. L. CLEMENS.

P.S.—I do not mark this “private,” there being nothing furtive about it or any misstatements in it. I wish you could have given me a call. It would have been a most welcome pleasure to me.

#### DONATIONS TO SPECIAL FUND.

*Received since last announcement.*

Professor H. Sidgwick	...	...	...	...	£50	0	0
Mr. F. W. H. Myers	...	...	...	...	35	0	0
Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood	...	...	...	...	20	0	0
Mr. H. A. Kay	...	...	...	...	5	0	0
Mrs. F. W. H. Myers	...	...	...	...	5	0	0
Mr. R. Pearsall Smith	...	...	...	...	5	0	0

## SUPPLEMENTARY LIBRARY CATALOGUE.

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

[R] indicates that the book is for reference only.

- BRAID (James, M.R.C.S.E., C.M.W.S., &c.) *Neurypnology; or, the Rationale of Nervous Sleep (a second copy)* .....London, 1843  
 ———— *Observations on Trance; or, Human Hybernation*...London, 1850  
 ESDAILE (James, M.D.) *Natural and Mesmeric Clairvoyance (a second copy)* .....London, 1852  
 ESOTERIC PHILOSOPHY (Hints on) .....2nd Edit. *Calcutta*, 1882  
 MITCHELL (J.), (and Jn. Dickle) *The Philosophy of Witchcraft* .....Paisley, 1839  
 OLCOTT (Colonel Henry S.) *Lectures on Theosophy and Archaic Religions* .....Madras, 1883\*
- [R] PAMPHLETS, English, Vol. VI. (12 Articles on Mythology and Demonology).
1. Review of Horst's Zaubler-Bibliothek...The Foreign Quarterly Review ..... 1830
  2. Review of Salvete's Des Sciences Occultes ..... 1830
  3. Review of Creuzer's Symbolik und Mythologie ..... 1829
  4. Review of two works on Judaism ..... 1833
  5. Review of two works on Grecian Mythology and Religion ..... 1831
  6. Serpent Worship, or Ophiolatry .....The St. James's Magazine, 1862
  7. Tree and Serpent Worship .....The Cornhill Magazine, 1862
  8. A Glance at the Theology of Homer .....Titan, 1858
  9. Review of three works on Druidism.....The Edinburgh Review, 1863
  10. Review of Home's Incidents in my Life, and Howitt's History of the Supernatural .....The Quarterly Review, 1863
  11. Sacred Trees and Flowers ..... 1863
  12. Review of Mackay's Memoirs of Popular Delusions...The Edinburgh Review ..... 1844
- [R] PAMPHLETS, English, for Vol. VII.
- CRUIKSHANK (George) *A Discovery concerning Ghosts. 2nd Edit.* London, 1864  
 LILLIE (A.) *Koot Hoomi Unveiled* .....London, 1884
- [R] PAMPHLETS (Theosophical.) \*
- MONA SINGH: *A Sketch*, by D. M. S. ....Calcutta, 1884  
 OLCOTT (Henry S.) *A Buddhist Catechism* .....Colombo and London 1882  
 REPORT of Eighth Anniversary of Theosophical Society .....Madras, 1884  
 TRANSLATION (A) From the Sanskrit. By S. Ramaswamier .....Madras, 1884
- WILKINSON (James John Garth, M.R.C.S.) *The Human Body, and its Connection with Man*.....London, 1851  
 WITCHES OF RENFREWSHIRE (A History of the) ...New Edit. Paisley, 1877  
 THEOSOPHICAL MISCELLANIES, Nos. 1 and 2. ....Calcutta, 1883\*
- LIEGEOIS (Jules) *De la Suggestion Hypnotique dans ses Rapports avec le Droit Civil et le Droit Criminel* .....Paris, 1884  
 MARICOURT (R. Comte de) *Souvenirs d'un Magnétiseur* .....Paris, 1884
- DAUMER (Prof. G. W.) *Das Reich des Wundersamen und Geheimnisvollen* .....Regensburg, 1872  
 DU PREL (Dr. Carl) *Die Philosophie der Mystik* .....Leipzig, 1885  
 HELLENBACH (L. B.) *Die Magie der Zahlen* .....Vienna, 1882  
 MEYER (Johan Friedrich von) *Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, 11 vols. bound in 6* .....Frankfort and Berlin, 1818-1832  
 PREYER (Professor W.) *Die Entdeckung der Hypnotismus* ...Berlin, 1881

\* Presented by the Theosophical Society.