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PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO MR. EDMUND GURNEY.

(REVISED NOTICE.)

It has been suggested by a member of the Society for Psychical Research that it would be fitting to commemorate Mr. Gurney's work in Psychical Research by dedicating to his name some branch of the Society's Library, and raising a fund to make the department more complete. The Council (with the approval of Mr. Gurney's family) gladly accept this suggestion, and invite contributions to a fund which it is hoped may be permanently invested—the interest being expended in building up by yearly purchases a Library of works bearing on Hypnotism and kindred subjects, to be known as the "Edmund Gurney Library," and bound and stamped accordingly.
The subject of Hypnotism has been selected, partly because it was in this direction that much of Mr. Gurney’s most valuable and original work was done; and partly because it is a branch of research now widely recognised as of high scientific importance, and on which every year produces new publications of value. The Society’s collection of books on Hypnotism will naturally form the nucleus of the proposed Library, but it is incomplete, and many fresh works will need to be added both at once and, in all probability, for many years to come. It is for this reason that the Council would be glad, if possible, to expend in each year only the interest of the fund to be collected. It is proposed that all books thus purchased shall continue to form part of the “Edmund Gurney Library,” and that the employment of the funds raised shall be entrusted to the Library Committee of the Society for Psychical Research for the time being. Donations are invited both from members of the Society for Psychical Research and from other friends of Mr. Gurney’s, who may be glad of this opportunity of doing honour to his memory. The Rev. A. T. Fryer, 4, Upper Vernon-street,* London, W.C., has kindly consented to act as treasurer, and will receive any sum entrusted to him for the “Edmund Gurney Library Fund.”

FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, Hon. Secs. Society
FRANK PODMORE, for Psychical Research.

19, BUCKINGHAM STREET,
ADELPHI, LONDON, W.C.
December, 1888.

The following donations have been already received or promised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Russell Gurney</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. S. H. Butcher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. W. H. Myers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H. Hutton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. F. W. H. Myers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Montague</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. T. Myers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Podmore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord and Lady Rayleigh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Stack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Sidgwick</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Balfour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. H. Sidgwick</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Croom Robertson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. A. T. Fryer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. F. Myers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Myers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Bertha Porter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. C. S. Schiller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N.B.—Mr. Fryer’s address as given in the JOURNAL for December was wrong; the above address is correct.
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

At a Meeting of the Council held at the Society's Rooms on December 17th, the following Members were present:—The President (in the chair), Dr. A. T. Myers, and Messrs. F. W. H. Myers, Frank Podmore, and J. Herbert Stack.

Three new Members and five new Associates, whose names and addresses are given above, were elected.

The resignation of several Members and Associates who, for various reasons, desired to retire from the Society at the close of the year, were accepted. It was agreed that the names of some others, whose subscriptions had remained for some time unpaid, should be struck off the list.

Various matters of routine business were attended to.

As previously arranged, the Annual Business Meeting of the Members of the Society will be held on Friday, January 25th, 1889. The Assistant-Secretary was directed to send out the notices in the usual form, according to the rules.

A General Meeting will be held, as previously stated, on the evening of the same day.

It has also been agreed to hold a General Meeting on Monday, March 18th, 1889.

The next Meeting of the Council will be held at the close of the Annual Business Meeting on January 25th.

FURTHER REMARKS ON EXPERIMENTS IN CLAIRVOYANT PERCEPTION OF DRAWINGS.

By Professor Charles Richet.

[Translated.]

It is with keen interest that I have read Miss Balfour's comments upon my article on Lucidity. May I be allowed to make on this subject two short observations, after which I shall relate some experiments which I made yesterday, a few hours after reading the number of the Journal which contains Miss Balfour's remarks.

It is certain that the subjects of lucidity (if lucidity exist) do not perceive the objects in detail, but only the objects in mass—in their principal outlines; also it appears, at first, preferable to give for their divination simple lines, and not complicated drawings such as were usually furnished to me in the envelopes, of the contents of which I was ignorant. But, on the other hand, with geometrical figures, or extremely simple designs, chance might play a more important part
than in the case of more complicated drawings. If one of these complicated drawings should be described in all its details, it would be extremely strong evidence; if on the other hand the subject could indicate only the principal outlines, one would look upon the drawing as upon a geometric design, abstract the details, and take note only of the principal outlines described by the subject.

I am, nevertheless, quite in agreement with Miss Balfour as to the advantage of employing very simple drawings only; but one knows that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to arrive immediately at a procedure of experiment, I will not say sound, but even passable. It is only after much groping and hesitation that one avoids faulty attempts and errors in starting. I have had no predecessors to guide me, which may be a ground for indulgence for the defects of this research, which after all is but a first rough sketch. I have even ended by being persuaded that the results obtained by these drawings (even if they were of irreproachable exactitude, which is, unfortunately, never the case) could not in themselves carry conviction. They do not even lend themselves to the calculation of probabilities. The best way, in my opinion, would be to experiment always with cards, but the cards seem to succeed even less than the drawings, for various reasons, upon which I have not now time to insist.

As to the second point dealt with by Miss Balfour, I am quite in agreement with her. But how is one to avoid this rock? How to provide, in presenting a drawing, against having in one's mind such or such a design? Assuredly one must not speak of it to the subject, for whatever one says tends only to put the subject on a wrong tack. As a rule, I never say a word, though sometimes it is really difficult to allow the subject to hesitate and grope for a quarter of an hour and more, without supplying the word. But even when one says nothing, one thinks, and it is impossible not to do so.

I shall allow myself, à propos to this, to relate the following facts, which have occurred quite recently, and confirm in a surprising manner the remarks of Miss Balfour.

On Sunday (December 9th), at 8 a.m., I received the number of the Journal containing Miss Balfour's paper, which I read naturally with great attention. What struck me most were the remarks as to Figure 60, Exp. XVI., and still more, as to Figure 88, Exp. XXXVIII., and I said to myself that Alice, on the one hand, and Claire, on the other, had given proof of some lucidity but that I had clumsily put them out by my words and my interpretations. [The cases referred to are those in which, the original drawings representing a tree and a swallow, the percipient's descriptions suggested to M. Richet a wreath and
a parrot’s head respectively. See pp. 96 and 112 of Proceedings, Part XII.

I was going, that very day, December 9th, to see both Alice and Claire. At 4.30 p.m., having put Alice to sleep, I made with her five experiments, which succeeded fairly well, though not perfectly in any case, and I ask to be permitted to relate them in detail.

I. I ask: “What object have I in my pocket?” She says: “It is not of much use; it is not long; it is to place upon paper; there is a circle, a stamp (timbre), a seal (cachet); it is not like a paper-weight.” Then I ask (and I was wrong to speak): “What is it made of?” and she says, “Iron.”

These answers are rather remarkable, in so far that they apply admirably, not to the object which I had in my pocket on December 9th—a die (estompe)—but to another object which I had carried about for some days previously (without showing it to any one) with the vague intention of giving it as an object to be guessed at, either by Alice or some other subject. It was a piece of wood, resembling a paper-weight, with a round in the middle—a fragment of wood-work which had become detached from a piece of furniture. The description which Alice had given of it was quite exact, except for saying, “It is to place upon paper,” which applied to the die. The worst mistake, that of saying “It is iron,” was, no doubt, provoked by my ill-timed question.

It seems, therefore, as if there were in this case a mixture of two images—of two objects—(1) the object which I had carried about for two days, with the intention of submitting it to Alice; (2) the object which I actually carried on the day in question.

II. In the next room, which was quite dark, I took a card out of a pack of 32 cards, and put it on the table; afterwards I replaced the pack in my pocket, without showing it. Naturally, I did not know the card, which I thus took from the pack, and in the next room there was no light, and no one was present. Alice said, “Knave of Spades.” In reality it was the King of Spades, which is very much like the knave.

III. I said to Alice: “I am going to take a coin out of my pocket and place it on the table in the next room,” which I did. She said, very rapidly: “It is a franc piece, with the effigy of Napoleon III., 1866.” It was in fact a franc, with the effigy of Napoleon, 1863.

IV. She has an album containing 31 photographs, with which I have sometimes made experiments, making use of each of the photographs as if it were a card in a pack. In the dark room, I took at random one of these photographs, without knowing which I had taken. She told me it was a lady, photographed at Rennes, which was
actually the case; but there were in her album six photographs of ladies taken at Rennes, and she was mistaken in the precise designation of the person whose photograph I had put in my pocket.

V. It is to the experiment with a drawing that I attach most importance. I put into her hands a thoroughly opaque envelope, and I had hardly placed it in her hands when she said, "It is a parrot. I see it quite well—it is so plain that it cannot be true (!). It is upon something high." She said not another word, and I opened the envelope. I said: "It is wrong. It is a man hanged on a big gallows." Then, instead of saying that it was wrong, she is delighted, contrary to custom, and says to me, laughing, "But I saw it; the high perch is the gallows!" And, in fact, one knows that in the public gardens, there are sometimes parrots out of doors on bars, but over them is a large ring, to which they can suspend themselves.

Here, I think, is confirmation of Miss Balfour's hypothesis as to the juxtaposition of two images. It is probable that when I reached Alice's house I was strongly preoccupied with Exp. XXXVIII. and Miss Balfour's criticisms upon it. How that became mixed up with the gallows so as to suggest the parrot I cannot say, but there seems to be more in it than mere coincidence.

I would remark also as to these five experiments,—the only ones which I made with Alice that day,—that they all succeeded, but only partially. Why was their success always spoilt by mistakes? Suppose Alice had said "a die—a king of spades—a gallows," &c., one might almost have affirmed that there was here a demonstration of lucidity in startling degree.

I pass now to the experiment made with Claire on the same day.

For various reasons, Claire has been hypnotised but seldom, but has nevertheless given some rather remarkable proofs of lucidity. As a rule I can put her to sleep only when she is ill, for magnetism has a soothing effect upon her, to a perfectly surprising extent. She is readily open to suggestion, and very sensitive to the magnet, and with her magnetism has more effect in relieving and curing than any other method of treatment.

I show her a closed envelope, of which I do not know the contents. It was then 6 o'clock in the evening, and I had just left Alice's house. Claire said to me, "I see nothing; the envelope is quite dark." (When she sees, or tries to see, it is by putting the envelope quite near to her closed eyes, and she says that she then distinguishes the outlines.)

"It is not the drawing in the envelope which I see. I see a tree. I have before my eyes the image of a tree."

In fact in the envelope was a drawing, very confused and ill-
chosen, of a tombstone—a column surmounted by a bushy cyprus; it was, therefore, also of a tree.

What part had chance in this experiment? It seems impossible to say. I was no doubt thinking of Figure 60 of my paper [a tree], and there was, on the other hand, a tree in the drawing.

I conclude that these experiments, which appear at first so simple, are really very difficult to carry out well. But as Miss Balfour says, with truth, imperfect as they are, they are not discouraging. We must redouble our efforts.

Ch. Richet.

Paris, December 10th, 1888.

We showed the above communication from Professor Richet to Miss Balfour, who sends us the following remarks:

I think from what M. Richet says that I cannot have expressed myself quite clearly in my notes on his paper when I said that “the drawings should be very simple, so that they may be fully taken in at a glance.” I do not mean by this that the lines of the drawing should be quite simple, but that they should convey the idea of the object represented at the first glance, there being nothing to complicate or interfere with that idea. Thus, suppose a drawing representing a dog. A well-drawn dog cannot be simple in its lines; but it should leave no room for doubt as to its being a dog and nothing else. If a percipient, on being given such a drawing, said it was a dog, I hardly think that M. Richet would consider it a less convincing experiment than if she “described it in all its details.”

No doubt experiments with playing cards lend themselves better than drawings to the exact calculation of probabilities. But supposing “lucidity” to be a fact, it ought to be as easy for a percipient to name the objects represented in a good drawing as to name a card, and the chances against the name being correct can obviously be made very much greater with such drawings than with cards, as a much greater number of objects can be represented than there are cards. Care should be taken that a sufficient number of drawings should be made and shuffled together beforehand to ensure this result.

CASES RECEIVED BY THE LITERARY COMMITTEE.

Assuming that the mediums in the following cases had no knowledge of the facts by ordinary means, it may be a question whether they are to be regarded as telepathic, clairvoyant, or as evidence of communication with the dead. They should be compared with the cases given in the Journal for November. It will be observed that the knowledge shown by the mediums might all have been in the minds of the inquirers, but that the ideas were not consciously in
their minds at the moment, and in the case of Dr. Ormsby, the form of the clothes and buttons was not consciously in his memory.

G. 644.

A strange test of spiritual identity happened to the writer soon after arrival in Colorado Springs, ten years ago. The mistress of the boarding-house in which she took her meals, being a Spiritualist, invited her one evening to attend a private séance at a friend's house.

The writer was totally unknown to all those present, and indeed an entire stranger in the town.

After some little time a person present was strongly controlled but unable to speak. By signs she made it evident that it was the stranger with whom she wished to communicate. After many guesses as to the possible unseen presence, the medium went through the action of lace-making on a pillow. The writer mentioned the name of an old Singhalese woman whom she had known many years before, and immediately the medium slid down from her chair, and seizing the writer's hand, kissed it many times, saying in the broken English she was accustomed to employ, how great was her joy and thankfulness at being able to express her gratitude. It must be remembered that this was an American woman, whose position at the feet of an English stranger was little consonant to national feeling, and certainly most unexpected by the writer, who for some 20 years had scarcely thought of poor Loko-rainy.

On retiring for the night a piece of lace made by the Singhalese lace-woman was found to have been worn by the writer. Could this have served as a link?

M. A. Garstin.

Box 764, Colorado Springs, U.S.A.

G. 647, abstract of.

From another informant, whose name we may not give, we learn that at a visit to a medium, Miss Lottie Fowler, under an assumed name, a Chinese woman—Wang-Choa-foo—known to the narrator some 25 years before, professed to communicate. The name was very carefully pronounced by the medium. Some Chinese colloquial expressions were used and an attempt made to write in Chinese characters,—the results, however, being not very intelligible to a Chinese who saw them. According to the evidence it appears to be in a high degree improbable that Miss Fowler should have heard the Chinese name in connection with the narrator, who tells us, moreover, that it is not a common one. It is not known whether Wang-Choa-foo is alive or dead. The incident occurred at our informant's third visit to the medium.

The following was communicated by Dr. Ormsby, of Murphysboro, Illinois, U.S.A., to the Religio-Philosophical Journal for July 7th, 1883. Dr. Ormsby informs us that the medium was a Mr. Drake, of Clinton, Illinois.

G. 645.

"Soon after the close of the war our eldest child, a boy of a little more
than four years old, died, and we buried his body with all the poignant grief of those who lay their loved ones down in the dust and have no assurance that they shall ever see them again; so keen a grief that I thank God I can never more suffer it. About 14 years afterwards I formed the acquaintance of a gentleman who claimed the ability to see and describe spirits at nearly any time. He was not acquainted with my history, and did not know that I had ever lost a child. Sitting one day in my office, I asked him to describe to me any spirits he might see there. He described two old ladies, who, he said, claimed to be my mother and grandmother, but there were no very salient points by which they could be identified. Then he said, 'There is a little boy about four years old sitting on your foot. He looks up into your face and says, 'This is my papa.' He is dressed in black or dark blue pants that button on to a waist of the same colour, and has a white ruffle down the front of the waist. The buttons on the clothing are bell-shaped; there is a plain rim around the outside and the rest of the button is bell-shaped.' During this description I asked no questions, made no comment, nor hinted that I had lost a child. I said absolutely nothing on the subject at that time. I did not from the description recognise the clothing as any particular suit that our child had ever worn, but when I went home I asked my wife concerning such a suit (not telling her anything about the séance) and she at once said, 'Yes; I made that suit from the coats you had worn in the army, and the buttons were the little staff buttons that came off the sleeves at the wrist.' A few days afterward sitting again in my office, I asked the same party whether he could see the child he had described to me; and if so, whether he still wore the same suit? To both of these interrogatories he answered 'Yes.' I then asked him to describe again the buttons he had seen. He did so in about these words: 'They are bell-shaped buttons with a plain rim around the outside, but the bell-shaped part is ornamented. The ornamental work is not cut; it is raised. The button is metal; what we call a brass button.' Then stretching out his hand he said, 'Why; I see those buttons as plainly as though I had them in my hand. I could pick one of them out from among a thousand different kinds.' Just then the city clock struck 12, and rising I asked him to walk home and take dinner with me. He accepted, and when we got home I set before him a box containing many buttons of many kinds, and requested him to select the button he had described to me. Giving the box a shake one of the larger size of the staff buttons came to the surface, and he instantly picked it up saying, 'There is the button.'

I then told him of our loss, and that his description was accurate, and very naturally the circumstance made a very strong impression on my mind, the more so as not being very enthusiastic I had made no suggestions and asked no leading questions.

"O. B. ORMSBY.

Murphysboro, Ill."

In the following two cases exceptional opportunities were enjoyed of observing the nature of the hallucinations. The first is so unusually prolonged and dream-like—so unlike the general type of hallucinations—that we should certainly have supposed it to be a dream had we not
such clear evidence that the percipient was awake and in full possession of her normal faculties at the time. The second, on the other hand, would certainly be regarded as a waking hallucination were it not for the evidence that the percipient was momentarily asleep, and it suggests that other apparently waking hallucinations may sometimes be of the same character. We know so little about hallucinations, and they play so important a part in our investigations, that all observations throwing light on their nature are of great value.

P. 635.

74, Durham-road, Manor Park, Little Ilford, Essex.

April 11th, 1888.

My brother's wife died on March 4th, 1885. From that time he was in failing health. Early in February, 1887, he grew rapidly worse, and was ordered to Bournemouth. About midnight one Saturday night (I think it was the 23rd of February), while he was at Bournemouth, I was lying awake in bed, the gas being full on, when I fancied that I saw a grave with a small white stone lying, and one in an upright position. These stones suddenly changed to a leaden hue, and upon the flat stone I saw a basket of exquisite flowers, all white, and such as I have not beheld before nor since. On the top of all the flowers was a very large tiger lily. Immediately following this I felt a presence near me, but could see nothing, and it flashed into my mind that my brother had died at Bournemouth. Shortly after I saw him in my bedroom with a lady, whose arm was linked in his. Her face I did not see, as they were a little in advance of me. I saw his, and recognised his form. He was on the side nearest to me. The lady was draped as a well-dressed bride, and veiled. Her dress was white and glistening. He was in ordinary clothing, and they were both very happy. I also heard distinctly the low murmur of voices, and heard, too, her glad laugh. (This increased my belief that he had died, and that this lady was his wife.) They were in mid-air, and were quite unconscious of my presence, and seemed to glide rather than walk. After advancing a little they stood still, my brother seeming reluctant to go on. After lingering a moment the lady vanished, leaving my brother as one deep in thought, but still hesitating; she reappeared for an instant and, as it seemed, enticed him to follow her. But he still seemed unwilling to go with her and she vanished finally, and after a few more moments lingering my brother followed in the same direction that the lady had vanished. He returned to London about a fortnight after this vision and died on the 23rd of March, 1887, very suddenly, and the memory of this wonderful experience will, I feel, be always sacred to me. The surprising part to me is, that throughout the whole of this I was possessed with a feeling of calmness and utter absence of fear.

Miriam Jameson.

Mr. Jameson writes:

April 7th, 1888.

My own share in the proceedings narrated was as follows. I was on the
night referred to sitting at work in my study—not far from our bedroom—when my wife called me and said that she felt sure her brother was in the bedroom. I said, "You are nervous. I will come to bed." I had scarcely done so when she sat up and began to describe to me what is stated in her narrative as to seeing her brother, &c. I saw nothing. My wife was composed, but her face was very animated and her eyes glistened. She looked and spoke just as a good actress would in describing scene and action not visible to her audience.

Our little son, then about 18 months old, had been taken into our bed—being wakeful. He was wide awake, and was prattling and trying to caress his mother while she told me what she was seeing. His interruptions seemed to hinder my wife from hearing what her brother said, for she hushed the little one repeatedly.

The orphan child, about two years old, of my brother-in-law, who had been with us from the time of her mother's death, was sleeping in an adjoining room.

I may add that, although I am acquainted with several well-known Spiritualists, I have never (nor has my wife) taken much interest in Spiritualistic phenomena. I mention this to show that prepossession would not account for my wife's remarkable experience.

My own mind is still in suspense on the point whether that experience was not purely subjective, although I cannot but admit that I have been deeply impressed by the fact of the intense objective reality of that experience to my wife.

WILLIAM JAMESON.

In answer to inquiries, Mrs. Jameson informs us:—

1. That she 'never had any other hallucination of sight, hearing, or any other sense.
2. There was no point of coincidence with fact in the two tombstones, the tiger lily, &c.
3. She thinks the interval of time between the vision of tombstones and the vision of figures was about five or ten minutes. "The white stones changed soon and suddenly, the leaden hue lasted longer, then came the flowers. Then I felt the unseen presence, and on turning round or over to my little son, who began to chatter, these figures appeared together, as I have told you, and I sat up in bed and watched them steadfastly until they vanished close to the outer wall of the house."
4. The walls, the gas full on, and all in her bedroom were visible to her, but she felt that her brother and the lady had an environment of their own. She remembers most distinctly her brother's curly hair.
5. She does not think that she had been more than usually anxious about her brother. She had been speaking of him, and had written to him that day.
6. She never mentioned the vision to her brother, and does not know anything about him on the night in question, except that she heard on the Monday that he had seemed a little better on Saturday night.

The vision affected her very much.
P. 382. From Mr. Pratt, Camden House, Lower Merton, Surrey.

December 13th, 1882.

On December 31st, 1856, I, Thomas Pratt, was residing at, and carrying on the business of a clerical tailor, &c., at 50, Cambridge-street, corner of Warwick-street, Pimlico, the house at that time being known as Oxford House, Cambridge-street. Mr. Gleddos, a young curate of St. Barnabas Church, Pimlico, came to me to pay his bill and order a new clerical coat about seven o'clock in the evening, saying he was going away for a short time, and he wished the coat to be ready to fit on by the time he returned. He was in a great hurry, having several calls to make before evensong, which was at eight o'clock. He did not give me time to finish receipting his bill, but took it away with only the word Rec. written on it and left the house immediately.

I was busy making a clerical coat that was wanted the next day, and had decided to sit up to finish it. I was accustomed to work all night frequently, and continued working at the coat after my wife and family had retired to bed. I kept on working and thinking about my order, planning it out in my mind, when suddenly Mr. Gleddos appeared at the corner of the board on which I was sitting, and at the same spot as he had stood in the evening, and looking just the same as he did in the evening; the gaslight was between us. At that moment the room door opened and he vanished. The fright was so great, I felt my hair go stiff up on my head. I had leaped from the board and looked outside the door, but saw nothing of him. Creeping upstairs as best I could my knees shook so violently I did not know what to do, but got into bed and covered my head over with the clothes and told my wife what had happened. I had left the gas burning, and when I got up felt very unsettled, and could not begin to work. About nine or a little after Father Lyford,* came to me, bringing the partly receipted bill in his hand, and inquiring if I knew anything about what was written on it, as Mr. Gleddos was found dead, and the bill was on the top of the drawers in the bedroom where he had died. I then told him what I had seen in the night. He seemed very much shocked, and told me not to talk about it.

As the day went on and I became more calm, I commenced to finish the coat. Now this will, I think, be the most important part of my ghost story. I had finished both halves of the coat, and only the back seam remained to be joined. It was this middle seam I was working at, and had sewn up to between the shoulders when Mr. Gleddos appeared, and here I found my needle as I had left it. As I was about to begin, I was surprised at the last part of the back stitching for hem; the stitches were all shapes and not one alike. This convinced me that I had been asleep, although my hand had used the needle at the same time. Having convinced myself it was a dream, the door coming open had woke me from my sleep, which could not have been altogether more than half a minute.

The door of the room was in the habit of coming open with the least

* The Rev. Charles Lyford was curate at the same church, but was called Father by those who knew him best.
vibration caused by wind, and from these two circumstances I came to the conclusion that I had dreamed of seeing him only. Had not these things come to my knowledge in this way as I have described them, I should have believed I had seen a real ghost, and nothing would perhaps have convinced me to the contrary. But I feel quite certain I did not see him with my eyes I work by, although at the time everything appeared to favour the belief of an apparition.

**Thomas Pratt.**

[Mrs. Pratt is now dead. The fact of the sudden death of Mr. Gleddos, which took place about 8 a.m., has been independently verified.—E.G.]

In this second case—Mr. Pratt’s—there is a coincidence which is certainly noteworthy. It is a hallucination occurring a few hours before a sudden death, and it might be regarded as possibly either premonitory or telepathic;—coinciding on the telepathic hypothesis with feelings premonitory of death on the part of the agent. On the other hand it must not be forgotten that hallucinations apparently purely subjective, sometimes take the form of after-images (see Phantasms of the Living, Vol. I., p. 502), and that this particular case much resembles that of the lady who "had a vivid waking vision of a servant who had startled her some hours before."

L. 822 (Borderland).

The following is at any rate an interesting experience, and there seems to be some reason for thinking that it may have been a case of "telepathic clairvoyance"—the vision representing an actual scene. It should be compared with cases at the end of Chapter VI., Vol. I. of Phantasms of the Living, pp. 255-266, with the last section of Chapter VIII., and with case (20) Chapter V.

April 4th, 1888.

Your letter to the Telegraph of March 27th, brought to my memory an incident that occurred to me some years since—in fact, in 1866. I might preface my statement by saying that I am not in the least superstitious.

For some years previous to 1866 I had been residing in B—as agent for a large firm in London. Soon after my arrival in B, I took apartments in the suburbs, in a house kept by two sisters, one a maiden lady, the other a widow with two daughters. To make a long story short, I fell in love with the youngest daughter, proposed and was accepted, although her mother always was very much opposed to it. Time passed on and I heard of a much better appointment. I threw up the one I had and came to London to secure the other, without telling anyone in B—anything about it. I had been in London about five weeks, when, one Sunday evening, feeling irritable and dull, I retired to rest, much earlier than usual. I had been in bed some time trying to court sleep, when
suddenly at one end of the room there appeared two figures, and as they developed one was my fiancée, the other the man whom I had always looked on as my greatest friend and "chum" in B——. There was the room—my room—the fireplace, and every particular true to the original, and the attitude of the two—he holding her hand, and her troubled look left no doubt in my mind that he was proposing to her. No sooner had I grasped the circumstances of the case than the vision melted and was gone; and now comes what I consider the remarkable part. On the following Tuesday I had a letter from the young lady's brother, informing me that her mother had prevailed on her to break off her engagement with me, and one from the young lady herself returning all my presents, and stating that her mother had forbidden her to correspond with me further; and in less than a month I heard from a mutual friend in B—— that the young lady was engaged to the man I had seen in the vision.

Being rather a sore point at the time, I never mentioned the vision to any of my friends or relatives at the time, feeling convinced that they would say it was a dream. But I know that I was as wide awake at the time as I am now; and while it lasted I had the sensation of being entranced, utterly unable to move, but no fright or unpleasant feeling. I can only compare it to a dissolving view, such as you see sometimes produced by a magic lantern.

I long imagined that I had a rival in the field, but never suspected my particular "chum" for a moment.

After it had passed away (the vision), I tried to consider what it could be, and came to the conclusion that it was animal magnetism, a subject that had created some stir in the papers and magazines some time previously. I give you the account for what it is worth. It has always been a riddle to me for which I have never been able to find the solution.

(Signed) J. H S——.

After a personal interview with Mr. S., Mr. G. A. Smith writes:—

April 19th, 1888.

I saw Mr. S. to-day. Whatever his impression may have been—waking or sleeping—there is no doubt that it was more vivid than any other subjective sensation he has ever had. He says he never dreams that he knows of—at least he forgets them immediately upon waking; but he recovered himself from this experience with a distinct feeling that he had encountered something different from a dream: he brought away a more vivid recollection of the scene, of the attitude, dress and expressions of the persons seen than he has ever done from any dream, and he was struck at the time with the curious condition of feeling present in the B——room as a spectator, and yet having a sort of side knowledge that he was in his own bed. And when the thing was over he had no recognisable sensation of having just woke; he could realise no break of consciousness whatever. He hadn't the faintest ground for suspicion that his friend would supplant him, and felt perfectly assured of the young lady's devotion to himself. He says he never remembers meeting with any similar cases, and he seems to have no tendency towards the marvellous. Quite the contrary. But he has always
held the view that the couple were really engaged as he saw them in the vision on that Sunday evening, and that their minds, both stirred with the idea of the injustice being done to him at the moment, might somehow have acted upon him so as to call up the vision to his view. Moreover the hour and evening (10 o'clock Sunday) would be just the occasion most likely for such an interview in B——; the room, too, was the most probable one for it to have really occurred in. A point not mentioned in his letter is that he noticed exactly how the lady was attired in the vision, and he observed particularly that she wore a blue silk dress that was unfamiliar to him. A few weeks later, on a brief stay in B——, finally settling his affairs in that town, he passed the lady in the street, when she was wearing a blue silk dress.

(Signed) G. A. SMITH.

THE FOX SISTERS.

In the last number of the Journal there was a note on the confessions of the Fox sisters, Mrs. Kane and Mrs. Jencken.

Since then a letter has been received from Mrs. Jencken by a friend of hers, in London and published in Light, in which her share in the alleged confession is—by implication though not expressly—denied. It seems only fair to Mrs. Jencken to print this letter here.

November 17th, 1888.

"My Dear Mrs. COTTELL,—I would have written to you before this, but my surprise was so great on my arrival to hear of Maggie’s exposure of Spiritualism that I had no heart to write to anyone.

The manager of the affair engaged the Academy of Music, the very largest place of entertainment in New York City; it was filled to overflowing. They made 1,500 dol. clear. I have often wished I had remained with you, and if I had the means I would now return, to get out of all this.

I think now I could make money in proving that the knockings are not made with the toes. So many people come to me to ask me about this exposure of Maggie’s that I have to deny myself to them.

They are hard at work to expose the whole thing if they can; but they certainly cannot.

Maggie is giving public exposures in all the large places in America, but I have only seen her once since I arrived.

(Signed) K. F. JENCKEN.

Our attribution to Mrs. Jencken of a share in the confession was based on the authority of several uncontradicted statements which had appeared in American journals. Among statements of this kind the following extract from the Religio-Philosophical Journal (a leading Spiritualistic paper in America), dated November 24th, 1888, may be read with interest in connection with Mrs. Jencken’s letter:

On Thursday evening of last week [that is, November 15th, two days
before the letter was written], at Rochester, N.Y., Mrs. Kate Fox Jencken joined forces with "Professor" Star, who has for years made his living as an expositor of Spiritualism. Kate does not seem to have added much to the show, aside from the prestige of her presence.

We may note further that the news of Mrs. Jencken’s co-operation with her sister in “exposure” appears to have been unquestioningly accepted as true by the friends no less than the foes of Spiritualism in England. The following paragraph, for instance, appeared in Light of November 3rd:

We learn from America that Mrs. Jencken and Mrs. Kane, two of the Fox sisters, have started on an exposure tour, in which they apparently propose to expose themselves first of all, and their dupes (if any) afterwards. It is always painful to be compelled to write of those whose names are familiar amongst us otherwise than in terms of commendation. But the issues at stake in Spiritualism are of wider import than the character of any individual. Painful, therefore, as it may be, we are compelled to say that no credence is to be attached to anything that these ladies may say. Mrs. Jencken has for a long time been a victim to a deplorable habit which has apparently destroyed her moral consciousness, and rendered anything she may say or do unworthy of attention.

As was said in the note that appeared in the Journal for December, little weight can be attached to what mediums who expose themselves may say, since they confess themselves deceivers; but in this case the confession seems to have been supported by experimental demonstration, and it would be strange on any hypothesis but that of trickery, that the raps should be capable of voluntary production for exposure purposes, and not capable of production when Professors Flint, Lee and Coventry, of Buffalo, in 1851, arranged the conditions so as to prevent the action of the joints by which, in their opinion (founded on experiments with another person), they were caused. A brief account of their experiments condensed from Capron’s Modern Spiritualism, published in 1856, will be found in Proceedings, Vol. IV. p. 47.

THE THIRD VOLUME OF THE JOURNAL.

The third volume of the Journal ends with the December number. Title-page and index are issued with this number. Covers for binding may be purchased at 1s. each, post free. Application to be made to the Assistant-Secretary, 19, Buckingham-street, Adelphi, London, W.C. The price of the volume, post free, will be 10s. Nearly all the numbers can be purchased separately, to complete sets, at 6d. each.